

American Dissident Voices

Dr. William Luther Pierce

Politically Incorrect Press

PRESENTS

American Dissident Voices by Dr. *William Luther Pierce*

Editing & Cover Design:

Shane Webster

for **People of *European Descent***

wherever they may live throughout the world

Melbourne Australia **July 10. 2011**

NOT FOR SALE!

Kinsmen die and cattle die,

And so must one die one's self,

But there is one thing I know which never dies

And that is the fame of a dead man's deeds.

(Old Norse Saga)

INDEX

1. Our Cause (9)
2. Truth Before Fashion (20)
3. The Letter They Wouldn't Answer (26)
4. FREEDOM Use It or Lose It (29)
5. What Is Racism (34)
6. Skinheads and the Law (39)
7. Brainwashing in America (44)
8. Terror Breeds Terror (50)
9. Non-White Immigration (55)
10. Disney and the Jews (61)
11. The End of Justice in America (67)
12. Hate Speech (73)
13. There's a Conspiracy (79)
14. The Silencing of Hans Schmidt (85)
15. Retribution Is Coming . . . And They Know It (91)
16. Why They Hate Buchanan (97)
17. The Destructive Media (102)
18. Men of Valor (108)
19. Proving White Is Black (114)
20. The Big Picture (120)
21. What Liberals Don't Understand (126)
22. Feminism The Great Destroyer (132)
23. Understanding Our Enemies (138)
24. The Meaning of Democracy (144)
25. The Texaco Fiasco (150)
26. Get Set for War (155)
27. Thoughts on Discrimination (160)
28. The End of the Millennium (165)
29. The Rule of Law (170)
30. Hope for the Future (175)
31. Shakespeare and Democracy (180)
32. Skating on Thin Ice (185)
33. Thoughts on the Holocaust (190)
34. Time to Stop Listening (195)
35. The Nature of Patriotism (200)
36. The Jewish Problem (205)
37. On Churchgoers (210)
38. How Liberals Think (215)
39. Time To Do What's Right (220)
40. Focusing Our Anger (225)
41. What Terrifies America's Enemies (230)
42. Toward a Healthy Society (235)
43. Allen Ginsberg (240)
44. Remember What Happened to Anwar (245)
45. Marriage and White Survival (250)
46. Slime at the Top (255)
47. Day of Infamy (260)
48. The Clinton White House (265)
49. The Women of Monte Cassino (270)
50. Right and Wrong (275)
51. The Morality of the Immigration Problem (280)
52. Why Our Government Is Corrupt (285)
53. The Campaign Against Hate Crime (290)
54. The Importance of Courage (295)
55. The Meaning of Affirmative Action (300)
56. The Psychology of Political Correctness (305)
57. Who Are the Haters (310)
58. The New World Order (315)
59. The Feminization of America (320)
60. The Giant Gold Robbery (325)
61. Black On White Violence (330)
62. Contrasts (335)
63. The Looting of America (340)
64. The Wages of Liberalism (345)

65. In Your Ear, Mr. Clinton (350)
66. The Tragedy Of Chautauqua County (355)
67. The Promise Keepers (360)
68. The Lesson of Haiti (365)
69. Exposing the Warmongers (370)
70. Brainwashing Our Children (375)
71. What Is a Patriot to Do (380)
72. The White Farmers of Zimbabwe (385)
73. The Criminal in the White House (390)
74. Jews and the White Slave Trade (395)
75. A Question of Sanity (400)
76. Bill and Monica (405)
77. Sinking of the Wilhelm Gustloff (410)
78. Bill, Monica, and Saddam (415)
79. Jewish Policy Against Iraq (420)
80. The Wrecking of Our Schools (425)
81. Judicial Insanity and Schoolyard Massacres (430)
82. The Theft of Our Freedom (435)
83. Replacing Shakespeare With Malcolm X (440)
84. Clinton's Legacy (445)
85. The Mexican Menace (450)
86. The Katyn Massacre (455)
87. Nationalism vs. the New World Order (460)
88. Building Understanding (465)
89. The School Problem (470)
90. The Lesson of Africa (475)
91. Cowardice and Individualism (480)
92. Paying the Organizatsiya (485)
93. Democracy (490)
94. Lew, Bill, Tupac, and Mitchell (495)
95. The Jewish Gold Rush (500)
96. The Genocide at Vinnitsa (505)
97. Superman, Volkswagen, and Lazar Kaganovich (511)
98. Thinking about a White Future (516)
99. The Romanovs, Child Porn, and Hate Laws (521)
100. Media Myths (526)
101. The Lesson of Amy Biehl (531)
102. David Geffen, Steven Spielberg, and Bill Clinton (537)
103. The Fayetteville Murders (542)
104. The Russian Economy (548)
105. Fashion for Genocide (554)
106. A Closer Look at the Enemy (560)
107. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (566)
108. The Coming of the New Elites (572)
109. The Corruption of America's Police (578)
110. The Millennium Bug and Mainstreaming the News (584)
111. Hate Crimes and the New World Order (590)
112. The Lesson of South Africa (596)
113. Tribes (602)
114. How It Fits Together (608)
115. Aesop's Fables and the Rules of Engagement (614)
116. What We Owe Sam Dash (620)
117. The Holocaust Shakedown (626)
118. The Limits of Toleration (632)
119. Time to Water the Tree of Liberty (638)
120. Clinton's War (644)
121. Choosing a Barbie Doll (650)
122. When the Barriers Come Down (656)
123. AIDS and the Cult of Equality (662)
124. Thoughts on Accepting Responsibility (668)
125. A Trial in Jasper (674)
126. Odysseus' Way (680)
127. Special Treatment (686)
128. Lawyers (692)
129. Hands Off Yugoslavia! (698)
130. Why the Jews Want War (704)
131. What Makes Madeleine Run (710)
132. The New World Order (716)
133. Lies, Murder, and Jews (722)
134. The End of Patriotism (728)

135. The Bigger War (734)
136. What They're Aiming For (740)
137. Stopping the Hijacking of America (746)
138. The Value of Talk (752)
139. Fooling the People (758)
140. State-Sponsored Terrorism (764)
141. How They Rule (770)
142. Smell the Blood (776)
143. Our Revolutionary Right (782)
144. Knowledge and Discipline (788)
145. The Division of America (794)
146. Enemies of Liberty (800)
147. Kennedy, Barak, and Revolution (806)
148. Authoritarianism and Oz (812)
149. Killing Little Children (818)
150. Bosch-Bin Laden (824)
151. Bat Guano and Hate Speech (830)
152. Jewish Democracy (836)
153. Hardheaded Altruism (842)
154. The Jews and the Senators (848)
155. Seeing the Forest (854)
156. Shuffling Toward the Slaughterhouse (860)
157. Individualism and Alienation (866)
158. Hypocrisy and Democracy (872)
159. Clinton's Call for Tolerance (878)
160. The New Protocols (884)
161. Fighting Together for the Future (890)
162. Germany and America (896)
163. Tribal Thinking (902)
164. Books and Freedom (907)
165. Thoughts on Government (913)
166. Deliberate Deception (919)
167. Timothy McVeigh and The Turner Diaries (925)
168. How to Bring Down the House (930)
169. Lies and the History Channel (936)
170. Illusion and Leverage (942)
171. Capitalism and Equality (948)
172. Reality Check (954)
173. The Hurricane (960)
174. The Club (966)
175. Elites vs. Masses (972)
176. Fear of the Smear (977)
177. The Killing of Kayla (983)
178. The Health of the Nation (989)
179. Returning Fire (995)
180. The Wages of Selfishness (1001)
181. Zimbabwe Liberal Consequences (1007)
182. Horror in Rhodesia (1013)
183. To Be, or Not to Be (1019)
184. Storm, Break Loose! (1025)
185. Shielding Evil (1031)
186. Moral AIDS (1037)
187. Our Task (1043)
188. Termites (1049)
189. Images (1055)
190. Music of Rebellion (1061)
191. The Evil Among Us (1067)
192. Basics (1073)
193. Black Is Good; White Is Bad (1079)
194. The Nature of the Beast (1084)
195. The Rubes and the Carnies (1089)
196. The Jewish Mob in America (1095)
197. The Faustian Spirit and Political Correctness (1101)
198. Survival Essentials (1107)
199. The Significance of the Holocaust (1113)
200. Joe Lieberman and Judaism (1119)
201. The Case of Hendrik Möbus (1125)
202. Behind America's Moral Decay (1131)
203. What's Important (1137)
204. Feasting on the Sheep (1143)

205. The Corrupters (1149)
206. There Will Be Hell to Pay (1155)
207. Down the Slippery Slope (1161)
208. Why Do They Do It (1167)
209. Corrupting Our Police (1173)
210. Conditioning for Death (1179)
211. A White World (1185)
212. I Need Your Support (1191)
213. Race Suicide (1197)
214. What We Can Do (1203)
215. Draw Your Own Conclusions (1209)
216. MTV and Hate (1215)
217. Racial Fitness and Survival (1221)
218. Child Porn, Ecstasy, and Pardons (1227)
219. The Peace Process (1233)
220. Sharon, Rape, and the Wizard of Oz (1239)
221. Marc Rich and the Rule of Law (1245)
222. Law and Shamrocks (1251)
223. Seattle's Fat Tuesday Riot (1257)
224. Poisonous Doctrines (1263)
225. Countering the Poison (1269)
226. Diversity Is Our Strength (1275)
227. As Ye Sow . . (1281)
228. Shocking Differences (1287)
229. Riots and Revolution (1293)
230. Patriot's Choice (1299)
231. Feces, Fetuses, Etc (1305)
232. The Morality of Survival (1311)
233. Sharing the Affliction (1317)
234. A Riot in York (1323)
235. Scalp Dance (1329)
236. Behind Liberalism (1335)
237. Murdering Iowa (1341)
238. The Scorpion and the Frog (1347)
239. Mike Wallace's Lesson (1353)
240. Fast and Furious (1359)
241. Why We Deserve Their Contempt (1365)
242. Subverting Freedom (1371)
243. Time to Blast Our Enemies (1377)
244. Demonstrating for Freedom (1383)
245. To Be, or To Be Nice (1389)
246. The Saga of Yahweh ben Yahweh (1395)
247. Self-Discipline and Moral Health (1401)
248. When Unreason Rules (1407)
249. Provocation and Response (1413)
250. Who Is Guilty (1419)
251. Regaining Control (1425)
252. America's Real Enemies (1431)
253. Face Crime and Anthrax (1437)
254. Advice for Patriots (1443)
255. Send Them All Back (1449)
256. Why Revolution Is Necessary (1455)
257. Terrorism and Hate (1461)
258. The Value of Truth and Righteousness (1467)
259. Destroying Order (1473)
260. An Awakening (1479)
261. Great Masters of the Lie (1485)
262. The Club (1491)
263. Labels (1497)
264. The Greatest Betrayal (1503)
265. Journalists and Canadians (1509)
266. What Is Moral (1515)
267. The Culture of Lies (1521)
268. Multicultural Justice (1527)
269. Media-Driven Law (1533)
270. The Martyrdom of Wafa Idris (1539)
271. Enron, Fastow, and the Looting of America (1545)
272. Our Biggest Mistake (1551)
273. Jewish Hate, the Media, and the ADL (1557)
274. The New Patriotism (1563)

275. Espionage and Anthrax (1569)
276. Senator Feinstein and Police Chief Parks (1575)
277. Bad News and Good News (1581)
278. A Fatal Influence (1587)
279. Tiptoeing around Our Problems (1593)
280. The Beginning of the End (1599)
281. Two Crucial Tasks (1605)
282. Democracy and Propaganda (1611)
283. Philadelphia and Kampala (1617)
284. A Third World War (1623)
285. The Big Lie (1629)
286. The Importance of Leadership (1635)
287. The FBI, the ADL, and Christina Long (1641)
288. The New Extremists (1647)
289. The Consequences of Corruption (1653)
290. Mossad and the Jewish Problem (1660)

Our Cause

Every day, I receive letters from our members across the country as well as from people here in the Washington area who have attended our meetings in the past. These letters and questions indicate that there is still some uncertainty in people's minds as to what we are, what we believe, and what we intend to do. Questions, in other words, as to what it's all about. I want to try again tonight to answer these questions as clearly as I possibly can.

I'm sure that one of the difficulties people have in trying to understand us is that they can't figure out quite how to categorize us. They're accustomed to putting everything they encounter in life into little, mental pigeonholes labeled right-wing, left-wing, communist, racist, and so on. And once they've done that, they think they understand the thing.

Now the trouble is that we don't quite fit any of the customary pigeonholes. And that is because the doctrine of the National Alliance, the truth for which we stand, is not just a rehash of old and familiar ideas but is really something new to Americans.

Perhaps the best way to approach an understanding of the Alliance is to start by getting rid of some of the most troublesome pigeonholes altogether. That is, by pointing out what we are not. We are not, as many people tend to assume at first, either a conservative or a right-wing group. And I'm not just trying to be cute when I say that. I'm not just trying to emphasize that we are a special right-wing group or a better right-wing group. In fact, our truth has very little in common with most right-wing creeds. We're not interested, for example, in restoring the Constitution. The Constitution, written 200 years ago, served a certain purpose well for a time. But that time is now passed. Nor was its purpose the same as our purpose today. We're not interested in states' rights, in restoring the former sovereignty of the individual states. We do not believe, as our conservative friends do, that a strong and centralized government is an evil in itself. It is, in fact, a necessity in overcoming many of the obstacles which lie ahead of us as a people.

What else is dear to the hearts of right-wingers? Do we want to restore prayer and Bible reading to the public schools? Hardly. Anti-fluoridation? Nonsense. Income tax? Abortion? Pornography? Well, we may sympathize more with the right-wing position on these issues than we do with the left-wing position, but they are still only peripheral issues for us. They are not the reason why we are here. They are not the things we are prepared to die for.

There are, in fact, several issues on which we are closer to what would ordinarily be considered the left-wing or liberal position than we are to the conservative or right-wing position. One of these issues is the ecology issue: the protection of our natural environment, the elimination of pollution, and the protection of wildlife. And there are also other issues in which we are closer to the liberals than to the conservatives, although I doubt that we agree with them completely on any issue; just as we seldom, if ever, agree completely with the right-wing on any issue.

The reason for the lack of complete agreement, when there seems to be approximate agreement, with either the right or the left is that our position on every issue is derived from an underlying view of the world which is fundamentally different from those of either the right or the left. That

is, to the extent that they have any underlying philosophy at all. Often there is none, and a great many people who identify themselves as liberals, conservatives, or moderates simply have an assortment of views on various issues which are not related to any common idea, purpose, or philosophy.

Before we turn to a positive look at the Alliance, let me inject just a few more negatives. One thing we are not trying to do is to find any quick or easy solutions to the problems confronting us as a people. We have enormously difficult problems. If we are to solve them at all, we must tackle them with more determination, more tenacity, and more fanaticism than they have ever been tackled before. We must prepare ourselves mentally and spiritually for a very long, bloody, and agonizing struggle.

We mustn't imagine that we are like a squad of soldiers about to assault a cave full of robbers and that the only preparation we need is to be sure our bayonets are fixed and that our powder is dry. This seems to be the attitude of most patriots these days and it is not a realistic one. "Throw out those bums in Washington," they say "and our problems will be over."

No. We must think of ourselves instead as the beginning -- the barest beginning -- of a mighty army whose task is not to clean out a cave full of robbers, but is to conquer an entire hostile world. Before the first shot is fired we must build our invasion fleet with thousands of ships and siege engines. We must lay in massive supplies of cannon balls, powder, and all sorts of other munitions. And we must do a hundred other things.

In other words, we must prepare ourselves for our political struggle before we can count on it yielding anything other than the invariable failure which has rewarded patriots in the past. We must build a foundation which will sustain us for a very long campaign.

Let me give you another analogy. We are like a tribe of hungry, starving people living in a land which, although the soil is fertile, provides relatively little to eat. These people find a few berries growing on bushes and a few edible roots in the ground. All they can think about is that they are hungry and they must fill their bellies. This is their immediate problem. They spend all of their time, day after day, year after year, hunting for those scarce berries on the bushes and pulling an occasional edible root out of the ground. And they never really fill their bellies; they always remain hungry and on the edge of starvation. That is because no one has ever taken a few minutes off from berry hunting and thought further ahead than the immediate problem of filling his belly, now, for this meal. No one has proposed that while some continue to hunt for berries, others in the tribe should tolerate their hunger pains for a while and make themselves a few simple tools, a simple plow from a tree branch perhaps, and a hoe, and then use these tools to plow up some of the most fertile areas of their land and plant a few berries in furrows and keep watch over them so that the birds don't scratch them up. They could weed their furrows and perhaps divert a portion of a nearby stream for irrigation. If they did this, if they thought beyond their immediate problem, and, to the extent possible, tackled a much larger problem, they would eventually, even though it might take years, solve the problem of hunger which they could never solve when that was all they thought about. The solution to the problem of keeping their bellies full would be to develop an agricultural basis for their berry-picking and root-digging.

Now we need a philosophical and spiritual basis for our political struggle. A basis, of course, which tells us why we must fight and what we are fighting for. But we also want a basis which will tell us how to build a whole new world after we have won the political struggle. In other words, we are not building a basis to use for a month, or for a few years, but a basis which will last a thousand years and more. We are building a basis which will serve not only us, but also countless future generation of our race. And it is high time that we did this. We have drifted without any sense of direction, without any long-range perspectives, for far too long. It's time that we stopped fixing our sights on next year, or the next election, and fix them instead on eternity.

You know, we Americans are famous for being a practical people, a hard-headed, no nonsense people. We are not great thinkers, perhaps, but we are real problem solvers. We don't fool around; we plow right into things. That's how we settled this country. We didn't agonize about whether we were being fair to the Indians when we took their land; we just walked right over them and kept moving west. That's what we had to do. We just followed our instincts and used our heads and, more often than not, we did the right thing.

But we also made some mistakes, bad mistakes. Because the southern colonies were ideally suited for certain types of crops which required lots of hand labor, there weren't any machines back then of course, we brought Negroes into the country. That seemed to make pretty good economic sense at the time. But we really should have thought harder about the long-range consequences of that move. We wouldn't have had to be real wizards to foresee the future. History provides a number of instructive examples for us to study.

We kept on making mistakes: mistakes based on shortsightedness mostly, mistakes from not being able to give any real weight to anything but the immediate problem, mistakes from not thinking far enough ahead. Analyzing the situation a little more deeply, we can say that we were shortsighted because we had no really firm basis for being longsighted. We had no solid foundation on which to stand in order to evaluate the long-range consequences of our decisions. And, as a result of this, we were suckers for various brands of sentimentality, strictly here and now sentimentality, sentimentality rooted only in the present. It was this sort of fuzzy sentimentality, this *Uncle Tom's Cabin* sentimentality, which led to the war between the states and to the dumping of some three million Blacks into our free society a hundred years ago. It also led to our failure to properly control immigration into this country, our failure to prevent the flood of Jews which poured in after the Civil War.

These things troubled many good people. Lincoln was troubled over the potential consequences of freeing the Negroes. Later, others were troubled over the dangers of uncontrolled immigration. But the fuzzy sentimentalists prevailed because those who knew in their hearts that the country was making mistakes didn't have a really solid basis from which to oppose the sentimentalists. They didn't have their sights fixed on eternity. They had no all-encompassing worldview to back them up.

And the same problem of shortsightedness is far worse today. A person goes to church and hears his minister tell him that we are all God's children, Black and White. And although his instinct tries to tell him that the minister is leading him astray, he will not challenge the minister because

he has no firm convictions rooted in eternity to back up his feelings. The same is true of the whole country, and of our whole race, today. We are like a ship without a compass. Various factions of the crew are arguing about which way to steer, but no one really knows where the ship is headed. We've lost our sense of direction. We no longer have a distant, fixed star to guide us. Actually, it's even worse than that. We have lost our ability to follow a distant star even if we could see one. We are like a nation, like a race, without a soul. And that is a fatal condition.

No purely political program can have any real value for us in the long run unless we get our souls back, unless we learn once again how to be true to our inner nature, unless we learn to heed the divine spark inside us and base all our decisions on a clear and comprehensive philosophy illuminated by that spark.

Let me tell you a little story, which I believe illustrates our problem. Several years ago, I spoke to a class at a private high school in Maryland. It was the Indian Spring Friends' School operated by the Quakers, but with a student body which seemed to be about equally divided between Jews and gentiles, with a few token Blacks thrown in. Throughout my talk to the class, a blond girl and the only Negro in the class were sitting next to each other in the front row and kissing and fondling each other in an obviously planned effort to distract me. The subject of my talk was the importance of White Americans developing a sense of racial identity and racial pride if we are to survive. When I finished, a White student, about 17-years-old, rose to ask the first question. His question was, "What makes you think it's so important for the White race to survive?"

I was flabbergasted and at a loss for words. And while I stood there with my mouth open, a young Jew popped up and gave his own answer. "There is no good reason at all for Whites to survive," the Jew announced, "because they have contributed nothing to the human race except the knowledge of how to kill people. Other races have contributed everything worthwhile, everything which allows people to be happier and more comfortable." And then he rattled off a list of five or six names: Freud, Einstein, Salk, and a few others -- all Jews. I then asked him if he himself were a Jew and he replied with as much arrogance and contempt as he could muster, "Yes I am and proud of it!" At this point the whole class, Whites included, rose and gave the young Jew a standing ovation. The teacher at the back of the room had a big grin on his face.

Needless to say, my talk was pretty well wasted on that class. The White kids in there had been subjected to so much moral intimidation, they had been pumped so full of racial guilt and self-hatred, their minds were so twisted, that it's doubtful whether anyone could straighten them out. Certainly no one could in an hour's time.

But the thing which bothered me even more than the phony collective racial guilt which had been pumped into those boys and girls, was my inability to answer the White kid's question. Why ***should*** we survive? That's one of those questions like, why is good better than evil? Or, nowadays, why is heterosexuality any better than homosexuality? If two people want to have sex together, who are we to say that it's better that they be a man and a woman than that they be two men or two women? A related question concerns racial mixing: why shouldn't a Black man and a White woman, or vice versa, live together if they can be happy? These are questions which most White people, even normal healthy White people, cannot answer satisfactorily today.

A hundred years ago, before the Jews came flooding into our country and taking over our mass media and our educational system, we might not have really needed answers. We just ***knew*** that it was important for our race to survive and to make progress. We ***knew*** that homosexuality and interracial sex were wrong. Our intuition told us this. The answers were in our souls even if we couldn't express them in words. But then the Jews -- who are clever people, very clever people -- came along, and they began asking these very questions. And when we couldn't answer them, they began providing their own answers.

Now all of us here tonight know what the Jews' answers are. We read them in our newspapers and hear them on television every day. Some White people, in fact a majority at first, did oppose the Jews' plans. But their reasons for opposing them were all the wrong ones. For example, when asked "Why shouldn't your son or daughter marry a Black?" their answer was "Well, two people with such different backgrounds won't be happy together. They will have children of mixed race who won't be accepted by either Whites or Blacks. There's a better chance for a marriage to work out if both partners are of the same race. The world just isn't ready for inter-marriage yet." Well, of course, the Jews made pretty short work of such shallow and superficial objections. The problem was that our people had already accepted most of the basic Jewish premises. Our criterion for choosing a marriage partner was happiness -- happiness! --either ours or our children's. No one had any really solid answers, answers based on something fundamental. Certainly the churches, whose role should have been to provide the right answers, were of no help. They in fact were, and are, in the forefront of the Jewish assault on all our values and institutions. They are so much in hock to the Jews that they are busy now trying to figure out how they can rewrite the New Testament, removing or changing all the parts that Jews consider offensive, such as the Jewish responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus.

The Jews were able to continue hammering away at White Americans -- probing, prying, asking more questions, raising more doubts -- until we had lost all faith in what we had earlier known intuitively was right. Our ethics, our code of behavior, our values, our feelings, and our aspirations all went down the drain. What they gave us instead was the new "morality" of 'if it feels good, do it.' Our children are taught in school that progress means more happiness for more people. And happiness, of course, means feeling good. The whole thing is summed up in a Coca-Cola commercial. I'm sure you have all seen it on TV: a ring of twenty people or so, of all colors and both sexes, obviously as happy and care-free as they could possibly be, are all holding hands and singing, "I'd like to give the world a Coke." Now who but the meanest and most narrow-minded racist is going to criticize something like that?

The average American -- even one who does not approve of racial mixing -- doesn't know how to respond to a clever appeal like the Coca-Cola commercial, certainly the average White kid in our schools today doesn't. And once he has unconsciously accepted the hidden premises in that commercial -- and the entire attitude toward life from which it is sprung -- the question I was asked at the Indian Spring Friends' School naturally follows. Since people of all races are equal and essentially the same -- Whites, Negroes, Jews, Gypsies, Chinamen, Mulattoes -- and since they can all be happy doing the same sorts of things, why should we worry about what a person's race is, or even about our own? Wouldn't sex be just as pleasurable for us if we were Black instead of White? Wouldn't a Coke taste just as good? What difference does it make if our

grandchildren are Mulattoes so long as the economy is still strong and they can all afford nice cars and 25-inch color TV sets?

Now, one can attack this Jewish fantasy world with facts. One can point out that although Jews are clever, they haven't done everything worthwhile in the world. White people have done a few things besides kill other people. And one can point out that racial differences are more than skin deep. One can talk about IQ scores; one can cite historical examples in which civilization after civilization has declined and crumbled when the race that built that civilization began intermarrying with its slaves. But none of that is really going to convince the kid whose main concern is whether the consumers of the world -- whether the happy Coke drinkers -- will be any less happy in a world without Whites.

What we failed to do in the past was to understand the deep inner source from which our feelings and intuition about race and other matters sprang. We had no really sound and healthy worldview to offer that White kid in place of the slick, plastic, Jewish worldview of the Coca-Cola commercial. And so we couldn't really answer his question about the survival of the White race any more than we could give him a really convincing reason about why he shouldn't do just anything that feels good -- whether it is taking dope, or sleeping with Blacks, or experimenting with homosexuality.

You may think of that kid as an extreme liberal case, but he is really no different than the average -- and I mean the average -- businessman in this country. He used to be a segregationist a few years ago, but he became an integrationist when the Blacks started rioting and burning things in the late 1960's. After all, riots are bad for business. Their individual views of the world may be a little different, but the businessman and the kid in Maryland both base their thinking on one and the same thing -- egoistic Jewish materialism. The kid who believes that the purpose of life is happiness, knows that there are not many things on this earth happier than a bunch of pickaninnies splashing in a mud puddle. And the businessman who believes that the purpose of life is to make money knows that a Black customer's money is just as green as a White customer's.

A person who accepts that sort of basis, indeed, ***cannot*** see any really convincing reason why the White race should survive. His aim is to live a "good life." And for him that means a life with lots of money, lots to eat and drink, plenty of sex, new cars, big houses, and constant diversions. Entertainment: that is all he lives for, all he cares about, and all he understands. Talk about purpose to him and his eyes go blank. Talk about eternity and he laughs at you. He knows that he won't live forever, although he doesn't like to think about that. He intends to get as much out of life as he can. Anything beyond that means nothing to him. What a difference that is from the attitude toward life that our ancestors in northern Europe had a few hundred years ago. They were greedy for money like we are, of course, and they liked to enjoy themselves when they could, but that was not the ***meaning*** of life for them. Their attitude toward life and death was perhaps best summed up in a stanza from one of the old Norse sagas. It goes like this:

Kinsmen die and cattle die,
And so must one die one's self,

But there is one thing I know which never dies
And that is the fame of a dead man's deeds.

The German philosopher Arthur Shopenhauer expressed essentially the same idea when he said that the very most any man can hope for is a heroic passage through life. Greatness, in other words, instead of happiness, is the mark of a good life. Now I don't mean to suggest that we must all think in terms of becoming famous or of dying heroically on the battlefield with sword or gun in hand. Some of us may be granted that, but what is important, what all of us can do, even those who think of ourselves as basically unheroic, is to adopt the attitude toward life and toward death which was implicit in the old sagas and in Shopenhauer's statement.

The attitude of living for the sake of eternity, of living with eternity always in mind instead of living only for the moment; the attitude that the individual is not an end in himself, but rather that the individual lives for and through something greater -- in particular, for and through his racial community (which is eternal) -- seems to have eluded most of us today. It is an attitude which is diametrically opposed to the Jewish attitude of egoism and materialism. And yet it is the alien Jewish attitude that has been adopted by most Americans today. We have chosen happiness instead of greatness, the moment instead of eternity. We have become a nation -- a whole race -- of full-time self-seekers, a race concerned with one thing: self-gratification.

The average man, of course, has always been pretty shortsighted and his interests have always pretty much been limited to his own welfare. So the materialism of today that I've been talking about is a matter of degree. It has a somewhat stronger grip on the man in the street than it formerly did. But what ***is*** worse is that today it also has a grip on our leaders, on our teachers, on our poets, on our philosophers, and even on our priests. It has so thoroughly saturated the souls of all of us that we have reacted to it by becoming spiritually ill. And this spiritual sickness, this loss of our souls, is why we are in such a mess today. And it is why we will be in a worse and worse mess as time goes on. We will never overcome the problems facing us until it is cured.

And please do not misunderstand me. I am not talking about the "wages of sin" in the sense with which many of us may be familiar. I'm not talking about some anthropomorphic deity, some heavenly father sitting on his throne in the sky punishing us, keeping us from overcoming our enemies because we are not fulfilling his commandments. No, that's nonsense! We are not being punished by any supernatural being. We are in trouble for the same reason that an explorer in a harsh and trackless wilderness is in trouble when he loses his compass and cannot see the sky through the dense foliage. He no longer knows which way to go. That is our most fundamental problem -- we do not know where we are going. We have no sense of direction. We have stumbled off the path.

But that is something I really should not have had to tell you because everyone here today knows this. Even if he doesn't understand yet how or why he knows it. He still knows that the present course our society has taken is wrong. It is unnatural. It is evil. We all know that it is wrong to accept the "I'm all right, Jack" attitude which prevails today. We know that it's wrong to live only for the present, to forget the past and to ignore the future. It is wrong to have instant self-gratification as our only goal. That's why we are here. We know that there is something more, something else, a better way. We know this for the same reason we are attracted to beauty and to

nobility and are repelled by the ugly and the base, regardless of the artificial fashions of our day. We know it because deep inside all of us, in our race-soul, there is a source of divine wisdom, of ages-old wisdom, of wisdom as old as the universe. That is the wisdom, the truth, which we in the National Alliance want to make the basis of our national policy. It is a truth of which most of us have been largely unconscious all our lives, but which now we have the opportunity to understand clearly and precisely.

Our truth tells us that no man, no race, not even this planet, exists as an end in itself. The only thing which exists as an end in its self is the whole. The whole of which the things I just named are parts. The universe is the physical manifestation of the whole. The whole is continually changing and always will be. It is evolving. That is, it is moving toward ever more complex, ever higher, states of existence. The development of life on earth from non-living matter was one step in this never-ending evolutionary process. The evolution of man-like creatures from more primitive forms of life was another step. The diversification of these creatures into the various races and sub-races, and the continued evolution of these different races in different parts of the world at different rates, have been continuations of this process. The entire evolution of life on earth from its beginning some three billion years ago, and in a more general sense, the evolution of the universe over a much longer period before the appearance of life, is an evolution not only in the sense of yielding more and more highly developed physical forms, but also an evolution in consciousness. It is an evolution in the self-consciousness of the whole.

From the beginning, the whole, the creator, the self-created, has followed, has in fact embodied, an upward urge -- an urge toward higher and higher degrees of self-consciousness, toward ever more nearly perfect states of self-realization.

In man -- in our race in particular -- this upward urge, this divine spark, has brought us to a new threshold. A threshold as important as that which separated the non-living matter of three billion years ago from the living matter into which it evolved. Today's threshold is a threshold in self-consciousness. We stand now on the verge of a full understanding of the fact that we are a manifestation of the creator, that we are the means and the substance by which the creator, by which the whole of which we are a part, can continue its self-evolution.

When we understand this, when we heed the divine spark within us, then we can once again ascend the upward path that has led us from sub-man to man and can lead us now from man to super-man and beyond. But we cannot do this, we cannot find the path, without this consciousness, without this understanding that the responsibility is ours, that we are not the playthings of God but are ourselves a manifestation of God and can become, must become, now a ***conscious*** manifestation. Only in that way can we fulfill our ordained destiny.

Let me emphasize again, in different words, what I told you earlier this evening about building a spiritual basis for our political work. The Alliance's long-range approach is necessary, absolutely necessary, and unavoidable. The short-range approaches that other patriots are trying, and have been trying for many decades now, the thousands of *ad hoc* solutions of quick and easy one-issue approaches, whether of tax-rebellion or of bomb throwing, cannot solve the ultimate problems with which we are faced. They cannot give us back our souls. It may seem ironical that we should be trying to conquer and transform the whole world, that we should be planning for

eternity, when no one else has been able to make a successful plan for achieving very much more limited goals, restoring the constitution, for example, or getting us out of the United Nations, or what have you. But it is the very shortsightedness of those working for these limited goals which has been the cause of their failure. And it is our rooting of our plans in eternity which gives us confidence for their ultimate success no matter how long it may take us.

So I tell you again, our approach is not just a matter of choice; it is necessary. There is no other way but ours. There is only one path. And there is something else we must understand. Our philosophy, our quest for the upward path, is not something that we should accept reluctantly because we see it as necessary to the solution of our race problem, our Jewish problem, and our communist problem. It is not something we accept because we cannot find an easier approach to these problems. No! If we look at it that way then we still haven't rid ourselves of the shortsightedness that has been our curse in the past. We must understand that the truth for which we stand transcends all the problems of the present. Finding our way once again to the one true path transcends all questions of economics, of politics, and ultimately even of race, just as eternity transcends tomorrow. So let's stop putting the cart before the horse mentally and spiritually. Let's take off our mental blinders. Let's realize that the truth has a value in itself and that dedication to the truth is a virtue in itself. This is all the more true in a world in which falsehood seems to rule.

The problems with which we are faced in the world today are serious ones and they must be solved. But the first and most important task, the task on which all our other problems must eventually depend for their solutions, but also the task which would still be just as important for us to accomplish if all our other problems didn't exist, is the task, the one task, assigned to us by the creator. That is the task of achieving full consciousness of our oneness with the whole, achieving full consciousness that we are a part of the creator and that our destiny is to achieve the single purpose for which the universe exists -- the self-realization of the creator.

Our truth is a very simple truth, but its implications are enormous beyond imagining. To the extent that we understand and accept it, it sets us apart from all the people around us. Our acceptance of this truth marks us as the only adults in a world of children. For implicit in what we believe is our recognition and acceptance of our responsibility for the future of the universe. The fate of everything that will ever be rests in our hands now. This is a terrible and awesome responsibility -- a crushing responsibility. If we were only men we could not bear it. We would have to invent some supernatural being to foist our responsibility onto. But we must, and can, bear it when we understand that we ourselves embody the divine spark which is the upward driving urge of the universe.

The acceptance of our truth not only burdens us with the responsibility that other men have shunned throughout history, it bestows on us a mantle of moral authority that goes along with the responsibility, the moral authority to do whatever is necessary in carrying out our responsibility. Furthermore, it is an acceptance of our destiny, an unlimited destiny, a destiny glorious beyond imagination, if we truly have the courage of our convictions. If we truly abide by the demands that our truth places upon us, it means that while other men continue to live only for the day, continue to seek only self-gratification, and continue to live lives which are essentially without

meaning and that leave no trace behind them when they are over, we are living and working for the sake of eternity. In so doing, we are becoming a part of that eternity.

For some, our task may seem too great for us, our responsibility too overwhelming. If they are correct, if we choose to remain children instead of accepting our adulthood, if we continue the shortsighted approaches of the past, then in the long run we will fail utterly. The enemies of our race will prevail over us and we and our kind will pass away forever. All our sacrifices, and all the dreams and sacrifices of our ancestors, will have been in vain. Not even a memory of us, or our kind, will be left when the creative spirit of the universe tries, in some other place, in some other time, in some other way, to do what we failed to do. But I do not believe that we will fail. Because in working to achieve our purpose, we are finding our way once again to the right and natural path for our people. We are working once again with the whole. And we have a mighty tradition behind us.

Our purpose is the purpose for which the earth was born out of the gas and the dust of the cosmos, the purpose for which the first primitive amphibian crawled out of the sea three hundred million years ago and learned to live on the land, the purpose for which the first race of men held themselves apart from the races of sub-men around them and bred only with their own kind. It is the purpose for which men first captured lightning from the sky, tamed it, and called it fire; the purpose for which our ancestors built the world's first astronomical observatory on a British plain more than 4,000 years ago. It is the purpose for which Jesus, the Galilean, fought the Jews and died 2,000 years ago; the purpose for which Rembrandt painted; the purpose for which Shakespeare wrote; and the purpose for which Newton pondered. Our purpose, the purpose with which we must become obsessed, is that for which the best, the noblest, men and women of our race down through the ages have struggled and died whether they were fully conscious of it or not. It is the purpose for which they sought beauty and created beauty; the purpose for which they studied the heavens and taught themselves Nature's mysteries; the purpose for which they fought the degenerative, the regressive, and the evil forces all around them; the purpose for which, instead of taking the easy path in life, the downward path; they chose the upward path, regardless of the pain, suffering, and sacrifice that this choice entailed.

Yes! They did these things, largely without having a full understanding of why, just as the first amphibian did not understand his purpose when he crawled onto the land. Our purpose is the creator's purpose, our path is the path of divine consciousness, the path of the creator's self-realization. This is the path which is ordained for us because of what we are, because of the spark of divine consciousness in us, and in no one else. No other race can travel this path, our path, for us. We alone must prove whether we are fit to serve the creator's purpose. And if we are fit, if we once again heed the inner knowledge engraved in our souls by the creator, if we regain faith in the things we once knew were true without fully understanding why and if we now also teach ourselves why, then we will once again be on the upward path ordained for us, and our destiny will be godhood.

Those of you who are with us for the first time have, I hope, gained at least the beginning of an understanding of who we are and of what we want to do. I know that I have left many of your questions unanswered; questions about current political, social, racial, and economic issues; questions about concrete things. We do talk about those things in our meetings. We talk about

them in a very concrete and down-to-earth fashion. I've discussed them in past meetings and I'll discuss them again in future ones -- the goals of overcoming the enemies of our people, of safeguarding the future of our race, and of building a new order of beauty sanity, strength, and health on this earth, so that our people can progress and mature until they are capable of fulfilling the role allotted to them by the creator. But now I want to be sure that you understand just one thing. If we ever are to achieve these concrete advances, these physical victories, this material renewal of our nation, of our civilization, of our race, then we must first make the spiritual advances that I've talked about here. Without the spiritual basis, the material victory will not be achieved.

As I said, in our future meetings we will explore many individual issues in much greater detail than we have here. We hope you will join us in these future meetings and further increase your understanding of our work, and we hope that you will begin to share our commitment to this work. And let me say this especially to those who are with us for the first time, we do not care who you are or what you have believed in the past, nor do we require that you agree exactly with us on a hundred different social, political, economic, and racial issues. All we require is that you share with us a commitment to the simple, but great, truth which I have explained to you here, that you understand that you are a part of the whole, which is the creator, that you understand that your purpose, the purpose of mankind and the purpose of every other part of creation, is the creator's purpose, that this purpose is the never-ending ascent of the path of creation, the path of life symbolized by our life rune, that you understand that this path leads ever upward toward the creator's self-realization, and that the destiny of those who follow this path is godhood. If you share this single truth with us, then everything else will follow and we invite you to make a commitment now, today, to join us and work with us.

Truth Before Fashion

Perhaps you'll pardon me if I speak to you today in a more personal vein than I usually do. I want to tell you about some personal perceptions of mine, because I believe that many of you who are listening have had similar perceptions. I believe many of you have something in common with me, something very important.

When I was a little boy, 11 or 12 years old, I used to spend my time taking clocks apart, building radios and model airplanes, and doing experiments in a tiny laboratory that I had in my parents' garage. I used to make little solid-fuel rockets and try them out in the back yard. My ambition was to be a rocket scientist when I grew up. And that's what I became, at least for a while, until I returned to the university to teach.

The point is that, more than anything else, I was interested in learning what made things tick. I was fascinated by knowledge, by discovery, by the truth. I didn't care at all what was fashionable: I wanted to know what was true. I was the kind of fellow who sometimes would wear one brown sock and one blue sock, because it really didn't make any difference to me. And I'm pretty much still that way, except that now my wife makes sure that my socks match.

While I was growing up, of course, I paid some attention to what was happening in the world around me. I knew that there were good people and bad people, smart ones and stupid ones. I knew that the world wasn't perfect, but I believed that it could be made better. I still believe that.

After I was grown I learned one thing, however, which was really depressing to me for quite a long while. I learned that most of the people around me -- not all, but most -- were much more interested in what was fashionable than in what was true. When I was a university student, for example, I was very interested in history, and I wanted to discuss the various topics which came up in class with fellow students. Whenever the topic was an ideologically sensitive one, however -- the Second World War, for example -- I found that it was very difficult to carry on an objective conversation with most people. They would balk whenever the discussion wandered onto unfashionable ground. I would ask the students I was talking with, why is it that almost no member of the general public can tell us how many American GIs died during the war -- or how many Germans or how many Poles -- but nearly everyone thinks he knows that "six million" Jews died? Why is that? Is it that people believe that only Jews are important? Or is it that they have been brainwashed with propaganda by the media, which are controlled by Jews? And if there is propaganda involved, shouldn't we be suspicious of its claims?

Well, whenever I would say things like that, the people I was talking with would become uncomfortable. Some would become emotional. They would refuse to continue the discussion.

I'll give you a more recent example of this sort of thing. A few weeks ago the United States sent a military expedition to Haiti to force the government controlled at that time by General Raoul Cedras to abdicate in favor of Mr. Clinton's good friend, Jean-Bertrand Aristide. General Cedras was a dictator, we were told by the controlled media -- a bad man -- and Aristide was a

democrat, a good man, a man much like Bill Clinton. We were sending troops to Haiti, the media said, to restore democracy.

Now, it's true that most Americans weren't as enthusiastic about sending troops to Haiti to install Aristide as the gang around President Clinton was. But we went along with it. And if you watch the television news coverage of the military occupation, you are led to believe that our soldiers are enthusiastic about their assignment. They are doing a noble thing, they believe, giving Haiti back to Aristide and restoring democracy.

Now, the fact is that Mr. Aristide is a Communist, and besides that a much worse thug and terrorist than General Cedras ever was. In 1991, when Aristide was the top dog in Haiti, he ruled by terror and murder. He killed his opponents with burning tires, "necklacing" them, as the Blacks call it, before General Cedras booted him out of the presidential palace. It is difficult to imagine a more despicable criminal than Jean-Bertrand Aristide as the ruler of a country. And our government is backing him. Our troops are keeping him in power and taking guns away from Haitians who oppose him.

Isn't that amazing?

But just try discussing that with the average U.S. voter. He doesn't want to talk about it. It's unfashionable. About as far as the average American will go is admitting that what goes on in Haiti isn't our business, and that we should let the Haitians run their own affairs.

Some Americans will say that we had to intervene in Haiti because economic conditions were so bad there that we had a flood of Haitian "boat people" coming into this country. That, of course, is sheer nonsense: economic conditions were worse than usual in Haiti before our invasion because the Clinton government had imposed an embargo on the country in an attempt to force General Cedras out. That's why the Haitians were starving: it was Mr. Clinton's embargo. But most people don't want to hear that.

And they don't want to hear about the fact that Aristide is a Communist and a bloodthirsty terrorist. They prefer to hear that our troops are in Haiti to "restore democracy." That's what is fashionable. That's what it is comfortable to believe.

Now, let me become personal again.

During the past 30 years I've noticed this sort of failure of reason over and over again. I've seen the government in Washington adopt policies that I was certain were destructive policies, policies that would lead to the loss of our freedom, to the loss of everything that we hold dear. I was appalled, and I would speak out against these policies.

But invariably the controlled media supported the policies, and so the policies were fashionable in the eyes of most people. People who were against the government's policies were called "racists" by the media. They were called "isolationists." They were called "haters." And most people let themselves be bullied by the media. They went along because it was fashionable to go along.

And so there I was, time after time, concerned about trends that I could see developing, concerned about subtle shifts in the propaganda of the controlled media, concerned about changes in government policy. I could see all around me the bad effects of such trends. I could see where these new trends were heading. It was clear. It was obvious. But other people seemed not to notice. It was as if they were oblivious to the destruction of their own world which was going on around them. I felt very frustrated that they refused to see what I saw, that they continued to pretend that things were fine when I knew that we were headed for disaster.

Can you picture that situation? Have you ever felt the way I've just described?

I don't mean to say that I always was right, that I always knew better than everybody else. I can make mistakes, I can make errors of judgment, just like anyone. But when I make a mistake it's an honest mistake. I don't deliberately misjudge things in order to be fashionable.

The unfortunate fact is that much more often than not my judgments about the government's policies have been correct. Policies that I instinctively felt to be wrong have turned out to be so. Trends that analysis and reflection convinced me were degenerative trends have turned out to be so. And I have never hesitated to speak out. I have never hesitated to say, for example, "Hey, everybody, the government's immigration policy is a disaster. It's changing the racial character of America. It will destroy everything that's good about our country if we permit it to continue." And the controlled media then would turn their hatred against me. They would shriek at me: Racist! White supremacist! Hater!

Or I would say, "Hey, everybody, the reason the crime problem has become so bad during the past 30 years is that we're subsidizing it. We're using our taxes to help the minorities, who are responsible for most crime, to breed. We've accepted so-called 'civil rights' laws which are empowering and protecting the criminal elements." And the controlled media would shriek at me again: Racist! Hater!

And, of course, I wasn't being a hater at all. I was simply concerned about the destruction of my country, the destruction of the civilization which my ancestors had built at such great cost, and I was giving voice to my concerns. I was speaking the truth as I saw it, even when the truth wasn't fashionable.

And I must admit that sometimes I had the very unsettling impression that I was one of a small minority of sane people, and that the majority of the population had fallen under the influence of a gang of lunatics and were letting the lunatics make all of the policies.

I've been seeing the quality of education in America fall disastrously year after year, and in response the government has formulated new educational policies which I knew could only make things worse, policies which almost seemed calculated to make things worse. Instead of aiming for quality in the schools, the government ever since the Second World War has been pushing for "equality." The quality of the educational system goes down, and so the government forces a big dose of "equality" on it. That makes the quality go down even more, and so the government responds with an even bigger dose of forced "equality." And when I see this I have to pinch myself, I have to say to myself: Are you really the only sane person in this country; are you the

only one who can see that this policy of pushing "equality" instead of quality will only make things worse? Are you the only one who still has a grip on reality?

And, of course, I know that I'm not the only one who feels this way. I know that there are many of you who also feel yourselves the only sane people in a world gone mad. I know that there are many of you who still prefer the truth to whatever is fashionable at the moment. Otherwise you wouldn't be listening to this program.

The problem is that we sane people, we rational people, we people who accept the evidence of our eyes and are able to make comparisons of what we see today with what we saw in the past -- we have got to do a better job of sticking together. We have to put up a united front against the lunatics.

And, you know, it can be done. It is possible for the sane minority to get the lunatics back into their cages and then begin repairing the damage they've done. It is possible to take the media away from the destructive psychopaths now in control.

I'm given hope by the fact that even the majority of ordinary Americans, the ones who always prefer to be fashionable, finally have overdosed on insanity. The gang of Clintonistas who've been running the country into the ground for the last two years have scared them so badly that we had a massive repudiation of them and their policies at the polls recently. Even the trendy air-heads who've been tolerating insanity for decades have finally said, "Enough!"

Please don't think that what I've just said means that I'm a Republican. The good thing about the recent elections is not that the Republican Party won; the good thing is that the elections put a party in control of the legislative branch of the government which is different from the party in control of the executive branch. If we're lucky we'll have the two parties fighting each other to a standstill for the next two years. We'll have governmental gridlock, and the government won't be able to do as much damage as otherwise.

This gives us a little breathing space, a little time to organize ourselves and prepare for battle with the lunatics.

Actually, I've used the word "lunatics" loosely in describing those we oppose. The people who control the media and the people in the government who take orders from them aren't really crazy. They're evil. Do you understand that? Evil. They're people committed to the destruction of everything beautiful and noble and decent in the world. We don't want to put them in a lunatic asylum. We want to hunt them down -- every last one of them -- and put a final end to their evil.

One of the most interesting results of the recent elections was the rebellion of White Californians against the growing tide of illegal immigrants from Mexico which was swamping their state. That rebellion expressed itself as Proposition 187. The media people and the Clintonistas -- and also many Christians who have been infected with the egalitarian madness -- are really unhappy about Proposition 187. They're hinting that those who voted for it are "racists," that the only reason they want to make things more difficult for illegal aliens is that most of the aliens aren't White, because they're Mexicans, mestizos.

And the White voters are responding, "Oh, no, that's not the reason at all. We're not racists. We just want to keep our schools and other public facilities from being overwhelmed."

But, really, for most of them that's a dishonest response. The whole reason why Proposition 187 was necessary is because the illegal immigrants are non-White. If they were English or Swedish or German they wouldn't be a problem. They wouldn't be a threat. Everyone understands that, but most people are afraid to say it. They are afraid of being unfashionable. So they kept smiling and pretending that everything was all right for 50 years, while their country was being ruined by the media and the government. Finally they had too much, and they rebelled by voting for Proposition 187. But they still won't face the situation squarely and call a spade a spade. They still prefer being fashionable to dealing in the truth.

But, at least -- at least -- they did rebel. That's a very good sign indeed. It shows that there are limits to how much the average citizen will let himself be abused. It's good to know that. I had begun to worry that he would put up with anything rather than risk being called a "racist."

You know, the trouble with most people is not that they're stupid. Most people can figure out as well as you and I can that if you give welfare to Blacks, pretty soon you'll have more Blacks.

They can understand that if you don't control your borders, pretty soon you'll have more Mexicans and Haitians in the country.

They can figure out that if you then pass special laws to protect criminals, you'll have a lot more crime to deal with.

They know that if you begin mixing Blacks and Whites socially, some Whites will begin acting like Blacks, and the average moral tone of White society will decline.

They can understand that if you force White students to go to school with Blacks and then try to maintain the pretense that Blacks are just as capable as Whites, you must lower scholastic standards and thereby keep White students from reaching their full potential.

They know that if you pass so-called "free trade" laws, which allow industries in non-White countries with extremely low wages, countries like China and Mexico, to compete with American industries, pretty soon you'll bankrupt the American industries and put many Americans out of work. And they can understand that if you permit Jews to get control of the mass media of news and entertainment in your country, and along with that a dominating influence on the political process and government policy, you're in big trouble. You leave yourself open to all of the aforementioned ills and a whole Pandora's box of others besides.

They can understand, in other words, that if people permit their government to adopt the policies the American government has adopted during the past 50 years, they will reduce themselves to the condition of the American people today: their civilization in a precipitous decline, their public and private morality in a shambles, their future mortgaged, and an assortment of non-White minorities in the process of foreclosing on that future.

This is something that most of our fellow citizens should be capable of understanding. Instead, they've let themselves be persuaded, primarily by the controlled media, that they should ignore their own reason and pretend that everything is A-OK.

Or, if they are so fed up with conditions that they just can't pretend any longer that there's nothing wrong, they still won't face the facts squarely and accept the obvious answers, because they don't want to be racists. And so they pretend that a switch from the Democrats to the Republicans will fix everything.

But, you know, somebody has to be willing to announce the fact that the emperor is naked. Even if it's not polite. Even if it hurts a lot of people's feelings. Even if everyone else is pretending that the emperor's new suit is the very height of fashion, someone has to come right out and say, "Hey, momma, look! The man has no clothes on!"

Not just me. A lot of us have to say that. A lot of us have to bear witness to the plain, unvarnished truth. It's important. Much more than the state of our economy and the quality of our schools and the crime problem depends on it. In the long run, everything depends on our preferring what is true to what is fashionable -- preferring it enough to speak out for it.

I don't expect everyone to do that. I know that most people will continue being the way they always have been. But it doesn't take everyone in order to make a difference. It only takes a few. It only took one small boy to open everyone's eyes to the emperor's foolishness -- one small boy to persuade all the townspeople that they really were seeing what they thought they were seeing.

So I'm counting on those of you who occasionally wear mismatched socks. I'm counting on you to say, "By god, I am right. The government and the media are wrong. And the right thing for me to do is to speak up now, regardless of whose feelings I hurt." You do that -- you keep looking at the world with open eyes and not being afraid to come to your own conclusions about what's good and what's bad -- and you tell people about what you see.

You tell them, and many of them will open their eyes and look too. Don't let the controlled media intimidate you. Don't let the government push you around. We're the ones who are right, not them.

You stand with me, and be honest with me, and speak out with me, and together we'll begin pushing back some of the evil which has been taking over our world. We'll begin building a better world together.

I'm counting on you. Thanks for listening.

The Letter They Wouldn't Answer

There is a neo-Marxist radio network, based in Oregon and Costa Rica, which operates a station calling itself "Radio for Peace International." Recently, they attacked American Dissident Voices, denying among other things our statement that Communism has Jewish roots. An ADV supporter and contributor, William Scott, Jr., wrote this response to their attack. So far, "Radio for Peace" has not seen fit to respond. Here's his letter:

Dear Sirs:

I am writing in regard to your program covering the National Alliance's radio show American Dissident Voices -- specifically, your attempt to discredit the show's discourse on the Jewish involvement in the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.

I have to admit that I am a bit surprised that you chose to attack that subject, since there is substantial documentation that a very disproportionate number of Jews were among the leaders of the original Communist organization.

I would like to give just a small part of the evidence that I have available. It is a fact that numerous journalists were witnesses to the events along with clergymen and politicians who recorded what they had seen in Russia during that unfortunate period.

During the last days of World War I when the Bolsheviks were making their move numerous diplomatic telegrams (available from the National Archives) were exchanged between U.S. diplomatic and military personnel in Russia and Washington, DC. For example, one telegram, State Department document number 861.00/1757, of May 2, 1918, was sent from the U.S. Consul General in Moscow to the State Department, in which he describes the situation in the towns:

"Jews predominate in local government, anti-Jewish feeling growing among population which tends to regard the oncoming Germans as deliverers."

Another telegram, State Department document number 861.00/2205, sent from Vladivostok on July 5, 1918, by U.S. Consul Caldwell, clearly verifies the previously cited example. Caldwell states:

"Fifty per cent of Soviet government in each town consists of Jews of the worst type...."

Another telegram, dated March 1, 1919, is also from Vladivostok, this time by Captain Montgomery Schuyler of the Headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces, Siberia, who reported to his Chief of Staff:

"The Bolshevik movement is and has been since its beginning guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type...."

And in another telegram, sent June 9, 1918, Schuyler cites Robert Wilton, correspondent for the London Times in Russia, regarding the ethnic makeup of the Bolshevik government:

"There were 384 commissars including 2 Negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians, and more than 300 Jews. Of the latter number 264 had come to Russia from the United States...."

These telegrams are only a few of the dozens that reflect similar sentiments, I would think, that were sent to Washington from our representatives in Russia at the time of both attempts at power by the Communists.

Another journalist who wrote about the Russian Communists in that era was the distinguished London Times foreign correspondent Douglas Reed, who wrote of Soviet censorship from first-hand knowledge in his book Insanity Fair:

"The censorship department, and that means the whole machine for controlling the home and muzzling the foreign press, was entirely staffed by Jews. There seemed not to be a single non-Jewish official in the whole outfit."

I could go on and on citing statements from various sources, but my point is not to convince you of the Jewish domination of the Bolshevik Revolution in one letter. However I would ask that you at least consider why, even with what seems to be creditable evidence, when one tries to discuss this or any other situation where Jews are involved one finds the standard canards and smears directed one's way. Why do they rely on intimidation to suppress discussion of a legitimate historical event?

I think this tactic will eventually backfire, but unfortunately for decent Jews the cynical Jewish power structure will not refrain from using whatever tactic gains them power.

I know that there are some Jews who will honestly admit to what I have just presented. For example, the Jewish author, Marcus Eli Ravage, wrote in the January-February 1928 issue of Century Magazine :

"You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have been at the bottom not merely of the latest great war but of all your wars, not only of the Russian but of every other major revolution in your history."

Another well-known Jew who comments similarly is Dr. Oscar Levy. He was a figure of international repute who edited and financed the English edition of Nietzsche's works in sixteen volumes. In the preface to the book The World Significance of the Russian Revolution by Professor George Pitts-Rivers of Oxford University, Levy stated:

"We [Jews] have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred.... We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have boasted of having given it the Saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners..." .

And finally, I must give credit to another courageous Jew, Benjamin Freedman, who spent a large portion of his wealth exposing the Jewish power structure (both the Communist and Zionist factions). He stated in a 1963 speech in Washington, DC, concerning the ability of the Jewish power structure to secure the assistance of willing dupes and to utilize the power structure's time-tested obfuscation techniques to further their political goals:

"They have fooled you so many times that you don't know whether you are coming or going."

There are many other such admissions that I have seen in print, and I have actually heard them with my own ears from Jews of my own acquaintance. So why the cover-up and all the apparent shock at such allegations?

The same goes for the so-called "Holocaust." Any Jew can apparently make any claim without contradiction -- since anyone who disputes such claims is automatically attacked and called "anti-Semitic," "hatemonger," "Nazi," etc. Now that even the Jewish "holocaust historians" have recently lowered the death count from 6 million to 3 million (and some even much lower) that should be enough to open the whole thing up to honest historical examination, instead of continuing the old propaganda line. But no, the 6 million figure is still paraded around as gospel and few dare to point out the recent reductions by scholars.

Actually, I think the Jews have put themselves in a precarious position by allowing these wild claims to go on virtually unchallenged. Although you may be surprised to hear that I don't deny that thousands of Jews were killed in WWII, I think that exaggerations are rampant. Keep in mind that some 50 million died in that tragedy. I find it offensive that the emphasis is almost entirely on the "6 million" to the exclusion of everybody else.

There is a powerful form of censorship in this country. Look where the power and money leads and you'll find the source.

When I was growing up we learned to value truth and to condemn hypocrisy. Nowadays we must bypass truth in order to be politically correct and to avoid offending certain groups. I say nobody should be intimidated out of investigating anything. This whole situation rubs me the wrong way and I'll never get used to it. I don't think that any society that accepts blatant lies and suppression of facts in place of the truth can survive. We must tell the truth no matter who doesn't like it.

Yours truly,
William Scott, Jr.

FREEDOM: Use It or Lose It

Perhaps you already know this, but this program is broadcast 22 times a week on 15 different stations in the United States. It's also carried around the world by powerful shortwave transmitters. I don't know exactly how many people are listening now, but I believe that altogether there are more than 100,000 of us listening in.

That's a good feeling, to know that there are so many of us together at this moment, hearing the same words, thinking the same thoughts, sharing the same concerns. We're like a big family, a tribe.

People tell me that here in the United States there is no longer any tribal or even any national sense of identity, that it is not possible to evoke any sort of family feeling from as large a group of people as those of us gathered here today. The American people, they tell me, are too heterogeneous, too divided, too selfish, too jaded, and too confused by the propaganda of the mass media to respond as a united whole, the way they could a hundred years ago, when this was still a White country.

And the people who tell me this are partly correct, of course. It's true that the controllers of the mass media want to divide Americans and make them heterogeneous or "diverse," to use the Politically Correct term so that they can be more easily ruled. It's true that this is exactly what was in the minds of Jewish legislators like Emanuel Celler and his accomplices in the Congress and the media when they opened up this country's borders to massive immigration from Asia, Africa, and Latin America back in 1965. It's what's in the minds of those who still oppose controlling our borders, who still oppose every effort to cut off this non-White flood.

It's true that the propaganda of the controlled mass media encourages the most selfish sort of individualism, a sort of "every man for himself+attitude, for the same reason. The aliens who control the media can only work their will on us if they can prevent us from having any sort of feeling of solidarity, any feeling of racial consciousness. That's why they have promoted every sort of "diversity," as they call it -- homosexuals, non-White racial minorities, feminists, their fellow Jews, of course -- everybody except normal, healthy, decent White men and women.

And this propaganda from the controlled media has confused a lot of people. It has made some of them feel guilty for being normal and healthy. It has made some of them feel that they should tolerate every sort of filth and perversion. It has morally disarmed them and made them hesitate to fight back.

But it certainly hasn't confused all of us. There are 100,000 or so of us here today, listening to this program, who aren't confused or ashamed or guilty. If I'm wrong on that, if there are a few of you who do feel that it's your duty to take a homosexual to lunch, to smile when you pass a racially mixed couple on the sidewalk, and to vote Democratic, then please tune to another station. Tune in something with a little more diversity. Tune in a basketball game or a rap concert, where you'll feel right at home.

As for all the rest of us, let's minimize the diversity for a few minutes. Let's maximize the solidarity. Let's stand proud and straight, and let's stand together, you and I, when we think about who we are and what we have to do.

We really are a big family, a tribe, with many more things which bind us together than separate us. All of us have ancestors who came over here from Europe, ancestors who evolved in Europe, who over a thousand generations developed the unique characteristics which make us Europeans and which distinguish us sharply from Asians, Africans, Middle Easterners, and other non-Europeans. We share the same blood, the same genes, whether our ancestors came from England or Ireland, Germany or Poland, Sweden or Italy. And in broad outlines we share the same history and the same culture.

The same values too. We are people who have a certain understanding of the meaning of personal honor, for example: an understanding which is not shared by other races -- including the race which controls our television and other mass media.

We also have a feeling for personal privacy and for personal dignity and for personal property rights which is unique to us.

Now the egalitarians, the media controllers, the Jews will disagree with us. They like to talk about "human dignity" as if that were a universal trait. But it isn't. Just compare the way we used to live in America 30 or 40 years ago with the way Africans or Mexicans or Asians lived and still live in their own countries.

We don't like being crowded together like ants in an antheap, having our neighbors breathing down our necks, sharing everything in common, and having almost nothing we can call our own. What is natural for us is having a little space of our own around us, having privacy, having our own property, and letting our neighbors have theirs without interference. We don't like having our lives regulated either by mob pressure or by the government. We need the freedom to have our own ideas, make our own ventures, suffer from our own failures and mistakes, and benefit from our own hard work and our own successes. We don't tolerate enforced Political Correctness very well.

It's not that way in Black Africa and never has been that way in any Black land. It's not that way among the swarming masses of Asia. It wasn't that way among the American Indians when our ancestors first arrived here, and it's not that way among the relatives of those Indians in Mexico today. They are all different people -- different from us -- profoundly different. They are entitled to live the way that is natural for them. They can crowd together in their own filth. They can do whatever they want to -- but not at our expense, not in our land.

Remember, I said that we used to live in a way that was natural for us in this country 30 or 40 years ago. That was before we had such a big dose of diversity crammed down our throats by the government and the media. That was when this was still essentially a White country. Even states like California were still essentially White. We could walk down the street at night without being robbed or raped or shot. There were no drugs in the schools. None. There was still enough respect for other people's privacy and property rights that we didn't have to worry about intruders

in our homes. We didn't have to worry about everything being stolen that wasn't nailed down. You know, it's still like that in some parts of America -- mostly in small towns and rural areas, which have not been hit by as much "diversity" as the cities. But wherever the government and the controlled media have succeeded in transforming our country into a Third World slum, we have lost our rights, our dignity, and our honor. We have been forced to accommodate ourselves to non-Whites. We have been forced to tolerate all sorts of unacceptable behavior, all sorts of unacceptable intrusions that we never had to tolerate before. We are expected to observe and tolerate every sort of filth and perversion -- homosexuality, racial mixing, jungle music, crime and crowding, and more taxes from us to pay for it. We are expected to tolerate the destruction of our world, to pay for the destruction of our world, and we're not supposed to complain about it, lest we hurt the feelings of the destroyers.

When I say that they're destroying our world, I don't simply mean that they're making life less pleasant for us, that they're bringing ugliness and nastiness into our lives, that they're corrupting our morals and polluting our culture. They're doing all of that, but they're also doing much more. They're destroying the physical basis for our existence. Every tribe, every race, needs space, needs territory for living and growing and breeding. Only in our own territory can we perpetuate our physical existence by breeding only with our own people. Only in our own territory can we keep alive our traditions, our sense of identity, our own culture. When we lose our territory, we will cease to exist as a tribe or a race within a few generations.

We mustn't fall into the trap of looking at the present situation in America and saying to ourselves: "Well, it's still not too bad. I can make a few adjustments and learn to live with it." What we must do instead is look at our present situation, compare it with the situation we had 30 or 40 years ago, and then look to what the situation will be like in another 40 years. That will not be a situation we can live with.

If we don't reclaim our own territory soon, there will be a proliferation of re-education programs like the one the Clintonistas are pushing now to de-Europeanize the teaching of history in the schools. They've designed American History courses in which Martin Luther King gets more coverage than Columbus, George Washington, Patrick Henry, and Thomas Jefferson combined. We'll see laws making it mandatory for all schools to teach these falsified history courses and rob our children and grandchildren of their sense of racial identity. We'll see a continued flood of non-White immigrants into our country, and an even greater eagerness of the politicians in Washington to cater to these minorities as their numbers increase. We'll see television and the other controlled media continue to push more and more "diversity." And the result of it all will be that our great grandchildren will be mongrels that we wouldn't want to claim as our own.

It really shouldn't be necessary to say these things. They're so obvious that I'm a little embarrassed to be telling you about them as if they were a new discovery. All of human history is a record of the struggle of various groups, tribes, and races to gain and hold territory for themselves and to keep aliens out, in order to insure their own continued existence. Even the most primitive people understand that. It's instinctive. And in the internal history of every people we can see the development of ideas and attitudes and values within certain boundaries. We can see the evolution of a culture with distinctive traits.

What we do not see in history, however, is the cultural chaos, the abandonment of all values, the moral nihilism which is being promoted by the controlled media and the government today. Because once the chaos and nihilism have taken hold, that's the end of the people's history. They go under, and the historical focus shifts to a healthier people.

We knew all of these things, we understood all of these things just a few years ago. We understood that not only were we not obliged to tolerate homosexual behavior, for example: we understood that we should not tolerate it, that we must not tolerate it. This isn't something we were taught in Sunday school: it was in our blood; it was natural for us to abhor homosexual behavior, just as it's natural for us to react with hostility when we see a racially mixed couple.

Yes, these things I've been talking about are obvious. We all know they're true. But still it's necessary for us to say them. We know that there are powerful forces trying to destroy our race and our civilization. We know that these forces have gone a long way toward reaching their goal. We know that they have corrupted many of our own people. We know that there are many people in America today who are related to us by blood, but who have fallen completely under the spell of those whose aim is to destroy us. We know that the people under the spell of our enemies believe that teachers should be forced to teach that homosexuality is a normal, healthy lifestyle. They believe that history should be falsified in the schools in order to avoid hurting the feelings of those races whose history is less rich than our own. They believe that our wanting to live and work with people of our own tribe, our own race, is wicked. "Racism," they call it. They would like to make it illegal. They would like to see more Mexicans in this country, more Blacks, more racially mixed couples, more rap concerts, more crowding and filth and "diversity." They would like to make it illegal for us to meet like this and talk about these things. They have become spiritually enslaved to the controllers of the media, and they would like to enslave us also.

The only way that we can fight these spiritually corrupted people, the only way we can beat them and take our territory back, and our history back, and our culture back, and our values back, and our future back is to say the things we know are true, and to give other people the courage to say them too. We must defy the Hollywood Jews, we must defy the government, we must defy those of our own people who have been corrupted by them.

And we can do it. Three years ago there was no one willing to say publicly what we are saying now. Everyone was letting himself be intimidated into going along with the controlled media and the government. Then we started broadcasting on one radio station -- just one broadcast a week. A year ago we had grown to seven stations. Now we're broadcasting on 15 stations each week. We have been able to grow like that because the people who listened to us on our first station three years ago told other people about us, and they began listening too, and then they told their friends. And our support grew, so that we could add more stations to our network.

And we can keep growing. The 100,000 of us who now gather each week can grow to a million and then to ten million. All we have to do is keep spreading the word to our friends, our neighbors, our relatives, our co-workers, and to strangers too. We can spread the word by telephone, by letter, by spray-painting the time and frequency of this broadcast on fences and

walls, by taking out advertising, by handing out leaflets. We can have 100 stations in our network by the end of this year.

And we really must do that. Not just because it'll feel good to have a million of us together each week instead of only 100,000. We have to do it because we need to be able to speak with a big enough voice to prevent the enemies of America, the enemies of our people, from silencing us. There are people in the Clinton government right now talking about the need to begin doing the same sort of job on the First Amendment that they've already done on the Second Amendment. They would like to make it illegal for us to criticize them. They would like to be able to throw anyone in prison who speaks out against their immigration policy, their education policy, their policy of "diversifying" America out of existence.

The same sort of people already have succeeded in doing that in many countries. It is illegal right now to make a broadcast like this one from a Canadian station, for example. Or from a British station. Or a French station. Or a German station. Or a Swiss station. Wherever there are Jews with their hands on a nation's mass media, and politicians who slavishly follow the ideological fashions set by the media, the people lose their freedom to criticize their destroyers. Everywhere the Jews go, their first goal is to get their hands on a nation's mass media, so that they can not only push their own destructive policies, but so that they can prevent anyone from identifying them publicly or criticizing them.

Most of the people in Canada, Britain, France, and the other countries where the Jews have succeeded in silencing any criticism of themselves believe that they are still free. They can still turn on their television receivers and watch a football game whenever they want to. They can still go into a drugstore and buy a fan magazine. They can even announce publicly that they don't like their government. All they've been forbidden to do is say or publish anything which might threaten the position of the Jews. And let's face it: to most people that's not important; certainly not as important as watching a ball game. But we, you and I, understand that that is everything. To lose the freedom to explain to others what the Jews are doing is to lose the ability to protect our own people. It is to lose our grip on the future.

In America we can still identify them. We can still tell people that the man who controls MTV, for example, and is pushing rap and other forms of Black culture to White boys and girls is the Jew billionaire Sumner Redstone. We can still criticize them. We can still tell people that Redstone and the other Jews who control the mass media are poisoning the souls of our young people, are subverting our nation, and have as their goal the utter destruction of our people. It's not illegal yet to say these things, even if many of our people already have let themselves be intimidated into keeping their mouths shut.

Let's exercise our freedom before it's taken away from us. Let's speak out now. Let's tell everyone about this program. Let's do whatever we have to do to grow from 100,000 to ten million. Because, you know, when there are ten million of us gathered here every week, they won't be able to take our freedom away from us and steal our future. We won't let them. We'll be strong enough to stop them.

What Is Racism?

Today let's talk about **racism** and related matters. There's hardly a subject the average White person is more uptight about, hardly a subject that makes him more uncomfortable. Fifty or 60 years ago people were really uptight about sex. Very few people could talk about it honestly and openly and comfortably. It embarrassed them. Whenever the subject came up people used all sorts of euphemisms and evasions to avoid having to mention things or use words that made them squirm and blush, things that they just couldn't deal with straightforwardly. In polite conversation one could not even use the word **leg** in talking about a woman, for example. It was too risqu‰, bordering on the pornographic, because of the mental associations it evoked.

Why was that? Why did talking about sex make us uncomfortable? Well, of course, it was because sex was a taboo subject. There were a lot of social and religious prohibitions and restrictions associated with sex, and these prohibitions conflicted with our natural urges. We were taught that following these natural urges was sinful, and that terrible things would happen to us if we did. The result was that we felt guilty about our natural urges. To avoid the very unpleasant feeling of guilt, we tried to avoid the subject of sex. We swept it under the rug and tried not to think about it.

That's the way it is with the subject of race today. Just as we were conditioned by religious teachings 50 or 60 years ago to feel guilty about our natural sexual inclinations, today we are conditioned--primarily by the controlled mass media--to feel guilty about our natural racial inclinations. We are conditioned to believe that they are sinful.

And what are our natural racial inclinations? We can get a pretty good answer by looking at the way we behaved and wrote and talked back in the era before race became a taboo subject, back in the time when we could still talk about it without feeling any pangs of guilt or embarrassment--back in the early part of this century, say. At that time we accepted the fact that people of a particular race preferred to live and work and play with other people like themselves. We certainly preferred the company of people of our own race, and that also was true of other races. We were often curious about or interested in the racial characteristics, the behavior, the lifestyles, the culture, and the histories of other races. We admired Japanese samurai swords and Chinese ceramic art, the Eskimo kayak, Hindu mythology, Mexican temples. In youth organizations like the Boy Scouts we studied the lore of the American Indians and tried to emulate their superb skills as stone-age hunters and woodsmen. Wherever another race had some real accomplishment, we were ready to study that accomplishment and to give credit where credit was due.

But at the same time we retained our feeling of separateness and exclusiveness and a pride in our own European culture, our own racial characteristics, our own history. We did not feel it necessary to apologize for teaching the history of our own race in our schools--that is, European history--and for not teaching Japanese history, say, or Tibetan history, except, of course, to those scholars in our universities who were studying exotic cultures. Especially, we did not feel the slightest inclination to invent a false Black history in order to magnify the self-esteem of young Blacks or to persuade young Whites that Blacks were their cultural equals.

Did we feel that our race is superior to other races? In general, yes--but we weren't uptight about it, just realistic. That is, we acknowledged without the slightest feeling of envy or resentment that other races could do some things better than we could: Blacks, for example, could do work in a hot, humid environment that would kill a White man. And their peculiar skeletal and muscular structure made them better sprinters and jumpers, on the average, while their relatively thick skulls and long arms gave them an advantage at boxing.

But we knew what we were especially good at, and we tended to value those things most highly. Someone recruiting for a basketball team, of course, would have different standards and might very well look at Blacks as a superior race. That didn't bother us. We were confident in our role as the pacesetters for everyone else, as the planet's preeminent problem solvers and civilization builders, as the best thinkers and doers. And, of course, we liked our poetry, our art, our music, and our literature best. In that sense we believed that we had a superior culture and we were a superior race. Superior by our own standards, of course.

Because of that--because of our feelings about ourselves and our preference for our own kind and our own culture--we were all **racists** by today's standards, of course. We were all **White supremacists.** But those terms were never used then. **Racism** was never an issue. We just thought and behaved in a way that was natural for us. As long as other races didn't get in our way, we felt no hostility toward them. But if they did get in our way, they usually regretted it pretty quickly.

And, of course, other races had pretty much the same attitude we did. They judged things by their standards. The Chinese believed--actually still believe--that they are superior to any foreign devils. Did that offend us in any way? Of course not. We didn't agree with the Chinese, of course, but as long as everyone stayed on his own turf, we were able to get along reasonably well. The only time there was conflict between the races was when they were forced to occupy the same turf. When that happened there always was conflict and hostility.

When greedy businessmen brought shiploads of Chinese coolies to this country to provide cheap labor for building railroads, so they wouldn't have to pay the prevailing wage rate to White workers, there was hostility between Whites and Chinese.

A much greater conflict was caused by importing African slaves to America. Profit-hungry slave merchants brought millions of them into this country and gave plantation owners an offer they couldn't refuse. The economic conditions of the 18th century made the use of slave labor very profitable. But the use of Black slaves by wealthy White landowners left small White farmers and craftsmen in the southern United States at a great disadvantage, with resultant hostility and conflict. After the slaves were freed and turned loose in White society, the conflict between Blacks and Whites became much, much worse, of course.

The conflict between the races eventually was limited by the practices of segregation, which established, in essence, separate societies in the United States for Whites and for Blacks. Whites lived in one part of town; Blacks in another. Whites went to White schools; Blacks to Black schools. There were White recreational areas and Black recreational areas, White restaurants and Black restaurants. The races mixed as little as they could, and each race was able to maintain its

own standards and its own culture, more or less. In most cases the institutions of segregation were sanctified by law. Wherever there was a sizable population of Blacks, for example, there were laws against miscegenation.

Segregation was not really an ideal solution for the long term, for either race, but in the short term it was infinitely better than racial mixing. The only good long term solution would have been complete geographical separation, in this case by repatriating freed slaves back to Africa and Chinese coolies back to China. But economic considerations--plus the regrettable shortsightedness which characterizes public policy in a democracy--resulted in repatriation being put on the back burner.

And so we lived with segregation as best we could, despite its shortcomings. We still had our turf and our society, and Blacks had theirs. In our society most of us could still talk about our own race and about other races without becoming embarrassed or feeling guilty. There was, of course, a great difference between the cultural and economic levels of White society and those of Black society. Standards in Black schools were far below those in White schools; Black incomes were lower; Black neighborhoods were poorer, dirtier, and more violent. A few Blacks overcame these conditions and prospered, but most lived rather squalidly.

A few Whites--and others--with extra time on their hands patronized the Blacks, even in those days before **racism** became a cause c‰lˆbre, and attributed Black ignorance and poverty to White **oppression.** Of course, it was nothing of the sort. The great majority of Whites did not concern themselves at all with Blacks and certainly wasted no time in trying to **oppress** them. Most Whites did not care what Blacks did, so long as they did it among themselves and did not threaten Whites. One merely had to look at the vastly greater difference which existed between the levels of civilization in Europe and in Black Africa to understand that the difference between the levels of White and Black society in America was merely a reflection of the difference in racial quality, and that Blacks in America would be living at an even lower level were it not for the benefits bestowed on them by their proximity to White society.

Nevertheless, the do-gooders persisted in blaming White society for the shortcomings of Black society, though without making much of an impact on White society. During the 1920s and 1930s the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People--the NAACP--lobbied for an end to segregation. Interestingly enough, all the presidents of the NAACP during this period were Jews, not Blacks, and the organization also received nearly all its financing from Jews. It was really the Second World War that changed things. The enormous buildup of wartime industry in America changed the composition of the U.S. work force radically. With millions of White males in uniform, women and Blacks were recruited into the factory work force in unprecedented numbers. The war had the net effect of moving large numbers of Blacks from rural areas into the cities and giving them more money than they had ever had before. Much more important was the psychological impact of the war. The war propagandists in America painted the war as a crusade for democracy and equality. We were told that the Germans believed themselves a **master race.** It was very wicked for any one group of people to believe that they were superior to any other group, we were told, over and over again. Well, after we had killed millions of our fellow Europeans and had lost 300,000 of our own soldiers proving that the Germans were not a **master race** after all, it was much easier for the propagandists of the

controlled media to persuade us that Whites and Blacks were innately equal, and that the lower socioeconomic level of Blacks therefore must be our fault. If Blacks were ignorant and poor, we had made them that way. It was segregation that was holding them down. The result was White guilt: it first began to take hold in the White consciousness in the 1950s.

Television became a powerful, new weapon in the hands of the guilt-mongers. We were treated to television spectacles of inoffensive, well-dressed Blacks sitting quietly in White caf‰s, while White waitresses refused to serve them and White patrons jeered them. We saw Blacks being pulled off buses and beaten with baseball bats by White Klansmen. We saw police dogs and club-swinging White policemen attacking Black so-called **freedom marchers** in Alabama. I don't mean to say that scenes such as these were typical of the so-called **civil rights** demonstrations of the 1950s and 1960s. But they did happen occasionally. White working-class people, who were least able to protect themselves from the Black assault on White jobs, White neighborhoods, and White schools during the 1950s and 1960s, sometimes reacted in an intemperate and undignified way. Sometimes they even reacted violently. Whenever they did, the cameras of the controlled media were there to record it. And these few scenes were cleverly edited, put in a context carefully selected to appeal to the innate White sense of propriety and fairness, and then broadcast over and over and over again. The result was more White guilt--as intended.

By skilfully using selected scenes of White resistance to racial integration which were embarrassing to most White viewers, the controllers of the media were gradually able to make the whole idea of resistance to racial integration embarrassing to most White people. And then the media gave a name to White resistance to integration: racism. And by repeatedly invoking this name in conjunction with scenes and actions and ideas which already had been made embarrassing, the name itself, the word itself, acquired the power to cause pangs of embarrassment and guilt--exactly as the sound of the dinner bell by itself caused Pavlov's dogs to salivate. The media had established a conditioned reflexive reaction to the word racism. The very word itself now is sufficient to cause the trendiest among us to turn pale and run for cover, while it makes even fairly rugged individualists uncomfortable.

Now, this brief history of **racism** really is a gross over-simplification. The actual process was much more complicated and involved many details which we have insufficient time to describe today. The schools, for example, were recruited into the conditioning program. The content of school curricula was falsified in order to prevent White students from understanding the rationale for segregation in America--or more generally, for the separation of races anywhere in the world. At the same time, history courses were de-Europeanized and larded with all sorts of imaginary accomplishments of non-Whites. The aim of all of this was to make it seem to White students that any effort to maintain a White society was not only irrational but also unfair.

The only thing which has helped a few White students resist this teaching has been the actual, physical presence of real Blacks in their schools, so that they could see the glaring contradiction between the theory of racial equality and reality.

One of the consequences of this generally very successful program of conditioning by the controlled media, this program of brainwashing, has been to make it very difficult to discuss

racial matters rationally. It's like it must have been trying to discuss sex rationally among Presbyterians a century ago.

When I'm on television talk shows and I talk about race, I receive really hysterical calls from some people, who just can't deal with it. And calls from the haters, too--people who tell me I ought to be killed for being in favor of separation of the races or for being opposed to miscegenation. And these people who scream out hatred and obscenities at me for daring to have Politically Incorrect opinions on race are White people--White people who have been conditioned by the controlled media to react that way.

But ordinary people used to get just as upset about sex a hundred years ago. They used to hate, despise, and even want to kill people who had unconventional ideas about sex--and I'm not talking about child molesters or homosexuals; I'm talking about healthy heterosexuals who simply weren't as rigidly conventional in their ideas or practices as the rest of the population. Margaret Sanger, the pioneer of birth-control education in America, was thrown into prison for her views in 1917. Joseph Smith, the founder of the Mormon church, scandalized conventional Christians by taking a number of wives, and he was lynched--murdered--by a mob in Illinois in 1844.

Nevertheless, race is something we must think about and talk about rationally and honestly. We must not be embarrassed by it. We must not feel guilty about it. We must understand that wanting to live and work with people of our own kind is a natural, healthy feeling that we are born with. Nature gave us this feeling so that we could evolve as a race, so that we could develop special characteristics and abilities, which set us apart from every other race. This feeling, this preference for our own kind, is essential for our continued survival. What is unnatural and destructive and truly hateful is enforced **multiculturalism,** as it's called, enforced **diversity.** I will conclude today by pointing out that our natural feeling about race isn't the only thing the brainwashers of the controlled media have worked hard to develop into a conditioned, reflexive guilt-and-fear mechanism. They've worked nearly as hard to confuse our natural understanding of the differences between men and women. When I say in public, as I often do, that the natural role for a man is that of provider and protector, and the natural role for a woman is that of a nurturer, I am subjected to the same kind of hysterical and hate-filled attacks as when I talk about race.

The media, the Jews, the egalitarians are intent on obscuring all distinctions, all structure in our society, all standards. We must resist their whole campaign of enforced Political Correctness. But most of all we must resist their effort to condition our thinking about race. We can survive feminism, no matter how neurotic and unhappy it may make us. We can survive other forms of egalitarianism, no matter how socially destructive they are.

But we cannot survive much longer unless we return to honesty in dealing with race.

Skinheads and the Law

I'VE BEEN SPEAKING recently with members of two quite distinct segments of our society, and I want to share with you some of the things I've learned. The two segments are policemen and skinheads.

These two groups ought to have a certain sympathy for each other, because they've experienced certain things, learned at first hand certain things about the society we live in, that most of us haven't. But I've found that for the most part they have very little sympathy for one another, and in fact quite a bit of antipathy. We'll explore together the reasons for this antipathy. Let's start with the skinheads. They're young White people, most of them in their teens and twenties, most of them working class. Many of them have tattoos. They usually have very short haircuts. Many of them wear a distinctive type of work boot. Some also wear suspenders. The tattoos, haircuts, boots, and suspenders are almost like a uniform, a sort of club insignia. Nevertheless, there's quite a lot of individual variation among them. For some, being a skinhead is a sort of hobby, a part-time recreational activity. For others, it's a serious, full-time commitment.

The skinhead movement began in Britain more than 20 years ago. It had become a fashion there among some groups of young factory workers to shave their heads, because they had to keep their hair cut short anyway in order to avoid getting it caught in the machinery. As racial, social, and economic conditions in Britain deteriorated, these young, White factory workers were among the hardest hit.

Specifically, because of an open-door immigration policy backed by Jews and liberals, many of Britain's cities were being flooded by non-White immigrants from Asia and the Caribbean. The government in Britain, just like the government in the United States, was providing subsidized housing for these non-Whites and giving them preference in hiring. This policy caused the unemployment rate among young British workers to go up. The non-Whites also brought crime and a number of other social and cultural problems with them.

Just as in America, there was a code of Political Correctness observed by the controlled media and the government. Under this code, non-Whites could do no wrong. Whenever there was a conflict between Whites and non-Whites, the Whites were blamed. Young Whites felt abandoned by their government. With a high unemployment rate, very limited prospects for improvement, and the breakup and destruction of their ancestral communities, they saw no future for themselves. Banding together and adopting a characteristic manner of dress and grooming was their way of asserting themselves and finding an identity. They were young, White, working class, and alienated. They were the original skinheads.

The skinhead culture spread to the United States, because the same social and racial decay and the same abandonment of young, working-class Whites by the government and other institutions exist here. In our large cities, with their heavy concentrations of non-Whites, many young Whites turn to the skinhead movement for a sense of security. As members of skinhead groups they don't feel so alone and helpless. Other than their desire to band together and find a sense of identity -- and sometimes security -- skinheads don't have as much in common as the controlled

media would have us believe. Some skinhead groups spend a lot of their time in mindless drinking and brawling. Others believe in clean living, and fight only when attacked. Some skinheads use drugs, but most don't. And while many skinheads in the United States have no racial consciousness, no sense of racial identity or loyalty, a growing minority of them are consciously and even outspokenly pro-White. Some of these refer to themselves as **White power skinheads.**

One attitude common to most skinheads is a strong dislike for government and the police. In part this is the consequence of the police reaction to the lawlessness of many skinheads. The police are not inclined to make distinctions between the clean-living skinheads and those who engage in drunken brawling. When the police see tattoos, short hair, and Doc Marten boots, they see trouble, and they tend therefore to take a very hostile and aggressive attitude toward any skinhead they meet. The skinheads who try to stay out of trouble resent this presumption of guilt. They resent having their rights violated by the police, just because some skinheads are lawbreakers.

Beyond this reaction to police prejudice against them, there is the more fundamental attitude among skinheads that they have been abandoned by the rest of the White society, and so they aren't as inclined to give blind respect and obedience to that society's institutions. Skinheads living in America's minority-ridden cities know what the public schools have become. They also know that the mainstream society insists on pretending that everything is still A-OK. Of course, there's talk by the controlled media about how standards have fallen in the schools, and about how big the problems of drugs and violence in the schools have become, but there's no mention at all of the cause of these problems, which is the fact that the schools are no longer White. No one will mention the problem of race in the schools, because he's afraid of being attacked by the controlled media as a **racist.**

Wealthy White parents get around the problem by sending their sons and daughters to exclusive private schools. Middle-class parents alleviate the problem by moving to the suburbs, so their children can go to somewhat safer -- which is to say, Whiter -- schools. White working-class kids are left to fend for themselves. No one else will stand up for them. They see the hypocrisy and the cowardice on the part of their elders, and it does not tend to increase their respect for authority, whether that authority is represented by the police or by school officials, who always blame them rather than the Blacks when there is a clash between Whites and Blacks.

Policemen, on the other hand, tend to respect authority. People who choose to go into police work tend to have a more authoritarian personality than the average person. They instinctively resent people who don't play by the standard rules. They don't like boat-rockers. They don't like non-conformists. They don't like people with a different life-style. And probably that's the way it ought to be -- within limits. The police, after all, have the job of protecting society. We want them to have their hearts in their job.

The problem is that many of the authorities in America have become corrupt. Some of those authorities have become a much greater threat to our society than the criminals the police are hired to protect us from. I'll give you an example that pertains directly to skinheads. The Jews, both in this country and in Europe where the skinhead movement originated, have viewed that

movement with fear and loathing from the beginning, because it was beyond their control. Young working-class Whites weren't supposed to fight back against the Jewish policies and programs which were aimed at the destruction of White society and eventually the destruction of the White race. They were supposed to roll over and play dead. They were supposed to become Politically Correct, like so many middle-class kids who went off to college. The Jews fought back against the skinhead movement at two levels. First they tried to subvert it. They sponsored groups such as Skinheads Against Racial Prejudice, which is known by its acronym SHARP. They encouraged drug usage among skinheads. They encouraged rap music and racial mixing. Despite these Jewish efforts at subversion, however, racial consciousness among skinheads has continued to grow.

Then the Jews tried to brainwash the public against skinheads through their controlled media. They produced a number of made-for-TV films in Hollywood which portrayed skinheads as hateful, depraved, and dangerous. You may have seen some of these films. A few titles from the last few years were Skinheads -- the Second Coming of Hate -- that's the first one I remember seeing -- and then there were Dead Bang, and So Proudly We Hail. These hatemongering films contained the same sort of distortion and deceit as the films the Jews have been turning out for decades to make the Germans of the Second World War era look hateful and depraved.

At the same time a number of Jewish propaganda organizations, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Klanwatch, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, began offering their services to police departments around the country as **experts** on what they like to call **hate crimes** and **hate groups.** All of these Jewish propaganda organizations are well-connected politically, and so they can approach police departments draped in the false cloak of authority. They offer **seminars** and **training programs** to the police, supposedly to teach them about the dangers represented by skinheads and to **sensitize** them to the needs of minorities.

The result of all of this is that the police get a very prejudiced view of skinheads before they ever meet one. Along with the very real lawlessness and disorder on the part of many skinheads, this prejudice practically guarantees that the police and the skinheads will despise each other. And that's too bad.

It's too bad, because the police, like the skinheads, are exposed every day to the filth and degeneracy that are taking over our whole society. Most middle-class folks are able to evade the crime and, more than that, the awful reality of what America has become in this Jewish effort to multiculturalize us. They know that there are certain parts of town where they must not go after dark, other areas where if their cars break down even in the daytime they will be in grave danger. They learn the rules for survival. They move to the suburbs. And they pray that the city won't follow them there. They pray that the gangs and the drive-by shootings won't come to their neighborhood. They pray that their children won't get hooked on drugs. They pray that their daughters won't get pregnant. And they ignore the filth. They pretend that it doesn't exist. They don't want to be considered **racists.**

And for the most part they survive. And when the filth does catch up with the middle class, it's usually only individuals who get hurt: a White family which gets pulled down into the filth here,

a young woman there, a teenaged boy somewhere else. The rest can go on pretending that it didn't happen, that everything is still OK -- at least, for the time being.

But the police know that things are not OK. They have to deal with the filth every day. They can't pretend that it doesn't exist. They know that it can be evaded only temporarily. They know that it is growing and that it eventually will follow everyone to the suburbs. They know that it must be fought and destroyed, or it will destroy all of us.

The racially conscious skinheads understand this too. That's what they have in common with the police. And the hour is too late for any of the segments of our people who understand this to be fighting against each other. We need to be standing together, all of us, against the common enemy.

Of course, it's easy to say this, but very difficult to put it into practice. There remains the problem of the drunkenness and lawlessness of many skinheads. We cannot condone drunkenness or mindless brawling or vandalism or drug use, even if we understand the reasons for this behavior, even if we understand that skinheads are alienated from this society because of what it has become.

What we have to do is encourage in every way we can the growth of the racially conscious portion of the skinhead community. We have to give young people back their sense of identity. We have to give them purpose and direction again. We have to help them value self-discipline and clean living again. This is one of the tasks the National Alliance has set for itself. Of course, it is precisely the racially conscious portion of the skinhead community which the Jews hate and fear. The Jewish propaganda organizations don't care at all about skinhead drinking and brawling, but they're scared to death of the skinheads finding a sense of racial identity and a purpose and cleaning themselves up and working for a common goal. And so it is specifically the racially conscious skinheads against whom these Jewish organizations like B'nai B'rith indoctrinate and prejudice the police.

This police prejudice is bad enough, but it is compounded in all too many cases by police corruption, by police who behave in a hostile and aggressive way toward skinheads, even to the point of violating the law themselves, because they know that the skinheads are out of favor with the political power structure and the controlled media, and these policemen want to ingratiate themselves with their superiors. I'm aware of cases where the police have arrested young Whites, then put them in large cells with a number of Black criminals and deliberately incited the Blacks to attack and sodomize them. Perhaps the police believe that they will receive some sort of **multiculturalism** award from the B'nai B'rith for such atrocious behavior.

So we have an educational job to do on our policemen as well as on skinheads. Ultimately we need to get rid of the corrupt cops just as much as we need to get rid of drunken, tattooed brawlers. Most of all we need to get rid of those who have corrupted the cops and who also have designed -- deliberately designed -- the social conditions which have robbed so many of our young people of hope for the future and of a pride in their identity, leading them to adopt an anti-social and self-destructive life-style.

Unfortunately, the National Alliance lacks the means at this time for cleaning up our police departments or our youth as a whole. We also lack the means to prevent the Jews from continuing their destructive policies for the time being. But we can educate. We can continue reaching at least that portion of our youth who have become racially conscious and are looking for the right direction. And hopefully we can help some of our uncorrupted policemen to understand that not every Politically Incorrect young person is a trouble-maker.

Some people ask me: *Why do you bother with skinheads at all? Isn't it better to try to reach the kids in the universities? After all, it's the kids in the universities who one day will be in the decision-making positions in the educational establishment, in business, in the military, in industry, and even in government agencies. Those are the ones whose thinking you need to influence now.*

And, of course, they're right -- at least, partly right. The kids with the tattoos are pretty well locked out of the decision-making process. It'll take a revolution to change that. We do need to influence the kids in the universities, and we're working on that.

But when I compare the average university student of today with the average skinhead, I am troubled by two things. The first thing is that most of the White university students have not had the close contact with racial reality that skinheads have had. The average White university student has not had to fight physically for his survival. He has never been threatened with a knife by a Black thug or been beaten up by a Black gang. He has never been tear-gassed or hit with a nightstick. He has never been thrown in jail. His understanding of the racial problem is only theoretical. His understanding of the corruption of our society and our government is only theoretical. We need people who understand from personal experience just how bad things have become in America, who understand just how dangerous the situation is -- people who have learned how to hate evil from the bottom of their guts and who are willing to do whatever is necessary to destroy that evil before it destroys all of us.

The second thing which troubles me is the relatively few White students in our universities who have any real manliness in their characters. We have too many whiners and wimps, too much timidity, too much softness. Certainly not all White university students are wimps, but far too many are, and on the average they do not compare well with the skinheads in this regard. If America is to be saved, if our people are to be saved, we need men and women who are intelligent and educated and disciplined, but we also need men and women who are tough and hard and brave. We need the best of the university students, the best of the university professors, the best of the policemen -- and we need the best of the skinheads. We need the best people from every sector of White society, standing together and fighting together, if any of us are to have a future.

Brainwashing in America

WE'VE TALKED HERE about a number of very important things in recent months: about the damage done to the American standard of living and to American sovereignty by the New World Order planners and their various **free trade** schemes; about the efforts of the government and the controlled media to disarm American citizens, so that they cannot rebel; about attempts to scuttle the First Amendment and outlaw Politically Incorrect speech.

Most recently we've talked about the ways in which the controlled media use the average American's desire to be fashionable, to be trendy, as a means to manipulate his attitudes and opinions -- in other words, to brainwash him. Today we'll focus on this last topic, because it's really the key to everything else.

How much more pleasant and progressive a world this would be if all of us were rational creatures -- and honest too! Honesty is important. But the fact is that most of us think with our emotions instead of with our reasoning faculty. We will believe the most absurd things, if we have some emotional compulsion to do so. And even when our emotions don't have us entirely convinced, we'll pretend that they do, if there is a compelling reason. We'll be dishonest in telling other people what we believe.

For example, the opinions of many of us on the subject of race are determined not by observation and reason, but by fear of being unfashionable -- and by other emotions besides fear in many cases. And even those of us who do not have fashionable ideas on race -- even those of us whose ideas have been shaped by observation and reason -- often are not honest in expressing our ideas to others. We still fear being thought unfashionable by others, and so we lie about what we believe.

I spoke a few weeks ago about the ways in which the controlled media have used our lack of reason and our lack of honesty -- or lack of courage -- to manipulate our attitudes on racial matters and to manipulate governmental policies on race as well. By presenting us with certain images which have an emotional impact and repeatedly associating those images with certain ideas, the men who control the news and entertainment media establish conditioned reflexes in the public. In other words, they brainwash us. They make us think the way they want us to think, not by showing us evidence and reasoning with us, but by understanding how to push the right emotional buttons on us.

In my last talk with you I gave the example of the way in which the controlled media manipulated public opinion during the time of all the civil disorders connected with the effort to force racial mixing between Whites and Blacks -- the so-called **civil rights revolution** of the 1950s and 60s. Our television screens showed us scenes calculated by the media controllers to make us sympathize with Black **civil rights** demonstrators and to make us embarrassed by the Whites who opposed them. They showed us White Klansmen pulling Blacks off buses and beating them with baseball bats. They showed us White policemen siccing their dogs on Black marchers in Alabama. Not typical scenes, certainly, but scenes carefully selected for their emotional impact. Of course, they could have chosen images which would have had exactly the

opposite effect. Instead of showing us Black demonstrators being beaten by angry Whites, they could have shown us interviews with the White victims of Black crime -- or with the relatives of White victims. They could have shown us residential neighborhoods which used to be White and decent before the government brought Blacks in, and which then became filthy and crime-ridden afterward. They could have interviewed some of the elderly White people trapped in these neighborhoods because they couldn't afford to move, and let these people tell us on the air how their lives had been turned into a living hell. Instead of showing us polite, neatly dressed Black children being escorted into a newly integrated White school by Federal marshals while White students jeered and cursed them, they could have shown us examples of the decay and degradation which inevitably followed the racial integration of the schools: the graffiti on the walls, the gang fights, the disorder in the classrooms. They could have hardened our will to oppose the destruction of our schools and neighborhoods, made us feel that it was our duty, instead of making us feel guilty for opposing racial mixing.

But the controlled media have their agenda, their goal, and that goal is always to break down the structure of our society, to lower our standards, to destroy our morale, to undermine our solidarity, to corrupt and confuse us. We always can predict the side the controlled media will be on in any social or economic or cultural or racial dispute. It always will be the side which weakens us as a people.

Another example of this process of brainwashing by the media has been their treatment of the campaign to make homosexuality acceptable to the average person. I don't know whether or not you've ever actually been physically present at a public demonstration by homosexuals, but let me tell you, they're pretty disgusting. Among homosexuals there seems to be an unusually high percentage of exhibitionists, of **in-your-face** types who like to show their contempt for normal people by shocking them. But when these homosexual demonstrations are televised, the viewers don't see the worst of this disgusting behavior. It's covered up by the media, who try to make these sick creatures seem almost normal to us.

I was living in the Washington, DC, area during the latter part of the Vietnam war. I went downtown to observe several of the big demonstrations first hand. The media always called them **peace** demonstrations. I was more naive at that time than I am now, and I was absolutely flabbergasted when I compared the news coverage of a demonstration with what I had actually seen with my own eyes just a few hours earlier.

These demonstrations always had a big contingent of communists in the lead, with other communist groups scattered among the rest of the marchers. The Communist Party USA was there with its big red banners and its pictures of Marx and Lenin. The Trotskyites were there with their banners. The Young People's Socialist League, the Progressive Labor Party, the Revolutionary Communist Party, and all the rest. They all carried Viet Cong flags as well as their own banners. Most of them were bussed in from New York, and there was a high percentage of really greasy-looking Jews among them, Marx- and Trotsky-type Jews.

The great majority of the demonstrators weren't card-carrying members of any of these communist groups. They were just liberals and leftists of various stripes, many of them students like Bill Clinton at the time, who were there because it was the fashionable thing to do. But these

Bill Clinton types were marching arm in arm with genuine Reds who were carrying Viet Cong flags. This was at a time when the Viet Cong were killing an average of 100 American soldiers every day.

Anyway, when I saw the television news coverage of the demonstration that evening and saw the pictures in the Washington Post the next morning, I looked in vain for any of the communist banners which had been so evident when I was there. The people in the controlled media had deliberately **sanitized** their coverage of the demonstration. They had cropped their pictures so that the communist banners and placards didn't show. They had turned their cameras on the normal-looking demonstrators and on the less- inflammatory placards: the ones that merely called for an end to the war instead of the ones which called for a Viet Cong victory.

The cameras sought out young women marchers carrying children in their arms and focused on them. Or if someone was pushing a baby carriage, she was sure to be seen in the television coverage. When the demonstrators began to chant, *Ho, ho, ho Chi Minh, the Viet Cong's gonna win,* the audio background would be blanked so television viewers wouldn't hear it, and the commentator would begin speaking.

The controlled media had made these demonstrations look **respectable.** They had made it look like the people opposed to an American victory were normal, decent folks like you and me, who merely wanted **peace,** just as they had made it look like the people opposed to forced racial mixing were hooligans.

You see, the people who control television are able to control our society, because they understand how to use this powerful weapon effectively. They understand how to manipulate the attitudes and opinions of the public with it. They don't try to tell us, of course, exactly how we must vote in each election. They just determine which ideas and policies to make fashionable, and which ideas and policies to make unfashionable. Once the media have done that, the politicians -- both Democrats and Republicans -- pretty well fall into line. The media masters are willing to let us decide whether we want Bill Clinton or George Bush in the White House, because they know that neither one of these politicians will dare to be unfashionable on the really important issues.

This ability to dictate what will be fashionable and what will be unfashionable by playing on the emotions of the public is the greatest power wielded in the world today. It is an absolute disaster for us that this power is in the hands of Jews rather than our own people. But that's the way things are at the moment. We have to understand that. And we have to fight it. We have to try to take that power away from those who wield it now and return it to our own people. There are several ways in which we can fight, and we'll talk about them.

I'll tell you one way, though, that we can't fight. We can't fight by trying to make the great majority of our people think with their heads instead of their emotions. We can't fight by trying to get people to substitute reason for fear and guilt and the other emotions on which the media masters play so skillfully. People are constituted the way they are, and we have to accept it. We can't change that. Most people always will be subject to manipulation by whoever has the power to set fashions. What we have to do is take that power away from those who have it now. One

thing that we can do, even though it's very difficult, is try to give more people the courage to be honest. I was a physics professor at a university back during the 1960s, when the so-called **civil rights** turmoil was very much in the news. Blacks were demanding this and demanding that, and they were rioting and marching and burning things and generally raising hell. Well, I observed all of these things, and I thought about them, and I talked with my colleagues at the university about them.

My colleagues could be divided into three groups, based on their responses to my expression of concern about what was happening.

First, there were the trendies, the liberals, the ones who held a moistened forefinger up to the breeze of propaganda coming from their television receivers and adjusted their opinions accordingly. One could argue with them, but there really was no point in it. They were absolutely determined to believe whatever was fashionable, and they weren't going to let facts or reason get in their way.

Second, there were the Jews, who are a lot more numerous on university campuses than they are in the general population. One didn't need to argue with them either. They were all up to their necks in various **civil rights** activities: organizing committees to hire more non-White faculty members or recruit more non-White students, demanding that the university's trustees get rid of all their investments in South Africa, and so on.

Finally, there were colleagues who were open-minded enough so that I could talk with them about what was going on. They weren't taken in by the TV propaganda, and they formed their own opinions about things. With very few exceptions, however, they were not willing to express their views publicly. They let themselves be intimidated by the Jews and the trendies. Many of them behaved in a dishonest way, telling me one thing in private and behaving in public as if they agreed with the current TV fashion. They were, I believe, unduly timid, unduly afraid of the consequences of opposing the Jews and the trendies.

It is true, of course, that there was a certain amount of physical intimidation: tire slashing, disruptions in class, the threat of violence, which the advocates of Political Correctness have never hesitated to use. But I believe that if those who opposed the politicizing and corruption of our universities had been bolder and had stood together, the way their opponents did, they could have prevailed in many cases. In many of our universities they could have preserved the atmosphere of academic freedom and the academic standards which used to prevail.

Actually the situation was a bit more complex than I have indicated. The government and the media both were leaning on the universities to lower their standards. It would have been necessary to defy the government as well as the Jews and the trendies. Eventually it would have been necessary to weed out the Jews and reestablish the bans on hiring Jewish faculty members which our universities used to have in order to protect themselves from subversion. This would have entailed a real fight, a major disruption at every university: the sort of disruptions which actually occurred on many campuses during the 1960s and 70s, when Blacks and Jews really turned things upside down and established the tyranny of Political Correctness which still rules. Even then the professors who disagreed with what was happening failed to speak out effectively

against it or to display any sort of solidarity. The consequence of this failure . . . well, we all know what the consequence was. It was the destruction of our universities. Worse, it was their conversion to enemy assets. We can still go to an American university for a technical education -- to learn engineering or chemistry or mathematics -- but we certainly can no longer acquire there what used to be called a liberal education. We certainly can no longer acquire there the knowledge and feeling for our civilization which in the past prepared us to be defenders and builders of that civilization.

What remains of our universities is really pitiful to behold, really disgusting. The people in charge present the worst possible example to the young people there. They are lickspittles and hypocrites, liars and wimps, without the slightest trace of manliness, honor, or self-respect. They teach doctrines which are fashionable, but which they know are false. They grovel at the feet of the Jews and other minorities in order to keep their jobs.

Just last month the president of Rutgers University, which used to be a fine institution, was desperately trying to hold his job after he made a slip and actually said something which everyone knows is true, but which it is Politically Incorrect to mention. In an address to faculty members he pointed out that Blacks simply don't have the genetic quality to meet the standards set for White students. Well, of course, one of the monitors of Political Correctness recorded his comments and gave the recording to the controlled media, which immediately began howling for his blood.

Instead of defending what he had said and backing it up with evidence, the president began groveling and apologizing. He whined and begged. He said he really hadn't meant what he said -- that it had just slipped out, and it was exactly the opposite of what he really believed. Probably many of you saw the news stories. Truly pathetic!

To have saved our universities from what they have become today would have been worth any sort of disruption, any sort of temporary unpleasantness.

The point is that just a little honesty, a little courage, at the right time could have prevented a great tragedy.

Do you think that I'm being naive in asking for honesty, when so little is evident in our national life?

You should understand that I'm not asking for courage from people who have none in them. But there still are a few individuals who are capable of being honest, even in our universities, even in our government, a few who have the courage to be honest -- if they're given a little encouragement, if someone else will set an example for them.

We're trying to set an example with our radio broadcasts. But many of you who are listening also can set examples.

We should never think: *Well, I'm only one person. What I do or don't do isn't important. I can't make a difference by myself.*

That kind of thinking is wrong. We can make a difference, because courage is contagious. It spreads from person to person.

And it's powerful. One courageous truthteller can back down a thousand cowards and liars and hypocrites. He can send a whole regiment of Jewish media bosses scurrying for cover, like vampires fleeing the light of the rising sun.

There has never been a time in the long history of our race when we were more in need of a few honest men and women, a few people of courage and integrity. There has never been another time when a few good men and women had the opportunity to make such a big difference as they can make now.

Let's do it!

Terror Breeds Terror:
Oklahoma City in Perspective

WHEN THE FEDERAL building in Oklahoma City was blown up a few days ago, I was shocked. I didn't know who had done the bombing, of course, but I had a very strong feeling that it was no coincidence that it came on the second anniversary of the Clinton massacre at Waco. I felt an intuition close to certainty that the bombing had not been an attack by foreigners aimed at America but instead was an attack by Americans aimed specifically at Clinton and his kind.

I listened to the expressions of pious outrage by Bill Clinton and Janet Reno and the other government gangsters on television that evening, and I thought, "You hypocrites! What do you expect? You are the real terrorists. When a government engages in terrorism against its own citizens, it should not be surprised when some of those citizens strike back and engage in terrorism against the government. You are the ones responsible for this bombing, for the deaths of these children."

Terrorism is a nasty business. Most of its victims are innocent people. Some of the office workers who died in the Federal Building in Oklahoma City may have been as much against the Clinton government as were those who set off the bomb. But terrorism is a form of warfare, and in war most of the victims are noncombatants. Certainly, none of us can condone the killing of children, but in fact it is the Clinton government which has led the way in the killing of children. About as many children died in the Waco massacre alone as in the Oklahoma City bombing. It really infuriates me to see creatures like Bill Clinton and Janet Reno shedding crocodile tears over slaughtered children. These two are using the bodies of the dead children as a shield for themselves. How many tears did they shed over the children they burned to death in Waco? The hatred one hears in their voices when they talk about the Oklahoma City bombers is not because children were killed; it is because they know that the bombing was aimed at them, at Bill Clinton and company.

Americans haven't had a real war fought on their own soil for 130 years. We haven't experienced any significant domestic terrorism since Bill Clinton and his pro-Viet Cong buddies were burning ROTC buildings and bombing draft offices back during the Vietnam war, and that was relatively tame stuff. I think things are about to change.

The U.S. government has been trashing other people's countries for a long time now and getting away with it. The U.S. government has been sponsoring Israeli terrorism in the Middle East for nearly 50 years, financing and condoning the assassinations and bombings of Arabs by Jews year after year, with remarkable forbearance on the part of the Arabs. The bombing of the World Trade Center in New York by Muslims was a very small reprisal for all of that.

After the U.S. government smashed Iraq four years ago in order to make the Middle East safe for Greater Israel, slaughtering thousands of Iraqi children in the process, there was much government talk about the danger of Iraqi terrorism, but nothing ever came of it. But now something new is about to happen, I believe. A growing number of Americans have such a

hatred of the government in Washington that some of them will commit desperate and foolish acts like the Oklahoma City bombing. A growing number will turn to terrorism as their only weapon against a terrorist government. And I suspect that we'll see some real terrorism -- planned, organized terrorism -- before too long. I suspect that a growing number of exasperated, fed-up Americans will begin engaging in terrorism on a scale that the world has never seen before.

As I said a moment ago, my first suspicion was that the Oklahoma City bombing might have been done by persons sympathetic to the victims of the government's Waco massacre. Things have reached the point in America, however, that this bombing could have been done by any of a very large number of angry, desperate people. The FBI has a list of potential terrorists that it checks whenever something like this happens, but in recent years that list has grown so large that it's become practically useless. This may come as a surprise to some citizens, but, believe me, there are many, many Americans who have come to consider the U.S. government their worst enemy. And among those Americans there are some who feel a sense of responsibility to do something about that enemy.

Let's get specific. If you watch a lot of television, you're easily misled into believing that the attitudes and sentiments you see on your screen are those of all Americans. They aren't. They are the attitudes and sentiments of those segments of the population which believe that things have never been better in America and that we have a wonderful government. Foremost among these are the media people themselves -- not just the Jewish media bosses, but all of those who have their snouts in the media trough, including the commentators. And, of course, there are the politicians and the bureaucrats. And the homosexuals and the career women. And the minorities. The Clinton constituency. They just love all of the artificial equality and all of the special privileges which have been bestowed on them. They can't imagine why anyone would want to go back to the bad, old days when this was a White country, and men were men, and women were women, and the freaks stayed in the closet, and everyone worked for his living.

Watching television you'd never know it, but there are some normal people with healthy instincts left in America. And not just heterosexual White males. There are still White women left in this country who believe that being a mother and a homemaker is not a fate worse than death: women who don't want more laws requiring that they be hired as prison guards or furniture movers or making it a "hate crime" to hold a door open for them, but who do want a clean, healthy, White world for their children to grow up in.

Certainly, not all of these normal, healthy White men and women are potential terrorists. But a very substantial portion of them are intensely hostile to the government. That portion can only grow during the next few years. It's not just the Waco massacre or the bombing of Baghdad or this country's criminal policy in the Middle East which makes so many Americans hate their government. It's what the government has done to America.

It's the government's deliberate flooding of our country with non-Whites from the Third World, and the refusal to halt the massive illegal immigration across our border with Mexico and the Caribbean.

It's the government's catering to the worst elements in the population, buying their votes with welfare programs paid for by our hard work.

It's the government's theft of our freedom -- with ever more oppressive taxes, with ever more restrictive rules and regulations of one sort or another, with efforts to take away our right to protect ourselves and our families.

It's the more and more obviously corrupt and degenerate politicians who are holding the highest offices in the government: crooks and liars of the sort typified by Bill Clinton.

It's the government's treasonous abdication of the responsibility entrusted to it, its shortsighted quest for votes, its willingness always to be led by the Jewish media rather than by a concern for the good of the country.

It's the government's deliberate turning away from the people who built America and its cynical promotion of "multiculturalism," with the consequent ruin of our schools, the degradation of our popular culture, and the conversion of our cities into crime-infested hell holes. The government and the controlled media are responsible for the spiritual poisoning of our young people: young Whites singing rap ditties and behaving like Blacks.

To yuppies in New York and Washington, none of these things may seem very important. For people who have never had an unfashionable thought in their heads, for people who turn to their television for all of their opinions and attitudes, it may be hard to understand why anyone would be upset about what the government has done to America. But, believe me, there are plenty of people who are very upset.

People used to complain about the government's destructive policies, and they used to write their Congressmen and hope that what was happening was only a temporary aberration. But after decades of writing their Congressmen and watching things become worse and worse, they're just plain mad as hell. The privileged classes I named a minute ago -- the Jews and the politicians and the homosexuals and the minorities and the female executives -- who believe that this is the best of all possible worlds, have no idea how angry, how furious, normal Americans are. And, as I said, they're only going to get madder as time goes on. The ones who aren't mad are the ones who've simply become alienated. They have given up all hope for restoring any sort of sanity or decency to the country and are just looking out for themselves.

When people are pushed as far as they are willing to go, and when they believe that they have nothing left to lose, then they will resort to terrorism. There will be more and more such people in the future. Even if they have no well thought-out plan, even if they belong to no organization and have no real ideology, even if they only are striking out as angry, frustrated individuals, their numbers and their deeds will grow. Such disorganized terrorism, motivated by anger rather than by a plan, will never bring down the government. About all it can accomplish is the weakening of the self-confidence of the government's supporters and the encouragement of the government's enemies. A long enough and intense enough period of terrorism can discourage many people from making long-term career plans and can lead to more of a short-term mind-set in the general

population, a "let's get through life one day at a time" outlook. But by itself it can't really accomplish anything positive.

It's really too bad that innocent people will die -- especially innocent children. It's too bad that people will be maimed and injured. It's too bad that people will be made fearful. If people could act in a rational way, all of that could be avoided. But they never do. When a civilization is dying, when the soul of a people is being poisoned, all sorts of irrational behavior takes place. The government does bizarre and destructive things. Individual citizens do bizarre and destructive things. And bloodshed and suffering are inevitable. It will become worse. There is nothing the government can do to stop it -- certainly not a government headed by the likes of Bill Clinton. So what ought people like us to do: people who approve of neither government terrorism, such as the Waco massacre or the bombing of Baghdad, nor private terrorism, such as the Oklahoma City bombing? Should we just sit on our hands and watch the government terrorists and the private terrorists fight it out?

That, unfortunately, is what most of us have been doing until now. We've watched it all on television, but we haven't done anything about it. I believe that it's time for a few of us to begin shouldering a little responsibility for what's going on in the world around us. After all, it's our civilization they're destroying.

Here's what I believe that we can and should do. We should help the more perceptive members of the public to see terrorism in its context, rather than merely as a series of individual acts. Back during the Vietnam war, when Bill Clinton's buddies were bombing ROTC buildings and draft board offices, and when they used a fertilizer bomb of the same sort used in Oklahoma City to blow up a research center at the University of Wisconsin, the context was clear. The terrorism was a protest against U.S. involvement in the war. The whole public understood that.

We need to help people understand that a good bit, if not all, of the private terrorism we'll be seeing in the future will be a protest against the government's destruction of America. And most of the government terrorism will be an effort to frighten the government's critics into silence and inactivity. More and more, the government will lash out at dissidents, at anyone who is not Politically Correct. And the two sides will feed on each other: the more repressive and terroristic the government becomes, the more individuals there'll be who'll engage in terrorism to get back at the government. And the more individual terrorism there is against the government, the more terroristic the government will become in turn. And the rest of us will be caught between them. More important than helping people understand the cause of private terrorism is helping them to understand the role of the government in terrorism. The problem is that when the government commits a terrorist act, it's not called terrorism. It's always called something else. That confuses people. I'll bet that before the Oklahoma City bombing ninety per cent of the general public couldn't have told you what happened in Waco, Texas, two years ago. And most of those who did remember the Waco massacre remembered it the way the controlled media described it: as a justified police raid on a group of dangerous extremists.

"Extremists": that's one of those buzz words the controlled media and the governmemt use when they want to prejudice the public against someone. The public needs to be told that the people killed at Waco were just members of a fundamentalist Christian church that didn't like the

government, but they were no threat to anybody. The government had no business interfering in their lives. The people who ordered the raid on the Branch Davidian church which killed nearly a hundred innocent people, mostly women and children, were Bill Clinton and Janet Reno. They did it simply because the Davidians were different. Their religion was odd. They weren't part of the mainstream. They weren't fashionable.

And Bill Clinton and Janet Reno are still sitting in their offices in Washington, condemning other terrorists, telling everyone that they won't tolerate terrorism. And as long as people like them are allowed to hold pubic office and to get away with mass murder, we'll have a growing problem of terrorism to worry about. People need to understand that.

We'll never have peace in America until the general public understands the government's role in provoking and committing terrorism and is ready to call the government to account for it. I don't know who set off the bomb in Oklahoma city or exactly what their motive was, but I have a suspicion that if Bill Clinton and Janet Reno had been put on trial for murdering all those children in Waco two years ago, there wouldn't have been an Oklahoma City bombing a week ago. Violence breeds violence. I wish there were a way we could stop it, but I think that about all we can do now is understand it and try to help other people understand it too. The bond of trust between the U.S. government and its citizens has been broken, and it's far too late to mend it. The rift between normal, healthy Americans and the Clinton constituency will continue to grow. Let's try to keep as many of those normal Americans as we can looking at the big picture and not letting themselves be confused by the controlled media.

The Clinton constituency, the privileged classes who support government terrorism against the rest of us, will be pushing hard for more government repression. They'll be pushing for scrapping what's left of the First Amendment and passing laws against any form of Politically Incorrect expression. They believe that if they can control what normal Americans read and hear and think, they can control what we do. Even before the Oklahoma City bombing, Jewish groups such as the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Southern Poverty Law Center and the B'nai B'rith were lobbying for laws to keep Politically Incorrect ideas off the "information superhighway," off the Internet. Now they'll use each new incident of terrorism as an excuse for censorship, for repression, for controlling what people are permitted to say and hear and read and write. They'll say, "If there had been more laws against `extremists,' against people who don't like the government, against people who don't think the way we tell them to think, this wouldn't have happened." They'll try to stampede a timid, frightened, confused public into allowing the government to take away even more of their rights in return for the false promise of more security.

Our task is to halt that stampede by helping people understand who America's real enemies are, by helping them understand the underlying causes of terrorism, and by encouraging them to stand together in a united front against government terrorism. We must begin laying the groundwork for an America in which there is no terrorism.

Non-White Immigration:
Death Sentence for America

TODAY WE'LL TAKE A LOOK into the future -- a look into what the future will be like if we all remain spectators and simply let the present course of events continue.

And we'll also look at what the future could be if we choose to become participants in the historical process instead of merely remaining spectators.

I will tailor these two visions of the future especially for those of us who live in North America -- but in broad outline they will be recognizable by all of us, no matter what part of the White world we live in.

First, let's look at the future we will have if we continue behaving just as we are now: if we continue watching TV, paying our taxes, and letting the politicians and the controlled media run the country.

Consider demographics, for example: the relative numbers of the different types of people in America. During the 50 years since the Second World War, America has been darkening, has been getting less and less White. Immigration from Europe was cut off after the war -- except for Jews, of course -- and the floodgates from the non-White world were opened. Asians and mestizos have been pouring into the country, both legally and illegally.

Most of these non-White races breed much faster than Whites do. The result has been a steady rise in the percentage of non-White minorities in America. If you live on a farm in Kansas or the Dakotas you may not have noticed the change. If you live in Florida or California or New York, however, you certainly have noticed it. In fact, most of our people who live in America's larger cities have had their faces rubbed in it.

If things continue as they are going now, there is no chance at all that this situation will become better. Non-White immigrants will continue pouring into America, because no matter how bad things get here, conditions will be even worse where these immigrants came from. The government will not even try to halt the illegal part of this non-White flood, because the government doesn't really want it halted. And the non-Whites already here will continue to have more children than the Whites. At some time in the next century Whites will become a minority in North America. And the flood will continue.

And the television propaganda telling us that the flood of non-Whites really is a good thing will continue too. The politicians will continue to sing the praises of "diversity" and "multiculturalism," in tune with the television. We will be told that if we object to the flood we are "haters" and "racists." Interracial sex will continue to be presented as fashionable by the media. And what was a White country 50 years ago will gradually become a Brown country.

Of course, even a hundred years from now there may be a few super-rich White families who will be able to keep their heads above the flood on their own private islands, with their private security forces, but for the rest of us there will be no White schools, no White neighborhoods, no White clubs or bars or restaurants. We will be submerged: that is, our grandchildren will be submerged. That's the way it has been planned, and that is the way it will happen -- not may happen, but will happen -- if we don't interfere: if we just keep watching TV, paying our taxes, and voting for the Democrats or the Republicans.

Right now I can almost hear the hoots and groans from a million or so Politically Correct idiots. "What difference does it make whether America is White or Brown?" they are saying. "What difference does it make what color our grandchildren are? Color is only skin deep. After all, we're all the same; we're all equal." Or, if they're onto the very latest Politically Correct fad, they are saying, "There really is no such thing as race. Scientists have proved that race is just an illusion created by racists to keep us all apart."

Really, there is no fad too foolish or too perverse, no opinion too contrary to the facts, for these Politically Correct lemmings to adopt, once it has been declared fashionable by the controlled media. But certainly the lemmings will have their way -- if the rest of us do nothing.

Or consider crime. The lemmings would have us believe that crime is the result of "oppression" and "injustice" by heterosexual White males, and that it will disappear as soon as we have a society where no one is "discriminated against" and where all of the officially favored minorities are given everything they want. I don't think that even the lemmings really believe that, but that's what the television has taught them to say, and so that's what they say.

You and I, on the other hand, understand that as we have given the minorities more and more handouts, as we have given them every sort of advantage over ourselves -- all sorts of affirmative action preferences in admissions to universities and professional schools, in the granting of financial aid, in hiring and promotions -- crime has become worse and worse. Passing laws requiring us to favor them and prohibiting us from discriminating against them in any way has made their behavior steadily worse -- not better.

It used to be that nearly all crimes committed by Blacks were against other Blacks. They knew that if they attacked a White person they would be severely punished, and besides, segregation kept them pretty much among themselves and didn't give them many opportunities for mischief. Now we've taught them that they don't have to fear us or respect us. The controlled media have persuaded them that we have oppressed and persecuted them and that whatever they do to us serves us right.

You know and I know that the crime situation can only become worse in the future, if for no other reason than that the number of Blacks and other minorities will continue growing. We have only to look to the continent of Africa in order to see our own future. Before Europeans came to Africa, the Blacks there were eating each other, literally, just like the other animals. We outlawed cannibalism among the Blacks, and for more than 300 years we tried to teach them the ways of civilization.

Then after the Second World War, in a spasm of lunatic egalitarianism, we turned our colonies in Africa over to the indigenous Blacks and left them to their own devices: no oppression, no persecution, every advantage for success.

And what happened? The Blacks reverted to their jungle behavior almost as soon as we had left. Even in South Africa, which until very recently was a civilized, White country, the jungle is reasserting itself. The financial capital, Johannesburg, which a couple of years ago was as safe and clean as any city in Europe, has become so crime-ridden since the handing over of the country to Black rule that its streets are now among the most dangerous in the world, with armed Black gangs prowling in search of prey by day as well as by night. It may be another 30 or 40 years before conditions in South Africa resemble those in Rwanda or Uganda, but that's exactly where they're headed.

And it may take more than 100 years for America to get there, but that's where we're headed too. There is a fundamental law of Nature which also applies to the historical process. It is the law of entropy. It tells us that if we have a highly developed civilization in one part of the world and a jungle society in another part of the world, and we place those two societies in contact and let the inhabitants of the jungle society take a hand in the running of things, the civilization which used to be highly developed will soon take on the characteristics of the jungle society. Ordered societies become disordered, except where the genius for order remains in firm control. The tendency is always toward decay, toward dissolution, toward chaos and ruin -- except in those rare instances where the vital spark is able to assert itself. When that spark is quenched or overwhelmed, decay inevitably sets in.

The vital spark I'm talking about, the genius for order, the spirit of progress which built our civilization, is European. Of course, Europeans aren't the only race with a vital spark. Every people has its own variety of organizational genius. The Japanese have theirs, the Chinese have theirs, and so on. Actually, every form of life has a peculiar genius for organizing the non-living matter in its environment into living matter. That's true of worms and viruses, of fish and horses. In each case, however, the genius takes a unique form, the spark burns with a different brightness. In Black Africa the spark of civilization always has been very, very dim. Among our people it has been very bright. Our government now, however, under the influence of the controlled mass media, is pursuing policies which are guaranteed to extinguish our spark, policies which are guaranteed to bring our level of civilization down to that in Rwanda or Haiti -- not next year, or even in the next decade, but eventually.

Haiti is a good example of the law of entropy. In the 18th century Haiti was the jewel among the European colonies in the New World. It was clean and green and prosperous. It was civilized. It had an efficient government, thriving industry and commerce, and law and order. It was a French island, a European island. Then came the egalitarian lunacy, the sheer democratic madness, of the French Revolution, which declared Black slaves and White masters equal. The consequence of this was that the French with foresight left Haiti, and the Blacks, having been persuaded that they were just as capable as Frenchmen, massacred the rest, hoping to have Haiti's riches entirely for themselves. What happened instead, of course, was that Haiti's civilization declined within a few years from the European level to the African level, and it has remained there ever since, despite the fact that the United States Marines went in and rebuilt Haiti's entire physical

infrastructure and reorganized its political system earlier in this century. As soon as the White Marines left, in 1934, the Black genius for crime, squalor, and disorder asserted itself again. So that's our future, if we just sit back and watch: more and more non-Whites, more and more crime and filth and disorder, and eventually, a century or two from now, another Haiti on the mainland.

But we don't have to just sit back and watch. We know how to avoid that dismal path of decay and ruin. We know how to solve every problem necessary to get us back onto the upward path again.

Consider illegal immigration, for example, which is responsible for so much of the darkening of America. The government and the controlled media pretend that illegal immigration is an insoluble problem. They show us on television all the holes which Mexicans have cut in the border fence, they show us groups of Mexicans wading across the Rio Grande, they show us Mexicans climbing over the fence and running through the traffic in San Diego to evade our Border Patrol, and they wring their hands and tell us that it's just impossible to stop illegal immigration. The government says it's assigning another 100 Border Patrol agents in one place and it's building a stronger fence in another place, but then the Mexicans just come across some other part of the border. The government acts like it just doesn't know what to do, that it's just too big a problem, that it would take too much money to solve.

But really, that's all just a game calculated to fool the American people. The government knows perfectly well how to stop illegal immigration, but it doesn't want to stop it. The government just wants to make us believe that it's trying its best. But, you know, any of you listeners who've had any military experience understand that illegal immigration can be stopped easily, quickly, and permanently. Even I, who've never been in the Army, can guarantee you that if I were in charge of the border between the United States and Mexico I could completely halt illegal immigration within 24 hours, and I could keep it completely halted with far less expense than that now required to operate our Border Patrol. All I would do is authorize Border Patrol agents to shoot anyone attempting to cross the border illegally. Two or three shootings in the first night, in each sector of the border where crossings are frequent, and the word would be out: "Don't try to cross the border, unless you want to die."After that, I would spend a couple of months erecting a simple fence from San Diego, California, to Brownsville, Texas. I'd erect it in two rows 100 feet apart, with mines and electronic sensors planted between the rows. I'd have jeep patrols along our side of the fence, patrolling at unpredictable times, but with never more than an hour between patrols, and I'd have helicopters patrolling above. I'd do it all with a permanent Border Patrol force along the Mexican border of 5,000 men, and no illegal immigrants would get through. None.

The lemmings, of course, would be screaming that I am bloodthirsty, that I am a murderer, and so on, but really, fewer Mexicans would have to be shot trying to come across the border that first night than law-abiding Americans are now being murdered each year by illegal-alien criminals in California and Texas.

I guess we all tend to be a bit selective in our sympathies. I have sympathy for my own people, for the victims of Mexican criminals, and the lemmings have sympathy for the criminals. They're

Politically Correct, and I'm Politically Incorrect. But I would stop illegal immigration, painlessly and cleanly, and they prefer to believe that it can't be done.

The problem of the illegal aliens already in America also can be solved. So can the race problem. These problems are more difficult and will require a much larger effort than the problem of illegal immigration, but the cost of solving them now is infinitesimal compared to the long-term cost of failing to solve them. All we need to solve these problems is the will to survive as a people, the will to build the basis for a progressive future for our kind, the will to avoid ending up like Haiti or Rwanda a couple of centuries hence.

Of course, we all know that one thing couch potatoes don't have is will. People who've been raised on television, who've grown up with a spectator's attitude toward the world around them, certainly aren't going to stir themselves just to ensure a future for their grandchildren. Instead, they're just going to reach for the potato chips and keep on watching. Spectators don't count. The people who do count are in two relatively small groups. In one group are you and I and the others who care enough about the future of our people to do something about it: in fact, to do whatever it takes.

In the other group are the people who control the mass media, plus their collaborators in the government, in the mainstream churches, in the universities, in finance and industry, and in the other institutions of our society.

You know who controls the mass media. Many of you also know why they don't want the problem of illegal immigration and the other problems threatening our future to be solved. They are Jews, and throughout their whole history they have lived by two principles: first, always be loyal to your fellow Jews; and second, always remember that anyone who is not a Jew is your enemy; never forget and never forgive.

Their collaborators in the government and other institutions are individuals who have no sense of loyalty to our people and who have a vested interest in following the lead of the Jews. Some of them are office holders who understand that they hold their offices at the pleasure of those who control the mass media, those who control public opinion, those who control votes. Most of these collaborators have no sense of responsibility to anyone but themselves.

Typical of these is a man who is a friend of an acquaintance of mine; he is an assistant district attorney in New York City, a man who understands what's going on but who doesn't really care. When challenged to take a stand for his own people, he said: "Look. Everyone around here knows that the Jews are running the government. It's too bad, but there's nothing we can do about it. I've got to look out for myself. I have a career and a family to think about. If I want to get ahead, I have to collaborate."

Unfortunately, there are many, many others among our people who have no more sense of personal honor or responsibility than this New York City assistant prosecutor. It is a great shame for us. We really need to purge ourselves of this shame some day.

Meanwhile, we can take some comfort in the knowledge that such people, who have no loyalty to anyone but themselves, are always ready to switch sides as soon as they see the tide turning. The tide is not yet turning -- at least, not enough for people like that assistant district attorney in New York to notice. The swarm of Brown immigrants from Mexico is still growing from week to week, and our government is still making only the most transparent pretense of trying to stop them. The couch potatoes are as passive as ever, and the Politically Correct lemmings are as idiotic as ever.

Changes are beginning to take place, however.

Our weekly radio programs are reaching more and more people. People who hear us telling the truth are emboldened to tell the truth themselves.

The ripples of truth are spreading. Soon those ripples will become waves. And one day the storm will break loose over this land.

Disney and the Jews:
Eisner and His Kind Must Stop Harming Our Children

We've spoken about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media before, but it's a matter of such urgency that we need to talk about it again and again. **It is absolutely essential for us to understand who controls our mass media and how they use their control to undermine America.**

Very recently a major rearrangement in the media world took place when the Walt Disney company paid $19 billion to take control of Capital Cities/ABC, the company that owns the ABC television network. That makes the Disney company the biggest of the media conglomerates. And it makes the man who controls Disney, Michael Eisner, the most powerful media boss in the world.

What does this mean for the future of our people? Should we be concerned that the company which brought us Mickey Mouse, Donald Duck, and Snow White will in the future be playing a much bigger role in forming the opinions of American television viewers and setting the moral and cultural standards of our nation?

I'll answer that question: Yes, we certainly should be concerned, because the Walt Disney company is not what it used to be. It has been transformed from a wholesome producer of children's entertainment into a malign instrument of subversion, whose purpose is to weaken and destroy our people.

To understand how this happened, let's go back to the beginning. Walt Disney was born in 1901 in a working-class, Midwestern American family. He spent his early years on the family farm in Missouri. As a teenager he helped support his family by delivering newspapers. He later attributed his ability to overcome obstacles and achieve success to the work discipline that he developed as a boy with the newspaper route.

Although young Walt came from a typical American background, with no advantages or privileges, he was a person of exceptional talent and drive. He felt a strong artistic urge while he was still in grade school, and he took a correspondence course in drawing. He continued to develop his drawing skills in high school as a cartoonist for his school paper. He dropped out of school at 16 and served in the First World War. After the war, instead of finishing high school, he and another young artist began experimenting with animated films in a tiny studio of their own in Kansas City. Using very primitive equipment, they made short, animated cartoons based on fairy tales. They tried to market their films through a New York film distributor, but the New Yorker took advantage of the struggling, young filmmakers: he stole their work and left them destitute.

In 1922, at the ripe age of 20, Walt Disney decided to make a fresh start in Hollywood. He sold his camera to raise enough money to make the trip to California. There he enlisted the support of his brother Roy as a business manager, and he persuaded his fellow artist in Kansas City to come join him. With Walt's drive and determination, they opened a new film studio. They invented a film character they called Oswald the Rabbit, and a series of animated cartoons featuring Oswald enabled the small studio to gain a foothold in the film business.

Later, when sound films were introduced in 1927, Walt invented Mickey Mouse. Walt himself provided Mickey's voice. Mickey Mouse was an enormous success and helped Walt Disney Productions prosper and grow.

Over the years Walt Disney's fertile imagination gave us Donald Duck, Goofy and Pluto, Dumbo the elephant, and a score of other animal characters which have fascinated children all over the world for more than 60 years. In 1937 Disney produced his great masterpiece, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs.* This beautifully animated fairy tale appealed to adults as well as to children. Like many fairy tales its roots lie deep in the racial consciousness of our people.

After *Snow White* came *Pinnochio, Fantasia,* and *Bambi.* Walt Disney Productions became a major power in the American film industry. And it was unique, in that it was the only major film producer in Hollywood not owned or controlled by Jews. The fact that Walt Disney was not a Jew caused problems for him, however. He was surrounded by Jews who resented his influence on American culture. A whispering campaign was organized against him. Stories were spread that he was a fascist. He began having labor problems.

The real problem, of course, was that Walt Disney's vision of the world, as reflected in the films he produced, was wholly different from that of the Jewish film producers around him. As long as Walt was making Mickey Mouse or Donald Duck cartoons, this problem could be overlooked. When he began animating feature-length fairy tales like *Snow White* and *Cinderella,* the Jews in Hollywood became increasingly nervous. The world of *Snow White* was an entirely White world, a European world. It stirred racial memories in White Americans, and the aim of the Jewish media bosses then as now was to make White Americans forget their roots. They wanted to begin promoting multiculturalism as soon as the Second World War was over, and Walt was in their way. They couldn't push racial mixing in their films and have someone as popular as Walt Disney refuse to go along: the contrast would be obvious to the public. Even Disney's extremely popular Nature films were resented by the rest of Hollywood. Films which promoted a love for animals and the natural world were viewed with suspicion by men whose view of life was entirely economic and urban.

These may seem like subtle differences, and in fact most people outside of Hollywood were oblivious to the ideological and cultural conflict between Walt Disney and the other film producers. The closest that the conflict came to attracting public attention was during the 1940s and early 1950s, when Walt Disney's total lack of sympathy for Communism and his refusal to let Communist propaganda be introduced into any of his productions set him apart from the rest of Hollywood. While Walt was alive, however, there wasn't much that Hollywood could do about him. He was too popular with the American people.

After Walt died in 1966, however, the situation changed. His company had depended on his genius for its prosperity, and without him it had a difficult time keeping up with the competition. After Disney company profits had declined for several years, Jewish corporate raiders Saul Steinberg and Irwin Jacobs moved in for the kill. In 1984, after Steinberg had milked the company of $32 million, Disney family shareholders were too weak to resist a takeover by Michael Eisner, the Jewish boss of Paramount Pictures. Eisner in turn brought in as his second in command another Jew, Jeffrey Katzenberg. The company that Walt Disney built -- the company that gave us *Snow White* and *Fantasia* -- has been in Jewish hands ever since.

During his first day as chairman of the Disney company -- his first day, believe it or not -- Eisner ordered the production of an R-rated film, about the kinky sexual misadventures of a typically neurotic Jewish family in the Los Angeles area. This was the first R-rated film ever produced by the Disney company -- but certainly not the last.

Now, no one who knows me considers me a prude. I believe that there's a place for adult films. I also believe that there should be a place for childhood innocence and childhood fantasy and childhood imagination: that is, a place for the sort of films which Walt Disney used to produce. And there ought to be a place in America for a company which produces such films. There ought to be a place for a film maker with an artistic vision and artistic talent instead of merely the craving for profit.

Actually, what Michael Eisner has done to the Disney company is far worse than cutting the soul out of it. He has transformed it into another instrument in the Jewish campaign to multiculturalize America. He has made it into a spiritually destructive propaganda instrument aimed at our children.

There are no better examples of this than a couple of recent children's films produced by the Disney company under Eisner: *The Jungle Book* and *Pocahontas.* Actually, in 1967, the year after Walt Disney's death, the original Disney company made an animated film based on Kipling's Jungle Book stories of India. It was a film in the Disney tradition, made to entertain children and not to brainwash them. Last year Mr. Eisner produced a new, Politically Correct version of The Jungle Book. The new version, which uses live characters instead of animation, promotes interracial sex. In Mr. Eisner's version, White males are portrayed as contemptible, cowardly, inept, and disloyal. The White heroine rejects her British-officer fiancee,, and lets herself be wooed and won by an Indian jungle boy, played by a Chinese actor. And, of course, it bears no resemblance at all to anything written by Rudyard Kipling. I hardly need comment on the film *Pocahontas,* which has received so much publicity recently, except to say that its message is the same as that of Eisner 's version of *The Jungle Book:* namely, that racial mixing is A-OK, that there's absolutely no reason why a White man should not marry an Indian woman or why a White woman should not have an affair with a Chinaman.

It took Mr. Eisner ten years to drag the Disney company down to the *Pocahontas* level. He is a careful man. He knows that there is a lot at stake. He certainly doesn't want to move too fast and cause a negative reaction from the American public. He didn't want to alert the American public to his intentions ten years ago. So he started with R-rated sex films and gradually moved to films which tell White children that miscegenation is fine and noble, and that non-Whites really have

much more character than Whites. But I believe that Mr. Eisner had this outcome clearly in his mind from the first day that he took over the Disney company and began degrading it.

And now Mr. Eisner will have the ABC television network under his control too. I don't expect that to change the party line at ABC very much. ABC, like the other TV networks, has been pretty solidly Jewish from the beginning. It was headed by Jewish media boss Leonard Goldenson for more than 30 years. The fact that Capital Cities Communications, whose chairman is Thomas Murphy, a Gentile, merged with Goldenson's ABC ten years ago didn't really have much influence on programming. Goldenson's people remained in the policy-making positions. Eisner's buyout of ABC just consolidates things in Jewish hands a bit. It takes Murphy out of the picture and makes it easier for ABC to become even more Politically Correct than it was. It means that we will be seeing programs on the ABC television network promoting miscegenation and undermining White self-confidence a little more frequently than before. It speeds up the schedule a bit for introducing even more destructive propaganda than before. It means that our children will be subjected to somewhat more intense brainwashing than before.

The situation with the rest of the mass media of news and entertainment isn't really different, of course. Just as Jews took over Hollywood in the 1930s, they also took over the other media, and today they have such an overwhelming influence that even those who are not Jews go along with their policies in order to get along.

Often when I point out this fact of Jewish media control to persons who are Politically Correct, they will respond by saying that it makes no difference who controls the media. Why does it bother me that Jews run Hollywood, they ask in a sneering, condescending tone. I know that people who respond in this way aren't being honest. They would certainly think it made a difference if I controlled the media, for example. And actually I'd be concerned if any group with an agenda of its own had control of the media. I'd be concerned if all of the media were in the hands of Southern Baptists, for example, or radical vegetarians.

I am especially concerned about the Jewish control of the media, however, for two reasons. First, the people who control the media also control the political process in America: they control, in effect, the policies of our government and the course taken by our society. That's because the politicians, whether they're Democrats or Republicans, will not stand up to the Jews. Instead they grovel at the Jews' feet. Every politician knows that he must be portrayed favorably by the media if he is to be elected, and every politician knows who controls the media.

The second reason why Jewish control of the media is such a disaster for us is based in the unique nature of the Jews. If Baptists controlled the media perhaps they'd persuade the government to have a law against making love on Sunday. If radical vegetarians controlled the media, we might have to eat soyburgers instead of hamburgers.

But we can survive those things. We might not be happy, but we could survive: our people could survive. Neither the Baptists nor the vegetarians would be trying to corrupt us spiritually or to destroy our race.

But corrupt and destroy are exactly what Mr. Eisner is doing. That's the purpose of films like *The Jungle Book* and *Pocahontas*. They are aimed, first, at the spiritual corruption of our children and, ultimately, at the destruction of our people.

I know that statement sounds extreme to some people who are not familiar with the facts of Jewish media control. They think that two recent children's films from the Walt Disney company which promote racial mixing aren't enough evidence to condemn all of the people who control our news and entertainment media. And I must agree. One needs much more evidence than that. But the evidence is there, for anyone who is not afraid to look at it, for anyone who is not so determined to be Politically Correct that he refuses to see it.

For example, consider what has happened to the popular music industry in recent years. It's not just the "gangsta rap" that we've heard a few Republican politicians complaining about because the media people who've been pushing "gangsta rap" moved a little too fast and caused a negative reaction from the American people. It's the whole trend of popular music away from traditional White forms and toward non-White forms. I don't have to tell you who controls the popular music industry in America, but I will anyway. In particular, the biggest music companies promoting Black "rap" music among White children -- companies like Time Warner and MTV -- are solidly Jewish. A Jew named Gerald Levin is to Time Warner what Michael Eisner is to Disney. And MTV is owned by Sumner Redstone, another Jew, through his Viacom Corporation. These three companies that I've just mentioned -- Disney, Viacom, and Time Warner -- are America's three biggest producers of mass entertainment -- they're number one, number two, and number three, respectively -- and they're all controlled by Jews. Is that just a coincidence? Think about it!

I could spend the next hour talking about the genealogy of the biggest media bosses. What you really need to do to be convinced, however, is to study the matter for yourself. I'll be happy to send you enough facts to get you started. Just write to me.

The idea I want to leave you with today is this: In this era in which the mass media have such a powerful influence over our people's ideas and attitudes and values, it is essential that we take the control of those media away from a group which is utterly alien to us. It's a group whose primary aim is to deaden our sense of identity and kill any sense of racial consciousness among us, so that we will not be able to resist the poisonous doctrines which they're promoting. These doctrines are multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism and egalitarianism -- and, of course, "diversity" -- all of the racially destructive "isms" of Political Correctness.

In this era when the single most important influence on the development of a child's self-image is television entertainment, it is essential that people like Michael Eisner and Sumner Redstone not be the ones setting the tone for that entertainment.

We all know that America has lost its sense of purpose and is drifting. We all know that American society is coming apart. We all know that our traditional values, our traditional life-style, our traditional heroes and role models have been disparaged and ridiculed by the controlled media. We all know that the idea of White racial guilt, the idea of deferring to minorities, the idea that we should tolerate perversion and accept it as "normal" -- all of these ideas have been

pushed by the mass media. Alienation and delinquency among our young people are increasing. The traditional American family is in serious decline. Racial intermarriage is on the rise. Non-White immigrants are pouring across our borders, and no serious effort is being made to stop them. Our political system has become hopelessly corrupt.

The only way that we can even begin to cure this illness is to regain complete control of our mass media. Our media must be used to give our people a sense of identity; a sense of racial community; a sense of kinship, of belonging; a sense of racial and national purpose. We must take control away from the people who are using the media now to confuse and alienate and mislead us. Only when our own people are setting the standards for the media, only when our own people are deciding what attitudes and values should be taught to our children, can we become strong and healthy again -- and that means breaking the Jewish control of the media. Let me hear from you on this most important of all the issues facing our people.

The End of Justice in America
Lessons of the Simpson Trial

SOMETHING VERY IMPORTANT, very significant, happened recently in Los Angeles. I didn't want to comment on it right away, when there was a lot of public excitement about it. But I've waited long enough, I believe, for the initial shock of this event to wear off, and so now we should be able to consider the matter calmly and rationally.

To get immediately to the point, the significance of the O.J. Simpson verdict is that the whole nation, from the empty-headed, trendy viewers of soap operas and football games all the way up to the serious, thoughtful men and women who have a deep concern for the future of our people -- all of us have had an impressive demonstration of the fact that our justice system simply does not work. It has broken down. It no longer deserves our respect or our trust.

And what is a country without a system of justice?

A country which is not ruled by a sound system of justice either will be ruled by tyranny, or it will descend into chaos and anarchy. In America we can see both of these tendencies at the same time: more and more chaos and anarchy in our cities and in the conduct of public affairs, and more and more tyranny by a government trying to keep a grip on things.

I do not mean to say that the Simpson acquittal represented any sudden change in the American justice system. It has been true for decades, for example, that in America's courts a defendant got just as much justice as he could afford to buy. It also is true that the decisions of juries have become more and more capricious in recent years, with the obviously guilty turned loose and the obviously innocent convicted. Terrible miscarriages of justice are happening more and more frequently. It is often the case that Political Correctness is more important in determining the outcome of a trial than any considerations of justice.

Let me tell you about just one such case with which I am familiar. In May 1991 a young White man, George Loeb, and his wife drove into a supermarket parking lot in Jacksonville, Florida, to buy groceries. As they entered the parking lot a car driven by a Black male almost struck their car. The two drivers exchanged angry insults, with the Black calling Mr. Loeb a **cracker** and a **honkie.** Then the Black drove off, and the Loebs did their shopping. They had bought their groceries, were back in their car, and were ready to go home when the Black returned -- this time with another Black male and a brick. The Black got out of his car and advanced toward the Loebs' car with the brick in his hand. He announced loudly to Loeb, **I'm gonna smash your motherf--ing head in.**

As the Black approached, Loeb responded by tearing open the glove compartment of his car, seizing a pistol his wife kept there for her protection, and firing two shots at the Black, killing him. Loeb was arrested and put on trial. At the trial both the defense witnesses and the prosecution witnesses recounted nearly the same sequence of events. The prosecution witnesses -- the slain Black's friend and a White woman who had been in the parking lot -- both admitted

that the slain Black had threatened to smash Mr. Loeb's head with the brick he carried. They claimed, however, that he had dropped his brick just before he was shot, whereas the defense witnesses said that he still had the brick in his hand when he was struck by the bullets.

The key to the outcome of the trial, however, was the charge made against Mr. Loeb by the Jewish prosecutor that he was a **White racist.** The prosecutor introduced into evidence books and personal letters seized in the Loebs' residence, indicating that Mr. Loeb strongly disliked Blacks and believed that they should be sent back to Africa. Mr. Loeb was then convicted of premeditated murder and sentenced to life in prison.

Does that sound incredible? A conviction for premeditated murder, when the shooting clearly was neither murder nor premeditated but instead was an act of self-defense? Life in prison for a family man, a university graduate with a stable marriage who had never been in trouble with the law and was merely defending himself and his wife against an armed attacker? Does that sound like American justice?

I must admit that when I first heard the story about George Loeb's conviction, I didn't believe it either. I thought that I was hearing a biased, exaggerated account of what had happened, that surely Mr. Loeb had done something which justified his conviction and the sentence which was imposed on him. So I obtained a videotape of the trial and viewed it for myself. You can do the same if you want. The complete video record of the trial -- which, by the way, lasted only 30 hours, because, unlike O.J. Simpson, that's all the justice Mr. Loeb could afford to buy -- the complete video record is available from the Courtroom Television Network, 600 Third Avenue, in New York City. It is an astounding record -- and horrifying -- and terribly depressing.

Before I saw that video I didn't believe something like that could happen in the United States. I spoke about it with friends who are lawyers, however, and they told me that it happens all the time.

The difference between the George Loeb trial and the O.J. Simpson trial -- besides the fact that the former is a middle-class White man who always has obeyed the law, and the latter is a multimillionaire Black sports star who buys his way out of his criminal problems -- the difference is that nobody knew about the Loeb trial, and so no one could be shocked by it, while everyone knows about the Simpson trial. The corruption of the justice system exemplified by the Loeb trial remained hidden, while the corruption exemplified by the Simpson trial has been seen by the whole world. That's the important difference.

We not only have seen it: we have had our faces rubbed in it for more than a year. We cannot ignore it or pretend that it doesn't exist. And this is very important, not just because it has shocked us: it is important because when people lose their faith in the system of justice, when they realize that they cannot count on that system to function fairly and rationally, when they see innocent people destroyed by that system and guilty people turned loose, when they realize that the system not only is capricious but that it has been corrupted by Political Correctness and is biased against people like themselves, then those people will withdraw their support from the government of which that failed justice system is a part.

People will put up with a great deal of inefficiency and mismanagement from a government, so long as they believe that there is a justice system which functions fairly and effectively, a justice system which punishes criminals and protects the innocent from government persecution. But when they no longer believe that, they will turn against the government. That's what our forefathers did 220 years ago, when they realized that they no longer could count on justice from the government of Great Britain.

And this recognition of what has happened to the justice system in America is long overdue, especially on the part of middle-class White conservatives. These conservatives want desperately to have faith in the system. They want to believe that if they continue saving money to send their children off to a good university, then their grandchildren will be able to grow up in an orderly and just world, a world in which there will be a place for them. They want to believe that somehow the growing problems in our society will be repaired, and that everything will work out all right.

But things won't work out all right by themselves. The problems won't get fixed up. Instead, things will continue getting worse. It's not just that the American justice system has developed a few flaws which need to be fixed; the problem is that the system is no longer American. We used to have a justice system rooted in Anglo-Saxon common law, rooted in the traditions of our ancestors in Europe. That was an American system. What we have now is the result of 50 years of forced multiculturalism. It's a system which is completely alien to us.

Just look at the Simpson trial itself, completely aside from the unjust verdict: the trial, up to the time the case went to the jury, certainly wasn't anything that a White American could be proud of. It was hardly even a trial; it was a multicultural circus, a long-running soap opera made for television.

It was a paradigm of multiculturalism and trendiness: We had a Japanese judge married to a White woman who is a police captain. We had a prosecution team consisting of a Black male and a Jewess currently being divorced by a White man. We had a defense team which, with the exception of F. Lee Bailey, was entirely Jewish and Black. We had a Black defendant who likes to run with White women -- and beat them up. We had one Jewish murder victim and one White female victim who had been raised by her liberal parents to couple with Blacks. We had a racially mixed but mostly Black jury. And the whole thing seems to have been run more for the benefit of the television networks than for the sake of justice.

Can any White person seeking justice in the courts or accused of a crime by the government have faith that justice will be done for him in such a circus setting?

I think not.

Can the public realistically hope to be protected from murderers and other criminals -- especially if those criminals are rich and Black -- by such a system?

I think not.

Imagine that you have to walk into such a courtroom as a defendant. Imagine that you are charged by the government with being Politically Incorrect -- with, say, failing to rent an apartment to a pair of homosexuals or to hire someone with AIDS -- or, perhaps, daring to defend yourself against an armed Black assailant. Do you believe that you'll get a fair trial?

I think you'll agree with me that you almost certainly will not.

How did this happen to our justice system?

The sad truth is that we let it happen. Remember, it didn't happen overnight. The O. J. Simpson verdict may have burst upon the consciousness of the public like a thunderbolt, but the subversion and wrecking of our American justice system have been going on quietly for decades. And we didn't oppose it. Some of us wanted to be trendy and fashionable, and so we went along with the multiculturalism. Some of us were cowards. We knew what was happening was wrong, but we were afraid to say so: we were afraid of being called **racists** and **anti-Semites.** And many of us were just indifferent to what was happening: we were too selfish to get involved. And so we let America's enemies destroy our justice system. We let them destroy the only shield we had against governmental tyranny on the one hand and mob rule on the other hand: our only shield -- and now it's gone.

We didn't stand up for our honest, decent White policemen, for our racially conscious White policemen like Detective Mark Fuhrman, who, God bless him, fought the multicultural terror and anarchy in the streets in the only way he knew, without any support from the politicians and the bureaucrats. He may have been a little rough in his methods sometimes, but he knew the nature of the beast he was fighting. He knew that if we don't destroy it, it surely will destroy us.

We let the politicians and the bureaucrats follow the lead of the controlled media and weed out the racially conscious White policemen and replace them with Politically Correct trendies, who collaborate with the multicultural terrorists instead of fighting them. The same thing has happened in the courts that has happened in the police departments around the country. The honest, no-nonsense judges have been replaced by media-conscious trendies like Lance Ito.

During her closing argument the Jewish prosecutor in the Simpson trial, Marcia Clark, said that we all wish that there were no one like Mark Fuhrman on this planet. Do you remember that? When I heard her say that, it really infuriated me. I suspect that many of you who also heard her say that thought at the time, as I did, that, no, we are happy to share this planet with Detective Mark Fuhrman. Instead, we will welcome the day when there are no longer any Marcia Clarks, or people of her type, on this planet.

So how will we reach that day? How will we oppose the multiculturalists who have destroyed our justice system -- and much else in our country? How will we fight them? How will we reclaim this planet for our people? How will we take it away from her people and undo the damage they've done?

Ultimately, we'll have to fight them the same way our forefathers fought King George. But we have much fighting of another kind to do before then. We have to wake up millions of our fellow

citizens who have been indifferent to what's been happening in this country for the past 50 years, and we have to pound some sense into their heads. Maybe we can't change the fact of their selfishness, but we can make them understand that it's their country which is being destroyed. It's their heritage and their future. And as for the millions who are too shortsighted to care about their future or their heritage, we must make them realize that the danger to them of a failed justice system is here and now, not just in the future. The O.J. Simpson trial was real. The George Loeb trial was real. I didn't invent them. The government did. The multiculturalists did. But we have to fight them.

It'll be a tough fight against the government and all of those Jewish television networks, but not an impossible fight. They have some fatal weaknesses. You know, they really didn't want O. J. Simpson back out on the street. They didn't want the insane verdict they got in that trial. It makes them look very foolish, very weak. But they couldn't help it. They couldn't control it. They've built a Frankenstein's monster: a destructive, uncontrollable monster. What they've built won't work, because it's unnatural, but they can't admit that, even to themselves. They think that they can take justice away from us, as they did in the George Loeb trial, and give us a big dose of egalitarianism and multiculturalism and **diversity** instead, and that everything will run smoothly. But without justice there can be no peace, no confidence in government, no social stability -- and ultimately no society at all.

What that means for us is that there will be more and more embarrassing failures for the multiculturalists, failures like the O.J. Simpson trial, which will expose the unnaturalness and the destructiveness of their policies for everyone to see. It's our job to help people see these things and understand their significance and place the blame where it belongs.

The government and the controlled media will fight back by trying to stop us from explaining these things to people. Any criticism of their policies they will call hate, and they will call for outlawing hate, for making any criticism of them or their policies illegal.

As our society continues to come apart because of these policies, they will claim that it is our exposure of the foolishness and destructiveness of their policies which is destroying our society, rather than the policies themselves.

As people become more frustrated and angry because of the destruction of their justice system, the government and the controlled media will claim that if only we could be prevented from talking about what has happened to the justice system, then the people would no longer be angry.

Do you remember that right after the tragedy in Oklahoma City this spring, Bill Clinton went on television and announced that the bombing was the fault of people who criticized the government? He said it wasn't the fault of his own Justice Department, which had murdered nearly 100 innocent people at Waco and then lied about what had happened, but instead it was the fault of people like me, who criticized the government for killing all of those innocent people. Do you remember that? He wanted to get us off the air, to shut us up, so that his so-called Justice Department could escape blame.

Let me tell you: the multiculturalists will not shut us up. They can pass all the repressive laws against free speech they want, but we will not be silent.

And you know, even if they could shut us up, even if the government locked us up under the so-called **hate speech** laws they're trying to get passed, the destructiveness and foolishness of multiculturalism would still be exposed by the government's own failures.

The colossal embarrassment of the Simpson trial may be a first, but it's not a last. The justice system has been thoroughly wrecked, and it will continue to be a threat both to innocent individuals like George Loeb, and to the general public, by turning people like O.J. Simpson loose. That can't be hidden. The Simpson trial gave everyone a nice, long look at the emperor's nakedness, and they will be much more alert than before to further revelations. And believe me, there will be more revelations.

"Hate Speech"

I'VE SPOKEN OFTEN with you about the Jewish monopoly control of our mass media of news and entertainment. Recently I detailed the takeover of the Disney company by Jews and its conversion into an instrument of brainwashing used against young Americans.

In addition to this consolidation of Jewish control over the media, there's another subversive campaign underway in this country which is just as dangerous for our future. It's the campaign to stifle any expression of opinion except those coming from the Jew-controlled mass media: the campaign to outlaw all dissident voices.

When I've mentioned this campaign in the past, some people have thought I was being an alarmist. They believe that freedom of speech is too deeply rooted in American soil to be done away with by a few extremists in the Clinton administration, or any administration. The American people won't tolerate having their freedom of speech taken away, they believe.

I wish that I could share their optimism. What makes it difficult for me to do so is the fact that there is a growing body of opinion in America that no one should have the right to do or say anything which offends someone else. The people who believe this are not only entrenched in the Clinton administration, they're entrenched in the Congress, in the universities, and in many other American institutions. These people will tell you with a straight face that the First Amendment was never meant to protect offensive speech -- or what they more often these days call -- **hate speech**. The Constitution doesn't give anyone the right to hurt someone else's feelings, they say. It doesn't give anyone the right to offend someone else. It doesn't give anyone the right to say unkind things about someone else, so that other people might be influenced by what is said and then in turn think or say unkind things themselves -- perhaps even do something unkind.

Actually, what these Politically Correct people really mean, although they won't tell you this -- what they really mean is that no one should be permitted to write or say anything which might offend one of the officially favored classes of people: homosexuals, morally or physically defective people, Jews, Blacks or members of other non-White racial groups, and women. They see nothing wrong with offending a White male, for example: they do it themselves all the time. But they do believe that it ought to be illegal to do or say something offensive to almost anyone else.

Let me tell you about something which happened last month in Ottawa. I'm reading from a news article in the August 5 issue of the **Toronto Sun**. It says:

'A female Ottawa dentist who wore a facemask, gloves, and gown while treating an HIV-positive patient is facing charges of discrimination by the Ontario Human Rights Commission. . . . Medical history revealed that the patient was HIV-positive and had a past drug dependency, according to an Ontario Dental Association report. Before treating the patient in the two and one half hour visit, the dentist discussed with the patient her preference to wear a disposable gown, gloves, facemask, and eye protection while treating the patient. Following completion of the

treatment the patient left without any negative comment about the care he received and booked for a six-month checkup.'

That's the first part of the **Toronto Sun** story. The dentist and the patient talked things over before the treatment began; the dentist then put on her disposable gown, gloves, and so on to protect herself from the blood and saliva of the AIDS-infected patient; and after the treatment the patient left with no complaint.

But then one of the Politically Correct watchdogs of the Human Rights Commission heard about it, and things changed in a hurry. The **Toronto Sun** article continues:

'Both the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the Royal College of Dental Surgeons say in a report that the dentist acted in a discriminatory manner when she wore a paper gown in addition to her barrier protection gear, based solely on the patient's HIV status.'

The news article went on to say that the dentist must not treat a patient with AIDS in any way differently from a healthy patient. If she doesn't wear a paper gown in treating healthy patients, then it is discriminatory to wear one when working on an AIDS-infected patient's teeth.

The article continues:

'The Ontario Human Rights Commission has threatened legal action against the dentist unless she complies with eight conditions, including paying the patient $8,000 to "compensate him for his mental anguish." '

Well, you say, that was Canada, not the United States.

Let me tell you, the people of Canada are not really very different from the people of the United States. What they will let their government get away with now, we'll let our government get away with in five or ten years. America already is swarming with Human Relations Councils and Human Rights Councils, whose business it is to sniff out cases of AIDS carriers who have had their feelings hurt by some insensitive person who refused to treat them as if they were healthy. And believe me, every one of these Human Rights Councils in the United States is just itching to have the judicial power to order people locked up who say or do anything they don't like.

I have another newspaper article in front of me, this one from the **Minneapolis-St Paul Star Tribune** for July 23. It describes a ruling issued by an official of the Minneapolis city government, warning city workers that henceforth they may be disciplined for what the official calls "visual harassment." By "visual harassment" the official means looking at any female who does not want to be looked at. A woman had complained to the official, he said, that it made her "uncomfortable" that members of city work crews had stared at her as she walked past them. The name of the official who decided that such looking would henceforth result in disciplinary action is, believe it or not, Carl Markus. Not Marx, just Markus.

Now that would just be funny, if it were an isolated case. But things just as ridiculous, just as Orwellian, are happening every day in America. The people who want to get rid of the First

Amendment -- and the rest of the Bill of Rights too -- the people who want to make it illegal to say or do anything which might offend an AIDS carrier or a feminist with a chip on her shoulder or whatever -- are probing, pushing, trying to see what they can get away with, trying to see how far they can go, how much the American people will tolerate. The two articles I've quoted from today I chose as examples because of the air of absurdity to them which makes them a little catchy, a little memorable. But I have a hundred more news articles from the past few months which in more prosaic terms describe the same sort of efforts to outlaw offensiveness, or "hate, as it's often called.

Perhaps I should say at this point that I understand what it means to be offended and to have one's feelings hurt. I've worn glasses since I was five years old, and it used to hurt my feelings when some of my school classmates would call me "four eyes." I used to do pretty well in my school work too, and as a result occasionally one of the kids who didn't do so well would refer to me sneeringly as "Einstein." That really made me feel uncomfortable.

And I'm sure it's uncomfortable for a person who's overweight to hear herself called "fatso." I'm sure it makes a retarded person feel bad to be told he's stupid. I'm sure that a person who's not attractive doesn't like to be reminded of that fact.

But, you know, that's life. We all put up with a lot of things we don't like. We try to make the best of it. If we're fat and we don't like being called fatso, we try to lose some weight. If we're nearsighted and have to wear glasses, perhaps we can switch to contact lenses -- or take karate lessons and punch out anybody who calls us "four eyes."

There's really something seriously wrong with the people who believe that it should be illegal to hurt a homosexual's feelings, or to stare at a pretty girl -- or to call a person who wears glasses "four eyes," for that matter. Some of these people clearly believe that it's more important for us all to be able to feel good about ourselves all the time than it is for us to be free.

And some of these people are simply using the "feel good" faction to push their own agenda, which is to make it impossible for the few people who have figured out what they're up to tell the rest of the people. They want to make it illegal to tell people about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media, for example. They want to make it illegal for this program to be on the air. They call this program "hate radio," because it is offensive to them.

What makes me worry so much is that the "feel good" faction is growing. There's something unhealthy about life in America today, and it's making more and more people really believe that they have a right not to be offended or have their feelings hurt, and that that supposed right is more important than the right to free speech. And the folks who are taking advantage of this sickness by pushing the idea that offensive speech or hate speech ought to be outlawed are becoming more pushy in their efforts.

Back in 1978 I wrote a novel which I called **The Turner Diaries**. It's a novel about life in the United States as I imagined it might be in the 1990s, if some of the trends I could see in the 1970s continued for another 20 years. I imagined that the government would become more repressive, and it has. I imagined that most of the people would react in a sheeplike way to

government repression and would not complain as long as they could still be comfortable and feel good, and that's the way it's turned out. And I imagined that a few people would not react like sheep, but instead would fight back violently -- and a few have. In writing my novel, I really tried to be realistic, and to speak my mind completely. I didn't rewrite any part of my book or leave out any part because I thought it might be offensive to some people -- and, of course, it has been.

I have a clipping here from the July 14 issue of **The Jewish Press**, which is published in New York City and which describes itself as the world's largest circulation English-language Jewish newspaper. It's a story about what the folks at **The Jewish Press** see as a need to "close the loopholes in the U. S. Constitution," as they so nicely put it. And it's a story about the novel I wrote. I'll read you a couple of paragraphs from this story in **The Jewish Press**:

'The radical right is taking advantage of the Republican victory in Congress to push its own agenda in defiance of the principles that have made the United States a haven for persecuted minorities, a beacon of freedom, justice, and liberty to all people. Unfortunately, the man-made laws under which we operate are like a two-edged sword, offering opportunity to all elements of society to achieve their goals but also similar rights for all to speak their minds even when it contravenes the very essence of tolerance and democracy. One glaring example of this attempt to exploit the loopholes in the U.S. Constitution to bring prejudice and racism in their most vicious forms to public attention is the publication in 1978 of a book called **The Turner Diaries** by Andrew Macdonald, the pseudonym of William L Pierce, a former professor of physics and research scientist . . . . Pierce's book, which surpasses **Mein Kampf** in its virulent anti-Semitism, has sold more than 187,000 copies. It describes an end-of-the-century scenario in which the Jewish dominated government is overthrown by the Organization, an underground white group which succeeds where Nazism failed. . . . Our first reaction . . . is that even in the United States there must be a limit to such abuse of so-called freedom of speech. We have enough experience with vicious racists to justify some control over their actions. '

Did you note the phrase "so-called freedom of speech"? These folks at **The Jewish Press** really would like for the government to prohibit the writing and publication of novels with plots they find offensive or hateful.

I have another newspaper clipping, this one from the August 23 edition of the **Fulton County Daily Report**. It's an editorial written by two radical feminists, one a law professor and the other a law student at Northwestern University. Like **The Jewish Press** these two women also focus on my novel **The Turner Diaries**. They urge that the laws of our land be changed so that I and others who write books they find offensive can be prosecuted -- or at least sued for the damage they claim our writing causes. In my case, they allege that the person or persons who blew up the federal building in Oklahoma City earlier this year were caused to do so by reading **The Turner Diaries**, and so therefore I should be sued for all of the deaths and property loss caused by that act. And, of course, the same for other books which they allege caused people to do harmful things or which offend people -- and, believe me, these women and their friends on the Human Rights Councils are **easily** offended. And they are quick to see a cause-and-effect relationship between written words or an image in a book and criminal acts by people who read those words.

They take it for granted that literature which they consider demeaning to women causes men to rape women. I'll read you just a little of their article:

'Even under current constitutional law, all speech is not equally protected regardless of content. The test is whether the harm caused by the speech is so grave that it outweighs the benefits of protecting its authors from liability. Usually the answer is no. This delicate balancing of interests, however, depends upon judgments about the severity of the harm, not on some absolute legal protection for all things written. Wrapping William Pierce in the fabric of the First Amendment ensures that there is a class of harms occasioned by violent and hate-filled images -- insults, threats, beatings, rapes, and killings -- that remain immune from ordinary legal consequence, even when cause and effect are plainly evident. In reality, if not in First Amendment theory, there persists a connection between image, incitement, and violence: cross-burnings and lynchings, yellow stars and deportations, pornography and rape, **The Turner Diaries** and Oklahoma City. '

Well, it's pretty clear what these two feminists have in mind, even if they don't come right out and say it. They want to make it illegal for you or for me to insult or offend them or someone in solidarity with them -- or, barring that, they want to be able to sue us for saying something which hurts the feelings of an AIDS carrier or a homosexual or a feminist or a member of one of the other officially protected minorities. They say, in effect, "Look, if we let William Pierce get away with writing books like **The Turner Diaries** just because of this obsolete legal fiction called the First Amendment, then we'll also have to put up with all sorts of other insults and hate-filled images."

I don't know what sort of insults have so rankled these two feminist lawyers, but it's pretty clear that they're rankled. I wouldn't worry about that so much, except that I'm afraid that the number of feel-good trendies who'll fall for their argument to abolish the First Amendment is growing. Worse than that, I worry that too many of the rest of us will just sit on our hands and let the anti-Constitutional lynch mob have its way.

And, you know, politicians keep up with these trends too. They read the newspapers. They take polls. If they believe that the majority of Americans will fight to keep their rights, then the politicians won't mess with them. They'll even make speeches about how much they love the Constitution, and especially the First Amendment. But as soon as they figure that the people won't fight for their rights, they'll be leading the lynch mob and making speeches about the need to protect people from being offended or harmed by hateful speech.

And what I've just said applies to nearly all politicians and their camp followers, not just to the Clintonistas. It applies to Republicans and conservatives at least as much as it applies to Democrats and liberals. I have another newspaper article, with an essay by Robert Bork, the very conservative legal scholar who was hounded out of his Supreme Court nomination a few years ago because of his conservatism. Mr. Bork now says that we need to reinterpret the First Amendment, so that it does not protect hateful speech. I don't know what appointment Mr. Bork has his eye on now, but that's what the man is saying.

It all boils down to this: Nobody in this country, or anywhere else, has any **inalienable** rights: not the right to free speech or freedom of religion or assembly, not the right to keep and bear arms, not the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. There always will be scoundrels who will try to take away your rights if they believe they can get away with it. And there always will be fools who will let them do it. The only rights that we have, the only rights that we can depend on, are those that we are willing and able to fight for, to shed blood for. And that's what it's coming to in this country very soon.

Now you've heard it. Now I want you think about it. And then I want you to start getting ready for what's coming.

There's a Conspiracy

There Are Groups in America Today Working to Abolish Our Constitutional Rights

Let's talk today about conspiracy. That's a subject I usually stay away from. The reason I don't like to talk much about conspiracy is that there are a great many right-wing nuts in America who believe that everything is the result of a conspiracy, and I don't want to sound like a right-wing nut.

Actually, there also are many left-wing nuts who believe in conspiracies. Ever since the Oklahoma City bombing last April, the trendy liberals and leftists have been insisting that Timothy McVeigh couldn't have done it with just one or two buddies. It had to have been the result of a giant conspiracy, involving all of the people and groups that the leftists hate and fear.

The right-wing conspiracy mongers believe that the government itself bombed the Federal building, in order to provide a pretext for cracking down on right wingers. And the left-wing conspiracy mongers believe that everyone to the right of Jimmy Carter was involved in the bombing. They don't buy the story that Timothy McVeigh did it simply because he was enraged at a government headed by a criminal like Bill Clinton which would murder its own citizens wholesale, the way the Clinton government did at Waco. They don't buy that story, because they can't imagine anyone not loving Bill Clinton. How could anyone be enraged at our wonderful government, which has promoted all of the Politically Correct policies, from affirmative action to special rights for homosexuals to open borders? Certainly, no one could hold the Waco massacre against the government. Why, those people the government slaughtered at Waco were just a bunch of crazy Christian fundamentalists, just a religious cult! It's a good thing the government got rid of them. No, the Oklahoma City bombing had to have been a giant conspiracy, involving White supremacists, anti-abortionists, the military-industrial complex, male chauvinist pigs - and all the rest of the people the lefties have been taught to hate.

Sounds pretty nutty, doesn't it? That's why I hesitate to talk about conspiracies. I don't want to sound like a conspiracy nut. But, you know, in the real world there are conspiracies. Not as many conspiracies as the conspiracy nuts believe there are, but still there are some. There was a conspiracy a little over 2,000 years ago by Roman republicans and traditionalists to assassinate Julius Caesar, because they saw him as a threat to freedom. Shortly after that, there was a conspiracy by Jewish leaders in Palestine to have Jesus of Nazareth crucified as a heretic and a troublemaker. Today there are conspiracies to fix prices, where the executives of a number of companies will get together and make a secret agreement not to undersell each other. There are conspiracies to cover up criminal activity by committing perjury, as occurred in the Watergate cover-up of the 1970s, in which a number of high government officials, including the President of the United States, were involved.

And there is a conspiracy now to deprive the American people of their most fundamental right: a conspiracy to deprive them of their right to say or write or preach whatever they believe. I'll say that again, because I want it to sink in: there are many people in the United States, some of the wealthiest and most powerful people, including many in the highest government offices, who

today are engaged in a criminal conspiracy to deprive you and me, and our children and our grandchildren, of our right of free speech, a right for which our forefathers fought and bled and died.

I'm not using the term conspiracy loosely here. I don't mean merely that there are trendy people who believe that the First Amendment was meant to protect only Politically Correct speech. I don't mean merely that there are people who hate you and me and wish that they could shut us up. It's not against the law for Politically Correct people to hate us. It's not against the law for someone to want to shut someone else up. But it is against the law for a group of people to get together and secretly make a plan to shut us up by depriving us of our Constitutional rights and then to begin carrying out that plan step by step. That's a criminal conspiracy, a conspiracy for which people can be arrested and sent to prison for many years. And I'm telling you that there is a criminal conspiracy involving many rich and powerful people, a criminal conspiracy in progress now to deprive us of our freedom of speech.

Now let's get down to the concrete facts of this criminal conspiracy. Ever since *American Dissident Voices,* went on the air four years ago, there has been a concerted, conspiratorial effort to silence us, to keep us off the air. Jewish groups have contacted one radio station owner after another and tried to persuade him to cancel his contract with us. When persuasion didn't work, they used threats. Some station owners have been threatened with arson or bombings. But most have simply been warned that they will be boycotted by all the advertisers the Jews are able to influence if they continue to broadcast *American Dissident Voices*. The Jews approached the owner of station WWVA, in Wheeling, West Virginia, more than a year ago and persuaded him to stop carrying our program. They approached the owner of station KAAY, in Little Rock, Arkansas, recently and persuaded him to stop carrying our program. During the past four years they intimidated many other station owners into breaking their contracts with us and dropping our program.

I know that this is so, because station owners who have not yielded to this Jewish intimidation, station owners who really believe in free speech, have told us about the pressure which has been applied to them. They have told us about delegations of Jews showing up at their offices, sometimes with an ambitious Gentile politician or a Christian clergyman in tow, and warning them to stop broadcasting our programs. We have heard this over and over again from the owners and managers of the stations in the *American Dissident Voices* network.

And I should add that the station owners who do cave in to this Jewish pressure usually won't talk to us at all afterward, because they understand that by cooperating with the Jews they have themselves become criminals. Again, I'm not talking loosely here: I mean criminals in the strictly legal sense of the word. It is not illegal for a station owner to decide all by himself that he doesn't like us and won't carry our programs any longer. But if he yields to a Jewish demand that he drop our programs, he is becoming a party to the conspiracy to deprive us of our Constitutional rights, and he knows that he must keep his mouth shut in order to protect himself.

I'll give you another concrete fact. Just a few weeks ago I accepted an invitation to speak before a private meeting of a patriotic organization in London - the largest patriotic organization in Britain, in fact. The day before the meeting the British Home Office, which is in charge of

immigration, sent me an urgent message warning me that I should not plan on traveling to Britain, because I would not be admitted to that country. The Home Secretary, the message said, was concerned that I might cause a public disorder if I came to Britain.

Now, I have never in my life caused a public disorder anywhere. There have been times when I've been tempted to make a ruckus, times when I felt a disorder was justified, but I'm basically a very peaceable person, and I've never yielded to the temptation to make a public disorder. Furthermore, the meeting at which I was scheduled to speak was a closed, private meeting: hardly an opportunity to make a public disorder. Nevertheless, the Home Secretary in the British government - a Home Secretary who just happens to be a Jew - told me that I would not be permitted to enter Britain because I might make a public disorder.

Now it's bad enough to be told by a Jew, an alien, a Middle Easterner, that I will not be permitted by him to enter the country of my ancestry, the country of my forefathers, for any reason at all. But, more than that, it is quite obvious that this Jewish Home Secretary was attempting to prevent me from speaking. He didn't want to preserve public order in Britain: he wanted to silence me.

I am happy to report to you that he failed in this attempt. I managed to get into Britain, make my speech, and get out again, although not without employing certain precautions in order to avoid being intercepted by the minions of the Home Secretary. But I am not happy at all that this criminal conspiracy to keep me from speaking, to keep me from being heard by those who are interested in what I have to say, reaches all the way across the Atlantic and involves the highest officials in the present British government.

This criminal conspiracy also involves the highest officials in the United States government. Although I cannot yet prove it, I strongly suspect that the Home Secretary in Britain was in collusion with government officials in the United States when he acted against me. He did not decide all on his own that I should be prevented from speaking in Britain. He received information about me and my travel plans from his fellow Jews in the United States government - and also from non-Jewish government officials here, officials like the politically ambitious chief of our secret police in Washington.

There are elected officials in our government, as well as appointed bureaucrats, who have been planning and working for years to torpedo the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, just the way they have torpedoed the Second Amendment, planning and working to prevent anyone from saying or writing anything Politically Incorrect.

Many of the conspirators who have been working to deprive us of our Constitutional right to keep and bear arms have not been bashful about their aim. They have formed organizations publicly stating their intent to disarm law- abiding citizens. The conspirators in the government, people like Senator Dianne Feinstein and Congressman Charles Schumer, have been quite loud in announcing their opposition to the Second Amendment. The bureaucrats in the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms have been quite flagrant in their abuse of the Second Amendment rights of Americans.

But there has been much more secrecy and double-talk and deception in the campaign against the First Amendment. The same people are involved in the conspiracy against the First Amendment as are involved in the conspiracy against the Second Amendment - people like Senator Feinstein and Congressman Schumer - but they are much less open about it. At the same time that they are campaigning for new laws to limit what Americans can say and write, they are telling us that they believe in freedom of speech.

Ever since the Oklahoma City bombing in April, which the criminal conspirators against free speech have regarded as a godsend, the consistent, unvarying line of the conspirators has been that the bombing was the direct consequence of permitting Americans to say and write Politically Incorrect things. Immediately after the bombing, Mr. Clinton was on television blaming the bombing on radio programs which criticize the government, its policies, or its actions: programs like *American Dissident Voices.* Since then spokesmen for the controlled media and for various Jewish groups, such as the Anti-Defamation League, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, have been unanimous in making the same claim. "Words have consequences," they say. "People who attack the government with words must be held responsible for acts of violence against the government committed by others who are influenced by those words," they say. Their message is that the only way we can be safe from terrorists is to outlaw the sort of speech which may inspire terrorist acts. We are living in increasingly dangerous times, they say, and we must be willing to give up just a little of our freedom in order to be safer. I'm sure you've heard that argument a hundred times during the past few months.

Is it a serious argument? We all understand, of course, that words and ideas do indeed have consequences. All around us, in every city in America, we can see the consequences of the ideas promoted by television and the other Jewish media for the past 50 years. I am quite certain that they wouldn't welcome the suggestion that they be held responsible for what their words and their ideas have done to our society.

The conspirators don't want to outlaw words which have dangerous consequences. They just want to outlaw words which are dangerous to them, words which expose the crimes they have committed and are committing against our people, words which reveal them for what they are. They want to continue spreading their poisonous and destructive ideas. They just want to stop us from talking about what they're doing and from defending ourselves against them.

And they know that Joe and Jill Six-pack always have been willing to give up their freedom in return for the promise of a little more security or a little more comfort. They know that they can persuade Joe and Jill that everyone will be safer if no one is permitted to criticize the government. They know that they can continue to manipulate Joe and Jill with their words if they can stop us from contradicting them and exposing them. And for most of the past 50 years they have been able to manipulate Joe and Jill and most of the rest of our people virtually without opposition, without contradiction.

I could speak out against them, but my voice was ineffective. Only a few people could hear me. The mass media were too huge and too expensive for me and my associates to use. Only the Jews and their friends could use them to reach the great masses of people.

But in the past few years technological advances have begun to change this situation. First, the advent of desktop publishing made it vastly easier and less expensive to publish books, magazines, and newsletters. Then computer communications through the Internet made it even easier to reach large numbers of people with uncensored ideas. I and my associates in the National Alliance have used the strength we gained from employing these new media to begin building a bridgehead for ourselves in the older mass media, starting with radio broadcasting. In the next year or two we will be ready to move into other mass media.

And the Jews cannot tolerate this. They cannot permit the truth about themselves and their policies to reach the great masses of our people. They know that even Joe and Jill Six-pack will rebel if they fully understand what has been done to them and to their world by Jewish monopoly control of the mass media.

And so, once again, the essence of my message to you today is this: the people in the media and the government, the spokesmen for all of those Jewish organizations calling for bans on what they call "hate speech," are not just misguided individuals who believe that we all will be better off if people like me are silenced. No, they are not misguided, and they are not acting as individuals. They know exactly what they're doing, and they are acting in collusion. They're involved in a criminal conspiracy to deprive all of us of our rights, so that they can maintain their control over our society without opposition. The conspirators are deliberately and consciously manipulating public opinion, pushing the average voter toward giving up the First Amendment, so that no voice can be heard but the voice of the conspirators.

You know, it has been said, even by many of those who would like to silence me, that the book I wrote nearly 20 years ago, *The Turner Diaries,* is prophetic, that many of the things I predicted in that book are becoming reality. Now I will make another prophecy: very soon, perhaps within the next few months, certainly within the next few years, the conspirators will make a final push to write into law a ban on any speech contradicting them or exposing them. The politicians who are talking now about how much they support free speech will implement this ban for them, in order to keep their jobs. They will tell us it's for our own good. And when this happens, it will not be by accident. It will not be that we blundered away our freedom. It will be the consequence of a deliberate, calculated, cold-blooded, criminal conspiracy by those who hate our people, hate our ways, hate everything about us, and are determined to destroy us.

And I will make one other prophecy: the conspirators will have their way - for a while. As I said, Joe and Jill Six-pack are very gullible, and they always follow the path of least resistance instead of the path of greatest advantage. They will permit their freedom to be taken away, and they will let themselves be persuaded that they are better off without it. But the victory of the conspirators will not last. It will not last, because they have waited too long to silence us. We have reached too many people with our message. Too many people of courage and commitment know about the conspirators now. Even if I am silenced, the truth will continue spreading. The rage will continue to grow. The smoldering fury will burst into flames, and the conspirators will not be able to extinguish it.

Ultimately, the conspirators will be no more successful in keeping the truth from the American people than the Jewish Home Secretary was in keeping my message out of Britain. And the day

will come when the conspirators - all of them - will be held accountable for their crimes and will be punished in full measure. I not only prophesy this, I swear it, I promise it.

The Silencing of Hans Schmidt

Hans Schmidt Was Thrown into Jail Simply for Displeasing the Wrong People

Perhaps you've noticed recently how pleased the news media have been to inform us that Mr. Clinton's popularity with the electorate is rising. His so-called "approval rating" is higher than it's ever been, largely because he is perceived as taking a decisive and principled stand to bring peace to Bosnia.

It's not that the American people are happy about the possibility of becoming involved in yet another war, but they are pleased to see their draft-dodging, pot- smoking President, who was in the streets with the Reds and the hippies chanting "Ho, ho, ho Chi Minh, the Viet Cong's gonna win" back during the Vietnam war, finally trying to act like a statesman by using American diplomacy and military power to end the butchery in Bosnia: finally trying to walk tall and carry a big stick. Probably that makes many Americans feel a little safer, feel that their President will stick up for them when they need him.

Well, let me tell you something else about Mr. Clinton's supposed principles: about the way he walks tall and sticks up for Americans when they need the support of their government. Five months ago, in August 1995, an American was seized by the German secret police at the airport in Frankfurt as he was preparing to return to the United States after visiting his 93-year-old mother in Germany. He was thrown into a German prison, where he remained until very recently, without trial and without bond. His name is Hans Schmidt. He lives in Pensacola, Florida. He has been a U.S. citizen for 40 years. He committed **no crime** while he was in Germany. He has never done **anything**, either in Germany or the United States, which is a crime under U.S. law.

What he had done, however, was publish a newsletter in 1994 in the United States which displeased the Jews. You see, Mr. Schmidt heads the German- American National Political Action Committee, an organization dedicated to the interests of Americans of German descent, like Mr. Schmidt himself - and like 55 million other Americans. One topic which Mr. Schmidt often discusses in his newsletters is the Jews' hate-propaganda campaign against Germany, especially their claim that the Germans gassed 6,000,000 of them to death during the Second World War, and therefore the Germans of today owe the Jews of today a free living. In particular, Mr. Schmidt criticized the anti-German hate film Schindler's List, pointing out a number of Jewish propaganda lies in the film.

Now, in the United States it's still not illegal to criticize a film - even a Jewish propaganda film. But in Germany it's a different story. In Germany to contradict the Jewish party line about the so-called "Holocaust" is illegal. It's what the Jews and their news media call a "hate crime." Many Germans are in prison today simply because they have written or said something the Jews didn't like.

That's because the German government today is a continuation of the occupation government imposed on the German people 50 years ago by the communist and democratic Allies who conquered Germany in the Second World War. It is a government in which German patriots were forbidden to participate. It consists of traitors who were willing to serve the conquerors of their people - of ambitious traitors who understood that the way to power and privilege in conquered Germany lay in pleasing the Jews. And these traitors were happy to impose on their own people whatever laws the Jews demanded. They taxed the German people so that the German government could send tens of billions of dollars to Israel in so-called "war reparations" - even though Israel didn't even exist during the war. And they enacted laws making it illegal for Germans to criticize or contradict Jews.

Now, of course, German laws are the business of the Germans. Until the German people rise up, hang their traitors, and form a patriotic government, they'll have to do without freedom of speech and freedom of the press. They'll have to obey the laws imposed on them by a government of traitors or pay the penalty for breaking those laws. But those laws **cannot** be imposed on Americans for what Americans do on American soil. The German government **cannot**. take away an American's right to say or write what he wants **in America**.

Hans Schmidt has been a naturalized American citizen for 40 years. He has committed no crime in Germany. The German government has no jurisdiction over what he has written in America. And yet he has been arrested by the German secret police and imprisoned. How can that be? Why did that happen?

I'll tell you. Hans Schmidt was arrested for two reasons. First, there are Jewish hate organizations in every country, including the United States and Germany, which not only make Jewish hate propaganda for the Jew-controlled media, but which also spy on the people of the country in which they are located. They compile hate lists of people who say or write things which displease them. They distribute these hate lists to their news media, and then the people on the lists are accused of "hate crimes" by the media. And they distribute these hate lists to the governments over which they have influence, and they demand that the governments take repressive action against the people on the lists. Hans Schmidt's name is high on most of these Jewish hate lists. That's one of the reasons he was arrested by the German secret police.

A second reason is that the German secret police knew ahead of time that the United States government would not protest Hans Schmidt's arrest. More important, they knew that the Jew-controlled news media would remain silent-that there would be no headlines in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post* or the *Wall Street Journal* or any other Jewish newspaper.

They knew that the U.S. government would not protest, because the head of the secret police in the United States, Mr. Clinton's FBI Director Louis Freeh, has pledged to them repeatedly during the past two years that he would do everything he could to help them silence Americans who are saying things the Jews don't like. He has publicly lamented the fact that the United States does not have repressive laws like those in Germany, which prohibit Politically Incorrect speech. He has publicly lamented the fact that the FBI cannot arrest people like Hans Schmidt - and me and many other Americans on the Jews' hate lists - but he has pledged that he would help the German secret police arrest them.

And that's exactly what he has done. Mr. Freeh is a politically ambitious little man, and he knows which side his bread is buttered on. He knows whom he must please in order to remain in favor in the Clinton government. And so when Americans on a Jewish hate list travel to another country, Mr. Freeh's secret police in Washington tip off the secret police in the other country. They collaborate in punishing American citizens for exercising their Constitutional rights.

And of course, it's not just Mr. Freeh who is engaged in this subversive, anti- American activity. The whole Clinton government is composed of people who want to abolish the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights, so that they can usher in the New World Order, where no one will be permitted to say or write anything which is not Politically Correct. They want a New World Order governed by "hate laws," where anyone who doesn't toe the line can be thrown into prison for a "hate crime." They take their lead from Jews who already have succeeded in imposing such laws on the people of Germany, of Canada, of Britain, and of many other European countries. The Clinton government could not silence Hans Schmidt while he was in America, but they did collaborate with the German government in silencing him, and they continue to collaborate with the German government by failing to protest its imprisonment of an American citizen.

Contrast this despicable, treasonous behavior of the Clinton government in Hans Schmidt's case with its behavior in the case of the Chinese dissident, Harry Wu. We've all heard about Harry Wu, because the controlled news media in America made a celebrity of him when he was arrested by the Chinese government a few months ago. The Clintonistas became his champions and protectors. Mrs. Clinton wouldn't attend an international feminist conference in China, because the Chinese had Harry Wu in jail. And Harry Wu had quite clearly broken Chinese law in China by illegally sneaking into the country with a forged passport. We may sympathize with Mr. Wu's anti-Communism, but we cannot honestly pretend to be outraged when the Chinese government arrests him for entering China with a forged passport. **That's illegal everywhere.**

Hans Schmidt, on the other hand, did nothing illegal in either Germany or the United States. He was arrested solely because the Jews demanded it, and because their lackeys in the German government knew that their lackeys in the U.S. government wouldn't protest. That **is** something to be outraged about.

Now, I've known Hans Schmidt for 15 years. He's a personal friend. At a time when I was even poorer than I am today, he gave me an automobile. It's an automobile which my wife still drives. I've spoken often with him over the years and shared important information with him. So I have a personal reason for being outraged at what has been done to Hans Schmidt. But you should be just as outraged as I am. The attack on Hans Schmidt's rights and freedom is an attack on the rights and freedom of every American. If Hans Schmidt can be silenced, so can I - or you - or anyone. If we don't express our outrage now about what has been done to Hans Schmidt, who will speak up for us when we are silenced?

There's not much point in directing our outrage against the German government. That's something for German patriots to concern themselves with. And I'm sure that one day they will rise up and settle matters over there, if they have enough rope and lampposts for the job. But we have a job to do over here. We Americans should direct our outrage against the subversives and criminals in our own government who have conspired with the German government to silence

Hans Schmidt. We should direct our outrage against the Clintonistas and all of the other collaborators. We should direct our outrage at the hate organizations which compile the hate lists and whisper in the ears of the politicians and provide hate propaganda for the controlled media: organizations like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center. It is these Jewish hate organizations which ultimately are responsible for the imprisonment of Hans Schmidt. It is these hate organizations which are pushing for "hate laws" in the United States, making it illegal to criticize them or their policies. It is these hate organizations which are pushing harder than anyone else to abolish our Constitution and subject us all to the New World Order.

Just being outraged at these hate organizations and at their collaborators in the media and the government isn't enough, of course. If we want to keep our freedom to say and write what we think, just being angry at those who are taking it away from us isn't enough. We have to fight these enemies of freedom with all the means at our disposal.

Look! We cannot do now to this filth, to these haters of our people, what really needs to be done. That will have to wait. But here's what we can do now, what we must do now: first, we must remember that most of the politicians and bureaucrats who collaborate with the haters are men without principle or conviction or scruple. They are simply ambitious opportunists. Most of them are lawyers. They don't care about freedom one way or the other, since they can't eat it or put in the bank. It's just a word to them. They don't care whether Hans Schmidt is in prison or not. All they care about is how much butter is on their bread. We must make these corrupt men understand that a day of reckoning is coming, and that they will be called to account. We must make them understand that on that day we will present them with a bill for all of the butter they have accepted from the haters. We must make them understand that the time for them to begin buying insurance against that day is now.

Remembering these things, let's begin by reminding them that to us freedom is not just a word, that to us it is important whether or not our government sticks up for its citizens' rights - and that until the day comes when we use other means, we will at least make our voices heard in support of freedom, that we will not be silenced, and that if they try to ignore us our voices will only grow louder and stronger.

Let's begin by writing letters and making telephone calls. Write to the State Department in Washington, which is supposed to be responsible for the welfare of American citizens traveling in other countries. Tell them that you are very unhappy that they did nothing to obtain Hans Schmidt's release. Tell them that you are angry. Tell them that you want to know why they haven't even protested to the German government.

Write to the politicians in the Congress who are supposed to be representing your interests. Tell them the same thing. Demand answers.

Listen! You may think that writing letters is wasted effort, that others already have written and that it has done no good, so why should you bother. The politicians and bureaucrats don't care, you may think, so why should you make yourself look foolish by making demands that they'll just ignore. If that's the way you think, you're wrong. I tell you that if everyone listening with us

today will write, if those politicians and bureaucrats receive a hundred thousand angry letters, they will remember that a little insurance might be a good thing for them.

And write to the editors of every newspaper and news magazine you read. Tell them what you think about the failure of the Clinton government to protect the rights of its citizens. Some of those letters will be published and will be read by tens of thousands of other people.

Use your telephone. Call every talk show which can be received in your area. Get on the air. Express yourself forcefully. People will listen to you.

The haters at the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center will continue to sneer at us and to snicker among themselves, and they will continue to spread their hatred to the media and to pull the strings on most of the politicians and to tell the Clintonistas what to do. It'll be a while yet before we can wipe the sneer off their faces for good, but even now we can make their hateful work more difficult for them.

The most important thing for us to keep in mind is that we are not powerless, despite what the haters would like for everyone to believe. We don't have to lie down and let them walk on us. If we just have the courage and the energy to use our voices, we can accomplish much. The haters always do their dirty work in secret, behind the scenes. They can only steal freedom from Americans if the public doesn't understand what they're up to. They can only get away with silencing people like Hans Schmidt if the public doesn't know about it. It's our responsibility to tell the public: to tell them loudly and clearly and repeatedly.

Let's think about one more thing. It is terrible, of course, that we have a government composed of criminals and traitors, of despicable politicians like Bill Clinton, who collaborate with the enemies of our people to bring about such crimes as the imprisonment of Hans Schmidt.

Despite this, however, as we move into this new year I am more optimistic than I have ever been. A great sea change is taking place in the consciousness of the American people, a great awakening. Most of them are still far from a full understanding of the evil which afflicts our nation. They are still far from being ready to deal with the haters and their collaborators in the manner they deserve. But there is at least a new openness, a new willingness to listen and to reason. I see a growing impatience with treason, a growing unwillingness to swallow the smooth lies of the Clintonistas, a growing suspicion of the controlled media and of the hate groups behind the media. And it is our responsibility, the responsibility of all of us with some understanding of what has been happening in America, to help the rest of the people develop their own understanding, to help their awareness grow, to speed their awakening.

I can see that awakening on the horizon, in the not too distant future. On the horizon I can see the glow of the cleansing fire with which this nation will be swept: the fire which will restore us to health and sanity and honor, the fire which will consume the filth and the deceit and the hate and leave us with the possibility to shape a new future for our children and our grandchildren.

We must endure more treason and injustice as the haters pull out all the stops in their efforts to maintain their power now, and later to save their skins. But the end of them and their evil is in sight, and that is something in which we can all rejoice.

Retribution Is Coming . . . *And They Know It*

Last month I told you about Hans Schmidt, the chairman of the German-American Political Action Committee, who was imprisoned by the German government for something he wrote in a newsletter which was published in the United States. He was charged by the German government with what the controlled news media call a "hate crime": that is, for writing something which is Politically Incorrect. Specifically, Mr. Schmidt had written that the present government of Germany is infested by Jews and is heavily under their influence. Mr. Schmidt was facing the possibility of a five-year prison term in Germany for having written those forbidden words.

I was very angry about that. My anger was not directed so much at the German government, but rather at the government and the media in this country, which had remained silent about Mr. Schmidt's imprisonment, even though he has been an American citizen for 40 years and his so-called "hate crime" was the exercise of his right of free speech in this country. Bill and Hillary Clinton, with all of their phony concern about human rights, had spoken not one word of protest about the imprisonment of Hans Schmidt.

Do you understand what I said? I said **phony concern.** I said that the Clintons are liars, that they are crooks, that they are hypocrites, that they don't give the slightest damn about any American's rights except their own, but they posture and pose and pretend in front of the TV cameras, because that's good for votes.

Of course, it's not just the Clintons or the Democrats. No one in the Republican Congress spoke up for Hans Schmidt's rights either. No one in the Republican Congress cares about Hans Schmidt's rights -- or your rights, or mine. They are all afraid of the controlled media; they're all afraid of the Jews.

That's what this country has come to.

Well, I am happy to report to you that, despite the American government, despite Bill Clinton and the Republican Congress, Mr. Schmidt is out of prison now and is recuperating at his home in Florida.

You see, the German government had a problem with Hans Schmidt. They arrested him back in August of last year because the Jews demanded it. The Jews told the German government, "Shut that man up; we don't like what he's saying." And the shameful fact is, when the Jews demand something, the politicians jump, whether they're German politicians or American politicians. So the German government arrested Mr. Schmidt last August when he traveled to Germany to visit his 92-year-old mother, and they charged him with a "hate crime," because he had written in his newsletter back in the United States that the German government is unduly under Jewish influence.

But then they had a problem. Although the controlled media had cooperated by suppressing the news of his arrest, the German government was afraid that if they put Mr. Schmidt on trial that might attract attention. Some American newspaper might report on the trial. Some other radio

broadcaster besides me might say something about it on the radio. And the American people might sit up and pay attention. They might say, "Hey, how can this be? How can the German government put an American citizen on trial for something he wrote in the United States?"

And people would realize that this sort of thing happens. They would realize that there is no such thing as freedom of speech or freedom of the press in Germany. They would realize that after the Second World War, 50 years ago, the Jews demanded that Germans not be permitted to say or write anything that the Jews didn't approve of, and that laws were passed in Germany to implement those demands.

People would understand that, despite its economic prosperity, Germany isn't a free country, that it is under Jewish control. And they would also realize that the American government hadn't done anything to protect Hans Schmidt's rights as an American citizen. They would realize that the Jews exercise nearly as much control over the U.S. government as over the German government.

So the German government couldn't really afford to put Hans Schmidt on trial. And they couldn't afford to just dismiss the charge against him and turn him loose, because that would remove the teeth from their "hate crime" laws, and Germans might begin thinking that they were free to say or write whatever they wanted. That would never do. The Jews wouldn't tolerate it. They would begin screaming about "anti-Semitism" and "neo-Nazis" and the "Holocaust" again. They would crank out even more hate-propaganda films and television programs against the Germans.

So after five months of imprisonment the German government released Hans Schmidt last month on his own recognizance and told him that he would have to stand trial on the "hate crime" charge. And then Hans Schmidt did exactly what they expected him to do -- and what most reasonable people would do in his situation: he returned immediately to the United States. The German government feigned surprise and issued another warrant for his arrest. Thus, the German government got around its little problem. It avoided having to put Mr. Schmidt on trial and risk calling international attention to the lack of freedom in Germany. And at the same time it left the charge hanging over Mr. Schmidt's head, so that he could not return to Germany -- which is what the German government really wanted to accomplish.

So in Germany today every knowledgeable person -- every journalist and every historian and every government official and everyone else concerned with public affairs -- understands certain things but is forbidden by law to say or write what he understands. If a teacher tells his students what he knows about some forbidden topic, or if a journalist writes forbidden words for his newspaper, then it's five years in the penitentiary for committing a "hate crime."

Well, that's Germany's problem, you may think. Actually, it's very much America's problem too. The reason the German government threw Hans Schmidt into prison for five months for something he wrote in the United States is that the German government is simply a puppet of the international Jewish power structure. The Jews have been trying for years to silence Hans Schmidt in America. They waited until he made a visit to his mother in Germany, and then they struck. They used the German government to intimidate him.

Now they're using the German government in an effort to silence me and others. They're trying to keep me off the Internet, and they're trying to keep this radio program off the air. They've been screaming for new "hate crime" laws in America which would make it illegal for me to talk or write about what they're doing, the same kind of "hate crime" laws they've already imposed on the German people. So far, they've been unsuccessful in America. Not because the politicians here aren't eager to do whatever the Jews tell them to do, but because there are still too many ordinary Americans -- armed Americans -- who won't put up with it. So the Jews are working through the German government again. They've told the German government to get me and other Politically Incorrect people off the Internet.

The German government responded a few weeks ago by testing the waters, using pornography as a pretext. The German government demanded that Internet access providers in the United States which had been providing access to people with pornographic material withdraw that access. The excuse was that Germans were viewing this American pornographic material through their computers in Germany.

Actually, that's a pretty lame excuse, because pornography of the most disgusting sort is freely available in Germany from many sources other than the Internet. But who can defend pornography -- especially child pornography? So the American Internet access providers complied with the German government's demand and cut off access to the pornographers.

Well, it didn't take the German government but a few days after that to make a new demand: Cut off access to everyone who puts Politically Incorrect material on the Internet. Since Germans are not permitted to read any material which deals truthfully with the Second World War or with Jews or with race or with a number of other sensitive topics, and since my organization, the National Alliance, among others, puts documentary material dealing with such topics on the Internet, the German government now claims that Internet access providers in the United States are helping computer users in Germany break the law by giving them access to forbidden facts and ideas. And the German government, prodded from behind by international Jewish groups, is demanding that this access be cut off. Since a German computer user can read anything on the Internet that an American can, and since it is illegal for a German to read anything which is not Politically Correct, the German government is demanding, in effect, that no one, German or American, be permitted to read such material.

Isn't that outrageous? Americans should give up their freedom of thought -- and I and others should give up our freedom of speech -- so that the minds of the German people can continue to be controlled by the German government -- and by the Jews behind that government.

So, what does all of this mean? Should Americans really worry that the German government is trying to tell us what we aren't permitted to read or to say on the Internet? Is that a serious threat to Americans' freedom?

You bet it is! It's serious because it's not just the German government which is trying to control our reading and writing habits. The demands for censoring the Internet first came from Jewish groups. The Simon Wiesenthal Center, headquartered in Los Angeles, has been foremost in screaming for laws against free speech on the Internet. The head rabbi at the Wiesenthal Center,

Rabbi Abraham Cooper, has sent threatening letters to Internet access providers, trying to pressure them into denying access to any Politically Incorrect person. Rabbi Cooper doesn't say "Politically Incorrect." Instead he uses the buzzwords "hate," "hate speech," "hate crime." But what he *means* is "Politically Incorrect." And other powerful Jewish groups -- the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Southern Poverty Law Center, for example -- mean the same thing when they talk about "hate." To them "hate" is anything which threatens powerful Jewish interests; "hate" is anything which they fear. And they fear nothing more than the truth. They fear nothing more than the exposure of their own motives and activities. They fear nothing more than free people armed with the truth about what these groups are up to. They know that they can only continue increasing their wealth and power at the expense of everyone else if they can control our thinking.

That's why Rabbi Cooper and the other Jewish leaders are desperate to censor the Internet, are desperate to get programs like *American Dissident Voices* off the air, are desperate to impose on Americans the same kind of thought-control laws they've imposed on the German people. For them to be safe they must be able to control the thinking not just of Germans, but also of Americans and Englishmen and Frenchmen and Swedes and all the rest of us.

And these Jewish leaders are very, very powerful. They are able to make the German government do their bidding. They are very close to being able to do the same with the American government. Their new strategy, their new argument, is that individual nations like the United States and France and Germany can no longer have their own separate laws and customs. Everything is international these days, they are telling the politicians, and we must adapt our laws to that fact. Since what Americans do affects Germans and other foreigners, we must have new laws to reflect these international interactions. We must scrap the Bill of Rights, because it is old fashioned. It isn't international.

And, believe me, the politicians are listening. The great majority of these politicians, Democrat and Republican, don't care at all **-- not at all --** about things like the Constitution and free speech. They just care about getting re-elected. They will pay lip service to the Constitution, they will tell you what champions of free speech they are, so long as they believe that's what will bring in the most votes. But they would just as soon pay lip service to Satanism or to homosexuality or to the same sort of thought-control laws which have been imposed on the Germans, if they thought they could get away with it.

I'll recap what I've just said, because it's very, very important. There are two reasons why Americans must take very seriously the current effort of the German government to censor Americans on the Internet. The first reason is that international Jewish organizations, which are extremely rich and powerful, are behind this effort. The second reason is that the American government, whose duty it is to resist such efforts, is totally corrupt and totally irresponsible.

And, of course, it's not just the Internet which is at risk here. If they succeed in stifling the Internet, the next thing they'll go after is radio broadcasts. After all, Germans can turn on their radios, tune to this program on short-wave, and commit a crime by listening to ideas and facts that are banned in Germany. I'll guarantee you that if the German government succeeds in imposing thought control on the Internet it will then argue that the same considerations of

internationalism apply to radio broadcasts, and that radio stations in the United States must be prohibited by law from carrying any Politically Incorrect programs. They would like to make radio in the United States as Politically Correct as television already is. Their aim is to cut off, one by one, every channel of free expression, every means of communicating facts and ideas which are not under tight Jewish control. And that will be the end of freedom for Americans.

We don't have much freedom left now, but what we do have we'd better fight for. We'd better fight every effort to censor the Internet. We'd better fight every effort to outlaw Politically Incorrect radio programs. We'd better fight every effort to impose new "hate crime" laws on us.

Unfortunately, it is not feasible, at this time, for us to oppose with organized physical force those who are trying to take away our freedom. We must use organized force only as a last resort.

There are two ways that we can fight effectively for our freedom at this time, however. One way is to exercise our freedom, to use it, to say what we know to be true, rather than remaining silent for fear that we will off end some advocate of internationalism or censorship. Speak up! Tell everyone about this radio program. Tell everyone about our World Wide Web site on the Internet at:
http://www.natvan.com
Share with others the facts and ideas you receive from these sources.

And the second way we can fight is to let the politicians know, in no uncertain terms, that we will not tolerate any more infringements on our liberty. Tell them that we will do whatever it takes to safeguard our freedom. Tell them that we will even resort to force, if we must. And the politicians will listen. They may be crooked, but they're not stupid. They can count. If they know that enough Americans are alert to what's going on and will oppose it, they also will resist Jewish pressure to impose on Americans the kind of thought control which already has been imposed on Germans.

I'll leave you with a final thought today. America's internal enemies may be very powerful. They may control most of our mass media. They may have most of the politicians in their pocket. They already may have corrupted America's institutions terminally. They already may have made bloody civil war and chaos inevitable by opening our borders to the Third World and converting most of our cities to festering centers of anti-American and anti-White turmoil. They already may have killed the America that our forefathers built, and they may have left for us only the possibility of salvaging what we can from the ruins and building a whole new country.

But, despite all these things, they are losing the war, and they know it. That is why they have become so shrill and so insistent in their efforts to silence us. They know that they are losing the war, and they are afraid. If they were confident in their control of the situation, they would not care what a few of us say on the radio or on the Internet.

Everything that they have done has been destructive, and the process of destruction is nearing its end, and they know it. Back in the 1960s they worked to break down our standards, our traditions, our discipline, and our internal cohesion. They worked to corrupt our young people. They introduced alien ideologies, they opened our borders, they encouraged every sort of

perversion and every sort of unrest. They changed America from a country in which we were proud and strong into a country which suited them: into a cosmopolitan, multicultural, crime and drug ridden morass. And now the country is dying. And they know it. They know that ultimately they must lose, because everything that they do is unhealthy and destructive and unnatural. But they hope that they can postpone retribution if they can silence us. And their allies, their collaborators, all of the crooked and unnatural people who have benefited temporarily from the destruction, hope the same thing. But I'll tell you this: **retribution is coming.** They will **not** avert it. And we **will** build a new America.

Why They Hate Buchanan

I'm sure that most of our readers have been observing with some interest the Republican primaries these past few months. And I'm sure that you've noticed, as I have, the most interesting feature of these primaries: namely the frantic attacks by the controlled media and by the other Republicans on candidate Patrick Buchanan.

The controlled media keep telling us that their polls show that most voters believe Buchanan is "too extreme." That is simply the media's way of trying to move the herd toward that view. They want people to think, "Pat Buchanan can't win, because he's too extreme. We know he's too extreme, because we heard it on TV." And, of course, the other Republican candidates are echoing the same line: *Buchanan is an extremist*, they say.

Now, just what is it about Buchanan that's extreme?

Is it his statement that if he becomes President he'll stop the flood of illegal immigration from Mexico? Is it now considered "extreme" for a Presidential candidate to be in favor of enforcing U.S. law and protecting our borders? Some people apparently think so.

Or is it Buchanan's position on foreign trade which makes him an extremist? Is he an extremist because he believes that American workers should not be forced to compete for jobs with Chinese coolies or Mexican *mestizos?* Is he an extremist for pointing out the simple truth that Washington's present policy of uncontrolled foreign trade is destroying one basic American industry after another and is exporting hundreds of thousands of American jobs overseas? Is that "too extreme"? **The people who slant our television news programs say it is. Mr. Dole and the other Republicans say it is.**

Well, we know that many wealthy businessmen welcome both the flow of cheap labor across our border with Mexico and also the opportunity to build their factories in Indonesia or elsewhere in the Third World, where labor is so inexpensive. And we know that Republican politicians traditionally receive much of their financial support from wealthy businessmen. Is that why the Republican Party bosses are so worried that Buchanan may become the Republican candidate? Is that why the other Republicans are saying that they'll support any Republican candidate chosen by the voters **except** Pat Buchanan?

No, that's **not** the reason. If Robert Dole and the other Republican candidates really believed that Pat Buchanan's views were too extreme for most people, they wouldn't worry about him at all. They'd just let him lose in the primaries, and then they'd have less competition. And as for the Republican Party bosses, don't they understand the purpose of primaries? Primaries are to give the voters a chance to choose the candidate they want. The party bosses should be happy to have the most popular candidate, instead of trying to frighten voters into accepting a less-popular candidate. And as for the wealthy businessmen, Buchanan is running without campaign money from them. If he can win without their money, who cares what they think about his views on immigration and trade?

No, Buchanan's policies certainly **aren't** extreme. The other Republicans aren't worried that the voters will reject those policies. Instead they're afraid that the voters will approve of those policies. They're afraid that Pat Buchanan will be able to build mass support for protecting our borders, for enforcing our immigration laws, for bringing back American jobs and rebuilding American industries which have been exported to the Third World.

The real key to understanding the attacks on Patrick Buchanan by other Republicans and by the controlled media is not extremism at all. It's something else that we're beginning to hear in the attacks on Buchanan, as his attackers become more worried about his popularity. That something else is what they're calling "anti-Semitism." Pat Buchanan is an anti-Semite, they're whispering, and so we must stop him at all costs.

If you look at some of the Jewish community newspapers, the ones we aren't supposed to see, they're not whispering about Buchanan's supposed anti-Semitism, they're screaming about it. They're calling him a "neo-Nazi," a "racist," a "Jew baiter," "hatemonger," and an "anti-Semite."

Now, is any of that true? **Is Patrick Buchanan really an anti-Semite?**

Let's look at the evidence, at the facts. What is true is that Buchanan is a traditional Roman Catholic, a conservative Roman Catholic, and he takes his religion seriously. A few years ago a mob of homosexual demonstrators, most of them Jews, invaded a Catholic church in New York City and desecrated the church, pouring blood on the altar and performing lewd acts inside the church in order to express their displeasure with the local bishop's opposition to homosexuality. The local media treated the whole affair as if it were a lark, a sort of boyish prank. The local politicians and the police had a similar attitude. Buchanan was enraged. He wrote in his own newspaper column that if it had been a synagogue which had been desecrated instead of a Christian church, and if the invaders had been Gentiles instead of Jews, the media and the authorities would have taken it much more seriously. The desecrators would all be in prison on "hate crime" charges.

Hey, we all know that's true. The Jews **do** get special treatment from the media and from the authorities and from the courts. They expect special treatment, and they get it -- especially in places like New York. But Buchanan had the guts to actually say it. And when the Jews jumped all over him and accused him of being "insensitive" for saying it and began wailing about the "Holocaust" and "anti-Semitism" in an attempt to make him back down, Buchanan didn't back down. Politicians are supposed to grovel and apologize when the Jews accuse them of being "insensitive." But Buchanan is a fighter. He denied being an anti-Semite, but he didn't grovel and apologize.

And there have been other instances where Buchanan has clashed with the Jews. When he was an adviser to President Ronald Reagan, and the Jews told Reagan that he mustn't lay a wreath at a certain military cemetery in Germany -- the cemetery at Bitburg -- because some of the soldiers buried there were members of the SS, Buchanan advised him to go ahead and lay the wreath anyway. The war had been over for nearly 50 years, and Buchanan thought it was time for reconciliation. But the Jews' motto is "never forget and never forgive," and so again they called Buchanan an "anti-Semite" for not yielding to their pressure.

Five years ago, when the Jews decided that Saddam Hussein and Iraq were becoming a danger to Israeli hegemony in the Middle East and had to be crushed, George Bush and the other Republicans were eager to do their bidding, as were the Democrats, and so we launched the Gulf War and bombed Baghdad into submission. But Patrick Buchanan spoke out and said, "Hey, we don't need this war. This war doesn't serve America's interests. The only people who need this war are the Israelis." All of the politicians knew that was true, but Buchanan was the only one who would say it publicly.

And then there was the case of John Demjanjuk. Jewish leaders decided a few years ago that it was time for another crucifixion, and they accused Ukrainian-American John Demjanjuk, a retired Cleveland auto-worker, of war crimes which he supposedly had committed 50 years ago, during the Second World War. This is Ivan the Terrible, the Jews claimed; he killed thousands of Jews during the war. And so they had one of their bought Federal judges strip him of his citizenship and ship him off to Israel for a show trial designed to generate sympathy for Jews and increase foreign aid to Israel.

Pat Buchanan again spoke out against this outrage. The other politicians, Democrat and Republican, politicians like Bob Dole, knew enough to look the other way and keep their mouths shut, but Buchanan said, "Hey, what about the Constitution? What about due process? What about this man's rights?" And Buchanan generated enough public interest in the fate of John Demjanjuk that the Jews' plans for a crucifixion were derailed. They weren't able to cover up the evidence that proved Demjanjuk was innocent, and public opinion eventually forced them to turn him loose. That's something else they've never forgiven Buchanan for.

But does any of these things make Buchanan an "anti-Semite"? *Do these things justify the Jews' claims that he is a "hatemonger," a "Jew baiter," and a "neo-Nazi"?* **I doubt it.** What do you think?

Now if **I** were the candidate instead of Pat Buchanan, the Jews **would** have something to scream about. Because if I were elected I'd declare a national emergency, and I'd immediately take the control of our news and entertainment media away from them. I'd root them out of Hollywood. I'd weed them out of our universities. I'd remove them from the courts. I'd clean house. But I really don't believe that Buchanan would do that. He's certainly never said or written anything to indicate he'd do that. **He's not a revolutionary. He's a conservative. He's a Republican. He's a Christian. He's simply a fellow with old-fashioned values, and he's a fighter.** He has no particular grudge against the Jews, but when some of them desecrate his church, he becomes angry and says something about it. When he sees an injustice taking place, as in the persecution of John Demjanjuk, he may or may not speak out, but his decision as to whether or not to speak out isn't based on what the Jews might think about it. He has other considerations.

And basically that's why the Jewish media are attacking him so viciously. *They can't tolerate a politician who has any considerations other than what the Jews might think.* Basically they can't tolerate a politician who doesn't jump when they whistle. If he won't apologize and grovel now, there's no telling what he might not do if he's in the White House. He might not send all of those billions of dollars from American taxpayers to Israel every year. He might not appoint Jews to half of his cabinet positions and to the head of the CIA and to **every** Supreme Court vacancy, the

way Clinton has. He might not send U.S. troops when and where he's told to send them. He might not base his policies on what's good for the Jews instead of on what's good for America. That's why they hate him. That's why they're trying to convince the voters that he's an extremist.

And that's also the reason that Bob Dole and the other Republicans are attacking him. That's why the Republican Party bosses are saying that they can accept any candidate **except Buchanan.** Bob Dole has based his career on being a step'n'fetchit for the powerful Jews who control the American political system. He's a boring, lackluster, unimaginative politician, who's never had an original idea, but the media bosses keep backing him for reelection, because he does what he's told. He votes for billions of dollars in aid to Israel every year. He kept his mouth shut when the Jews grabbed John Demjanjuk and put him on trial in Israel on phony charges. He went along with the bombing of women and children in Baghdad. He votes for every so-called "free trade" bill and other piece of New World Order legislation the Jews want enacted. Dole is dependable.

And Dole in turn depends on the system of which he is a part, a system in which everyone jumps when the Jews whistle. Without the system, Dole would have to go out and find himself a job. He would have to work for a living.

And Buchanan is not part of the system. Buchanan is an outsider. A Buchanan win would severely damage the prestige of the system. It would upset the Republican applecart. That's why Dole and the party bosses are afraid of Buchanan. That's why they keep calling him an "extremist," when in fact his views are anything but extreme. God, I wish that he were an extremist! We need more extremists.

What's important for us to remember, though, is that extremism isn't the issue here. Extremism is just a smoke screen. The real issue is refusing to take orders from the Jews, refusing to follow the Jewish party line. That's what the Jews call "anti-Semitism." That's what they call "hate." That's what they call "neo-Nazism." And the really important and interesting thing about these Republican primaries is that they may give the American people a chance to face this fact. The big media bosses, the top Jewish leaders, would like to keep the issue confined to "extremism." They would like for the general public not to know about the charges of "anti-Semitism" and "neo-Nazism" that they're throwing around so freely in their Jewish publications that we're not supposed to see. But if Patrick Buchanan keeps doing even reasonably well in the primaries, the Jewish bosses will have a hard time keeping the lid on. They will have a hard time keeping some of their more excitable brethren from screaming in public that Buchanan is an "anti-Semite" because he won't take orders from the Jews. That will be very illuminating for Buchanan's supporters and for the public generally.

Actually that sort of thing already is happening to a small degree. Some of the really excitable Jews, the really **hateful** Jews, already are finding it impossible to keep their mouths shut. One of these is Rabbi Avi Weiss, a very intense little Jew who heads a Hebrew outfit called "Amcha." Rabbi Weiss and his followers have made a habit of trying to disrupt Buchanan's election rallies. They jump up on the speaker's platform with signs saying, "Buchanan Is a Jew Hater," and wave them in front of the TV cameras. Of course, they get tossed out of the rallies, and some of the Buchanan supporters who are there tell them what they think about their antics. To Weiss, this is proof that he is right: Buchanan and his supporters are Jew-haters, because they call Weiss and

his fellow disrupters nasty names when they toss them out of rallies. Weiss is accustomed to politicians who grovel and apologize. Anyone who doesn't grovel and apologize must be an "anti-Semite" -- especially anyone who dares to say nasty things to one of God's Chosen People. And so Rabbi Weiss, who writes in general circulation newspapers as well as in strictly Jewish papers, is loudly calling Buchanan an "anti-Semite."

And I believe that other Jews will begin doing the same before the campaign is over. That will allow Buchanan supporters to understand who their real enemy is, to understand who's behind the propaganda campaign against Buchanan, to understand who's pulling Bob Dole's strings.

Of course, the trendy liberal elements will follow the Jewish lead, as they always do, and they also will step up the intensity and viciousness of their own attacks on Buchanan. But still, the general public will have a chance to see that the reason the media and the party bosses don't like Buchanan isn't extremism at all. It's what his enemies will call "anti-Semitism" and what is *really* just a reluctance to let the Jews tell him what to think and what to say and lead him by the nose the way they lead the other politicians. And at least some members of the public will gain a bit of understanding of the nature of the Republican/Democrat political charade in Jew-ridden America. They'll understand that if the Jews don't like you, then the media won't like you. And if the media don't like you, you won't get elected.

That alone will make these ongoing Republican primaries an enormously rewarding experience for America. It'll be a rewarding experience for me too. Sometimes I feel a bit awkward, talking week after week about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media, the Jewish control of the American political process, the Jewish control of the U.S. government.

People should be able to see these things for themselves. I shouldn't have to tell them the same things over and over again. The evidence is everywhere. It's obvious. But most people don't pay attention to it. They don't want to come to conclusions that might be considered "extremist." So they pretend that everything is all right, even when they know that it isn't. And they hope that someone like Pat Buchanan will come along and fix things.

And now they see Buchanan being attacked, first as an "extremist" and then as an "anti-Semite," for saying that we ought to restore the integrity of our borders, that we ought to enforce our immigration laws, that we ought to protect American workers from competition with Chinese and Mexican workers, that we ought not to start wars unless America's vital interests are threatened.

For that he's an "anti-Semite"?

Buchanan supporters should be able to draw their own conclusions. I hope that they will.

The Destructive Media

Jewish Control of the American Mass Media Has Real Consequences for the United States and the World

One of the subjects we've covered a number of times in this newsletter is the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media and the enormous damage this control is doing to America and to our people. We write about this so much because there's hardly anything in the world more important, hardly anything which demands our attention more urgently.

The evidence of the damage being done is quite obvious, but somehow many people manage to not notice that evidence. I had a newspaper reporter in my office a few weeks ago, and he asked me, "Why do you object to the Jews controlling the media? Aren't they running things about the same way anyone else would?"

I told him, "No, they're running things to fit their Jewish agenda, and that agenda is not good for us."

Then he asked me for specific examples: "What are the Jews doing with their control of the media that's harmful to us?"

Now, I really don't believe that the reporter wanted an answer to that question, because this was a man who knew which side his bread was buttered on. He couldn't **afford** to be thinking bad thoughts about the people on whom his career depended, but I gave him an answer anyway. I gave him some specific, concrete examples of the way in which the Jewish control of our news and entertainment media was damaging us as a people. Perhaps you'll be interested in hearing some of those examples too, and so I'll share them with you.

The first example I gave the reporter involved the largest media conglomerate in America, the Walt Disney Company. I reminded the reporter that Walt Disney, who was a Gentile -- who was one of us -- had been a pioneer in the motion picture industry. He was one of the men who built Hollywood. He built it by giving us films like *Snow White* and *Fantasia* and *Cinderella.* These were not just healthy, wholesome films: they were films which struck a deeply responsive chord in us, because Walt Disney shared our roots.

While Disney was winning a place in the hearts of people of European descent all over the world, the rest of Hollywood was being taken over by Jews. By the late 1920s it was apparent that not only was there money to be made in motion pictures, but motion pictures could become a very influential medium, and so Jews began taking over.

By the time Disney died he was about the only major non-Jewish film maker left in Hollywood. After his death Jews took control of the Disney company, and today it is controlled by Michael Eisner. Eisner immediately began making propaganda films **designed** to encourage degeneracy in viewers.

I gave to the reporter as an example of Eisner's films one that came out a couple of years ago and received all sorts of acclaim and awards from Jewish reviewers in the *New York Times* and other Jewish newspapers: it was *The Crying Game,* which was made by the Miramax division of Disney, a division headed by the Weinstein brothers. *The Crying Game* was a film about homosexuality and transvestitism and interracial sex. The message of the film was that these things are all right: that homosexuals and transvestites are people just like us, and that we should love them, and that it's all right for us to share their life-style.

Racial and sexual roles deliberately were made ambiguous in the film: a British soldier who just happens to be a Negro, an Irishman's mulatto girl friend who just happens to be a man wearing a dress. I doubt that I've ever seen a film with a sicker, more destructive message. And this film was held up by the Jewish media as wonderfully "sensitive," as wonderfully artistic. Nor was *The Crying Game* any sort of fluke or exception to the rule. Mr. Eisner has produced many other films with a similarly destructive message.

I also gave the reporter to whom I was speaking examples about the destructive way in which the Jews use their control of the news media. Do you remember the enormous hullabaloo in the news media a few months ago when two White soldiers at Fort Bragg, in North Carolina, got drunk and shot a convicted Black crack dealer and his female companion? It was on the television news and in the big newspapers day after day after day. "Racism in the Army!" the headlines were screaming. News commentators wrung their hands and agonized over "White supremacy" at Fort Bragg. "What can we do about White supremacy in the military?" they moaned. And, of course, the politicians, who certainly know which side their bread is buttered on, had to get into the act. The White House issued statements. The secretary of the Army announced that an investigation would be launched to find out about White racists in the Army and then to boot them out when it found them. We were treated to tearful television interviews with the relatives of the slain Black crack dealer. We're **still** hearing about the killing of this convicted Black criminal by two drunken White soldiers, as Jewish groups continue to use it as an example in their media campaign for new laws against what they call "hate crimes" and "hate speech." Just two weeks ago there was yet another big article about it headed "Extremism in the Ranks" in *Newsweek* magazine, which is owned by the Jewish *Washington Post.* Everybody has heard about this shooting at Fort Bragg.

Now I'll tell you about a shooting you haven't heard about -- unless you happen to live in the immediate vicinity of Camp Pendleton, the big Marine base in southern California. Last month, on March 5, 1996, a 28-year-old Marine sergeant who was stationed at Camp Pendleton hid a .45-caliber pistol under his jacket, walked into the office of the executive officer of his unit, Lt. Colonel Daniel Kidd, and shot Kidd twice in the back, killing him. He then turned his pistol on the commanding officer, Lt. Col. Thomas Heffner, and shot Heffner in the chest, critically wounding him.

Both Lt. Colonel Kidd and Lt. Colonel Heffner are White. The murderer, Sergeant Jessie Quintanilla, is a dark-skinned Pacific Islander from Guam. When Quintanilla ran out of the office after shooting the two White officers, he shouted that he had done it "for the Brown side" and that the killings of Whites would continue until all non-Whites are released from prison.

Amazingly, not even the San Diego-area newspapers, which could hardly avoid at least reporting the bare facts of the shootings, suggested that race was a motive or that the killing of Lt. Colonel Kidd was a "hate crime." They ignored the race factor. The national media, so far as I am aware, have scrupulously avoided the whole story. No statements from the White House, no call for investigations of Brown racism in the Marines, no headlines anywhere about "extremism," no calls from Jewish organizations for new laws to control "haters" in the military.

Now, what is the difference between the shootings at Fort Bragg and the shootings at Camp Pendleton which could have justified the glaring difference in the way they were treated by the controlled news media? Was it that the Fort Bragg shootings were a more serious crime than the Camp Pendleton shootings? Was the killing of a convicted Black drug dealer by two drunken White soldiers more newsworthy than the cold-blooded murder of a White Marine Corps officer with an outstanding service record by a non-White sergeant with a hatred of White people? Was the Fort Bragg shooting more cause for concern on the part of ordinary Americans than the Camp Pendleton shooting?

I don't think so.

Let me suggest that the difference in the way in which the shootings were treated by the news media stems from the fact that the Jewish bosses of the media have an agenda of their own, and they slant the news accordingly. They make the news fit their agenda. The Jews who control the news media have a program to "sensitize" White Americans about racial matters, and by that I mean that they want to instill in White Americans a sense of White racial guilt, to make White Americans feel that any sense of White racial solidarity is reprehensible, to persuade them that any White resistance to demands by non-Whites is "racist" and therefore wicked.

And so they deliberately -- I say deliberately, knowingly, calculatingly -- create the impression with their biased and selective reporting of the news that White attacks on non-Whites are a far bigger problem than non-White attacks on Whites, whereas exactly the opposite is true. The shooting at Fort Bragg suited the Jews' purpose, and so they gave it enormous publicity and drummed it into everyone's consciousness. The shooting at Camp Pendleton didn't suit their purpose, and so they gave it minimal coverage in the news media they control. That's the sort of thing I have in mind when I say that the Jewish control of the media is doing enormous damage to our people. It's giving the average American a grossly distorted view of the world.

I'll give you another example, one which most of us probably have heard about. In Chicago earlier this year a White mother and her two young children were murdered by Blacks in an especially horrible manner. The White woman was slashed open with a butcher knife, and an unborn infant was ripped from her womb by Blacks who wanted the baby. The woman's children, a ten-year-old daughter and an eight-year-old son, were stabbed to death. These were racial killings, but because the victims were White and the murderers were Black most of the media would have preferred to ignore them. The unusually atrocious nature of the crime caught the attention of the tabloids, however, and so the rest of the news media were obliged to give it minimal and grudging coverage. But there were no demands from Jewish organizations, like the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center, for new "hate crime" laws because of these hate-inspired murders. There were no hand-wringing editorials about the

murders in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.* The television networks wasted no tears on the victims. The whole attitude of the media was: the less said about these murders the better.

Can you imagine how different the treatment by the media would have been if the races of the victims and the murderers had been interchanged? Imagine that a gang of neo-Nazi skinheads had grabbed a pregnant Black woman and her two Black children, had stabbed the Black children to death and then killed the Black woman by ripping her open with a knife and tearing her unborn child from her body and running off with it. That would have been on the front page **and** the editorial page of the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post,* and every other Jewish newspaper in the country for weeks. Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather would still be telling us about it every evening. Every television screen in the country would still be full of politicians, priests, and rabbis telling us what we must do to eliminate "White racism." They would be telling us what kind of "racist" books and "racist" radio programs and "racist" music the skinheads were exposed to which led them to kill the Black family. And of course, spokesmen for the Southern Poverty Law Center and the Anti-Defamation League would be given non-stop media coverage as they clamored for laws to make Politically Incorrect speech illegal. You know that's the way it would be handled.

And that sort of slanted news is damaging, because tens of millions of White Americans actually believe what they see on television and read in the newspapers. They cannot distinguish between the real world and the slanted world portrayed by the media masters. They assume that real people behave the way the actors in Mr. Eisner's *The Crying Game* behaved; moreover, they assume that's approved behavior. They assume that the news stories selected for the evening television news programs are truly representative of what is happening in the world. Their opinions and attitudes are shaped by the slanted world of the media rather than by the real world. In the long run this Jewish media control is not just damaging: it is lethal. It will destroy us. And that, of course, is just what it is intended to do.

Here's another specific example of the way in which the Jewish control of our media is used to damage us as a people. Do you remember the Republic of South Africa? Do you remember what the media did to that country? Let me remind you. For years the mass media in America maintained a solid wall of hostility against South Africa. The Whites there were unspeakably wicked, according to the media, because they practiced a system they called "apartheid," which simply means apartness, or separation of the races.

Now, it is true that we always have had a busybody element among our own people -- egalitarians and other foolish or malicious types who always are looking for an opportunity to force others to conform to their ideas -- but without the support of the Jewish media the busybody element would not have been able to do much damage. It was the controlled media which made "apartheid" a dirty word; it was the controlled media which made the attitude toward South Africa a major political issue in this country; it was the controlled media which made a government enforced boycott of trade with South Africa politically popular; it was the controlled media which viciously attacked anyone who had a good word to say about South Africa; it was the controlled media over here which provided a forum for the handful of South African traitors and terrorists who were trying to destabilize their own society.

And ultimately it was the controlled media which destroyed South Africa. As the economic damage to South Africa from the trade boycott mounted, White South Africans found themselves under increasing pressure. Furthermore, they were being subjected to the same anti-White hate propaganda that we were. The films they saw, the television programs they watched in South Africa came from Hollywood and New York. And eventually the South Africans became so demoralized that they foolishly turned their country over to Black rule, hoping that somehow that would make the world love them and their economy would improve.

What actually has happened, of course, is that crime and mismanagement have skyrocketed and standards have fallen, and now the White South Africans who are able to go some place else are leaving. What has happened to every other country in sub-Saharan Africa after the Whites turned the government over to the Blacks is now happening to South Africa. It is slipping back toward the jungle. And the controlled media in America played the largest single role in bringing this result about.

And this result was deliberate. It was calculated. It was planned. It was not because of any fuzzy-minded, do-gooder sentiment on the part of the media bosses. They knew exactly what they were doing. It was cold-blooded. Compare this media concern with equality for Blacks in South Africa with the attitude of the media toward the behavior of the Jewish government in Israel. That government practices what is known as collective punishment. If a Palestinian is suspected of being a freedom fighter -- suspected, not convicted -- the Jewish government punishes his whole family. His wife, his parents, his children will be arrested and tortured. The house they live in will be blown up. Have you ever heard the controlled media criticize this sort of behavior?

Now, patriots have various concerns, various priorities. Some of them believe that we should concern ourselves first and foremost with the way the U.S. government handles its finances, with ruinous taxation and scandalous welfare programs. Some of them believe that our out-of-control immigration situation is our most pressing problem. Others are concerned primarily with the government's failure to deal effectively with street crime. And some have focused on the breakdown of our educational system under the impact of forced equality, or on the decay of our morals.

But I tell you that we can solve none of these problems until we regain control of our news and entertainment media. So long as the Jews control our mass media they will control our politicians, and so long as they control our politicians they will control the policies of the government. We will not be able to shut down the welfare system or control our borders or make our cities safe or restore our standards and values so long as the controlled mass media are able to make a majority of our people feel guilty for wanting to do these things, so long as the media are able to make people believe that keeping Mexicans and Haitians out of the country or shutting off the flow of welfare is racist, and that racism is the worst of all sins.

So long as the Jews control our mass media they will be able to keep enough of our people confused and misled and divided so that we cannot regain control of our government by peaceful, democratic means.

If we are to regain control of our destiny and survive as a people, then we have only two choices: violent revolution to take the control of the mass media back by force, or gentle but effective persuasion to lead more and more of our people from confusion into understanding.

I personally believe that violent revolution is not feasible at this time, and as long as the course of gentle persuasion remains open to us, that is the course we must choose. I believe that the only proper thing for us to do now is to continue building our own media and making them more effective -- media like our series of radio broadcasts and our World Wide Web sites on the Internet and the books and magazines published by National Vanguard Books.

Men of Valor

We Must Have Such Men if the West Is to Survive

Several weeks ago the actor Marlon Brando was interviewed on a television talk show, and he got a little careless. He blurted out something which everyone in the media and in show business knows, but which no one is supposed to say. Marlon Brando said that Jews own and run Hollywood, and that they run it for their own benefit: they run it to suit themselves and no one else. The films they make portray other ethnic groups unfavorably, but the Jews portray themselves only in the most favorable light.

Well, sir, what else is new? Next someone will be announcing that the earth goes around the sun!

You know, that's a funny thing: the Jews and their allies reacted to Brando's statement about the way the Christian church reacted 400 years ago to Galileo's statement about the relationship between the earth and the sun. They screamed for Brando's blood. And at the same time they tried to obscure the issue and distract people's attention away from the central point: namely, the Jewish control of the media.

They called Brando an "anti-Semite." They began wailing about the so-called "Holocaust." They stepped up their demands for laws against what they like to call "hate speech."

The same sort of thing happened about a year ago, when a British journalist, a reporter for the London *Daily Telegraph,* wrote an article about Hollywood pointing out that all of the top executives in the motion picture industry are Jews. The Jewish establishment greeted this revelation in exactly the same way, denying what was obviously true and at the same time trying to make people feel guilty for realizing that it was true. They yelled "anti-Semitism" and trotted out their favorite gas-chamber stories. Weren't six million enough? they moaned. **So much hate!** They acted as if the simple statement of truth about their control of Hollywood were an act of persecution, and that anyone who didn't immediately blot it from his mind were an "anti-Semite."

Now, this sort of behavior -- this pretense of shocked and wounded innocence -- has worked wonderfully for the Jews for the past 50 years. They've been able to intimidate most people into keeping their mouths shut most of the time. They have made the average American so afraid of being labeled a "racist" or an "anti-Semite" that they have been able to enforce their own code of Political Correctness: a code under which one may say nothing about a Jew except an expression of praise or sympathy.

It's a fascinating situation. They've been able to enforce this code, under which no one may say that they control the media, only because they **do** control the media: it is their control of the media which gives them the power to enforce their code of Political Correctness on the public. And they certainly have most of the public buffaloed.

Or do they? They raised such a fuss about Marlon Brando's comments earlier this month that an Internet poll was taken to find out what the public reaction to the fuss was. One of the major

Internet access providers, Prodigy, took the poll, and the results were encouraging. The Prodigy poll found that despite all of the Jewish screaming about Brando's comments being "anti-Semitic," half of those polled didn't think what Brando had said was anti-Semitic at all, but was a simple statement of fact. Jews do give themselves especially favorable treatment in Hollywood films, they said.

Yes, it is encouraging to learn that despite all the media brainwashing 50% of the public hasn't been fooled. That raises my estimate of the public's intelligence and power of perception.

Now, if that 50% would be willing to stand up and say in public what they will say in an anonymous poll, my estimate of the public's character and courage also would be raised -- and so would my hopes for the future of our people.

You know, it is important to be intelligent and perceptive. It is important not to be fooled by our enemies; it is important to be able to see through their lies and deception. But it is more important -- much more important -- to have courage and to be honorable in one's behavior. It is important to have valor. That's something which is sadly lacking in America today, I'm afraid. Despite what Mr. Brando said, I'm not inclined to give him credit for much valor; I'm inclined to believe that he had a few martinis in him when he gave that interview, because the next day he was groveling and apologizing.

What's really unfortunate is that we don't have a valorous ruling class in America to provide leadership and to set standards for others. Without such a class the country cannot long survive.

We do have a ruling class of sorts, of course; there is always a ruling class of some type. But the men who rule America today are certainly not men of valor. They are lawyers, bureaucrats, rich businessmen, scribes and Pharisees.

They are men without ideology, men whose only fixed principle is always to do what is advantageous for themselves. And, in a sense, they are the "best" of their type: that is, they have worked harder, been smarter and meaner, and hewed more closely to the party line -- to the established body of cant -- than those who didn't make it to the top. The "fittest" in any society survive and prosper.

But valor, unfortunately, does not seem to have survival value in 20th-century American society -- at least, not the kind of valor which we remember fondly from bygone centuries. What would an old-fashioned Yankee or a Southern gentleman do in today's America? How would he react upon encountering a Black male swaggering down the sidewalk with a White woman on his arm? Suppose he came face to face on the street with one of the filthy creatures who has made a career in politics, the media, or the pulpit by helping to bring about the state of affairs in which White women dare to be seen in public on the arms of Blacks. How long could a valorous man stay out of prison?

The best men today know that they are living in enemy-occupied territory, and upon such a sidewalk encounter they only grit their teeth and pass in silent rage, while the worst display an ingratiating smile.

I'm reminded of something Alexander Solzhenitsyn wrote about life in the Soviet Union 70 years ago, when the Jews and their allies were consolidating their grip on the Russian people. In cities like Moscow, Solzhenitsyn wrote, the black vans would go out from secret-police headquarters every night. A van would pull up in front of an apartment building, and four or five secret-police agents would get out and knock on a door. Then they would make an arrest: someone who had been overheard making a Politically Incorrect remark or had been seen reading a Politically Incorrect book. The person would be taken away and never be seen again. This happened hundreds of times every night. The head of the secret police was an especially vicious Jewish thug named Genrikh Yagoda. The arrests and the murders in the basement of secret-police headquarters went on night after night, month after month. And Solzhenitsyn lamented the fact that no one ever put up any resistance.

Even though the Reds had confiscated most privately owned firearms, there were still a few around. Even without firearms, it wouldn't have been especially difficult for a few brave and determined men -- a few men of valor -- to ambush one of these secret-police patrols and kill the secret policemen. After this had happened a few times, the patrols very likely would have found other things to concern themselves with besides arresting Politically Incorrect citizens. The cops could have spent more time with their donuts and coffee, and Yagoda could have spent more time preparing his next Five-Year-Plan.

But there was no resistance. There were no men of valor. The people were like sheep. The murders continued. And I'm afraid that after the Jews have their "hate crime" and "hate speech" laws in place in this country, Americans will put up no more resistance to the FBI than the Russians did to their secret police 70 years ago.

One of my favorite authors is Brooks Adams, the 19th-century American economist and historian. In his book *The Law of Civilization and Decay* Adams put forth the idea that the spiritual climate of a particular period in history favors the survival and proliferation of men with a particular inner orientation, while driving men with a different orientation out of existence, much in the way the physical environment favors or disfavors a particular somatic trait.

Adams divided men roughly into two classes: spiritual man and economic man. The former are what I would call men of valor. Adams saw their epitome in the English yeomanry of the Middle Ages: freeholding farmer-warriors. They flourish during the period when a new civilization is being established.

The other class, economic man, epitomized by the merchants and bureaucrats who later replaced the yeomen, flourishes during the period of a civilization's decay and collapse. Adams pinpointed democracy as an institution congenial to economic man but especially inimical to the existence of spiritual man.

The entire Western world -- not just America -- has been spiritually dead since the Second World War. Economic man has swarmed over its corpse, fattening himself on its material remains and multiplying mightily. Physical collapse may not yet be imminent, but the decadence is profound and irreversible. Valor, sorely needed to see us through the coming night and hold us to a worthy purpose until the new dawn, is a memory growing fainter by the decade.

As the West continues its slide into chaos, strong men, White and non-White, will rise to provide some degree of order and security for their adherents. Some will not be much more than local mafia chiefs; others will carve out regional or even national constituencies based on common economic interests, common ideologies, common ethnicities, or some combination of these.

In each case the leaders of these groups will be distinguished by valor of a sort. They will be men who have proved themselves tougher, more energetic and aggressive, and cleverer than their rivals. They will command respect as well as obedience from the members of their groups -- which is more than can be said for America's present ‘leaders. ‘

We will see more and more a return to leadership based on personal strength rather than institutional sanction -- to natural leadership, the kind which existed among our people thousands of years ago, before we began building cities and writing laws, and which still exists among many non-White populations today. That's also still the way it is in some more-or-less civilized areas just outside the borders of the Western world: in places like Lebanon, for example, and in Latin America.

Now, rule by mafia bosses may be fine for Levantines and Latins, but we need more than a valor based only on toughness, cleverness, and ambition. The West has no shortage of tough, clever, ambitious men. And we still have many who are physically strong and courageous -- although perhaps not so many these days as we would like.

The valor we remember -- and the valor we must have again -- depends at least as much on moral courage as on physical courage. Even more, it depends on the inner sense of direction which must guide the man of valor, if his courage and strength are to be used to a worthy end.

Originally the word valor meant value, worth. A man's worth was a measure not of what he owned or controlled, however -- not of how many shares he could buy in the stock market or how many votes he could collect at the polls -- but of what he was.

The ideal man of valor is guided unerringly by his inner compass. He is imperturbable and implacable. His loyalty to his cause is his honor, and his actions are as unaffected by considerations of personal comfort or safety as by the opinions of lesser men.

How can we have such men to lead us in this age of Jewish television, democracy, and the supremacy of the marketplace?

A man does not acquire valor simply by making a resolution to act valorously; it is the product of a lifetime of right living and right thinking by a man born with the right stuff in him.

Surely, men of our race are still being born with the right stuff. Economic man may be forcing spiritual man out of existence generation by generation, but the process is not complete yet.

Our problem is to provide an environment which does not stunt or warp the spirits of our best men and women. The environment which prevails in America today produces from our best stock merely lawyers tricky enough to out-shyster the trickiest Jew, businessmen hard-driving

enough to beat out the most grasping Levantine competitor, professionals in every field willing to jettison scruples and truckle to alien arbiters in order to stay ahead of the pack. Children raised on a steady diet of MTV simply do not become men or women of valor.

When the chaos in America has grown to the point that there is no longer steady work for lawyers and corporation executives, the same stock will yield merely gang leaders meaner and tougher than the meanest and toughest mafioso rival, **if** the spiritual climate remains unchanged.

What we must do, no matter what it takes, is change that climate. We must devise a way to nurture the best seed that we have and to provide a regimen and a tutoring, an upbringing and an inculcation, for the yield of that seed which will once again give us men of real valor, in the best sense of the word.

It certainly would be easier to do this, easier to create a new atmosphere in which valor can flourish, if we controlled the news and entertainment media which our enemies control. If we, instead of the Jews about whom Mr. Brando complained, owned Hollywood, for example, we could do a lot in that direction.

Well, we don't own Hollywood, and we don't control the television networks, and we don't own the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*, like the enemies of our people do, but we do get *American Dissident Voices* out every week on shortwave radio and on satellite and on a number of AM radio stations. You also can listen to *ADV* broadcasts on the Internet, if you have a computer with a fast modem and a sound card. Just check our World Wide Web site at www.natvan.com. At our web site you can listen to the current week's broadcast as well as a collection of our earlier broadcasts. Even if you don't have a sound card, you can download free copies of the transcripts of our programs.

Our work to make *ADV* programs available to a broad section of the public through a number of different media is possible only with your support. We're working now to extend the reach of our message by adding new broadcasting stations to our network. We're also working to develop new media for our message. We want to reach the public through video and through CDs as well as through radio. We need your help to do this. We can't do it without your help.

And we need your help **now,** because the people who own Hollywood and their allies in the Clinton government are pushing very hard for new laws which would make our broadcasts illegal. They want to be able to put people like Marlon Brando in prison for telling the truth about the Hollywood Jews. They want to put me and my associates in prison for bringing you the truth through the radio and through the Internet and through the books and magazines which we publish. They want to make telling the truth about them a "hate crime." They want to scrap the First Amendment, so that they can label as "hate speech" any expression of truth they don't like and make it illegal.

They work through Jewish organizations like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center. These un-American organizations attempt to frighten the public into giving up their freedom in return for the promise of a little more security. And they work through the government. The people in the Clinton

administration are eager to give them the new laws they want. Bill Clinton and Janet Reno would love to round up everyone who is not Politically Correct. The only thing which holds them back is fear of the public reaction. They're afraid of what that 50% of the public who agree with Mr. Brando might do.

Our job is to keep disseminating the truth as widely as we can, so that that 50% will grow to 60% and 70% and 80%. Our job is let the Clintonistas know that when they move to take away our freedom they will have a revolution on their hands. Our job is to build a pipeline for truth and inspiration so big that it cannot be shut off.

And, with your help, one of these days we will take Hollywood away from the Jews and we will use it to build a new climate in America: a climate in which valor can once again flourish.

Proving White Is Black

I have written before about the breakdown of the judicial system in this country. Right after the O.J. Simpson trial last year I pointed out that the courts in America have become terminally corrupt. I gave you an example of this corruption: the 1992 trial of a young White man named George Loeb in a Florida court. That was a case in which Mr. Loeb and his wife had gone to a supermarket to shop and in the parking lot nearly had their car struck by a car driven by a young Black male. Angry words were exchanged. Then the Black male drove away, and the Loebs did their shopping.

When the Loebs returned to their car, the Black male drove back into the parking lot, this time with a Black friend. He got out of his car and approached the Loebs' car on foot. He had a brick in his hand and was screaming that he intended to smash Mr. Loeb's head in with the brick. Mr. Loeb snatched a pistol from the glove compartment of his car and shot the Black dead. It was a clear case of self-defense.

A Jewish prosecutor, however, charged Mr. Loeb with murder, and he was put on trial. With the permission of a cooperative judge, the prosecutor read to the jury personal correspondence which had been illegally seized from Mr. Loeb's home. The correspondence revealed that Mr. Loeb had a strong dislike for Blacks. It revealed that he was a "White racist."

The jury did the Politically Correct thing and found Mr. Loeb guilty of murder. Then the judge did the Politically Correct thing and sentenced him to **life in prison.**

At the time I told you about the Loeb trial I pointed out that similarly horrifying things happen in our court system all the time, and that the average person never hears about them. I pointed out that the O.J. Simpson trial was unusual only in the amount of publicity it received, but not in its failure to yield a just verdict.

Now let's talk about another recent trial which illustrates my point. That's the New York trial of Bernhard Goetz. Perhaps you remember when this case first came to public attention, 12 years ago. Goetz, a 36-year-old electronics engineer, was riding the New York subway when four Black thugs approached him and demanded that he give them money. Goetz responded in a perfectly reasonable way: he pulled out his revolver and shot all four of them. Unfortunately, he didn't kill them, although he did cripple one of them. The three Blacks who weren't crippled recovered and continued their lives of crime. And New York being what it is, Goetz was arrested and charged with attempted murder for protecting himself. He was also charged with having a weapon to defend himself. He ended up going to prison for the better part of a year for possessing a gun to defend himself.

And then a couple of Jewish lawyers from the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild, William Kunstler and Ronald Kuby, sued Mr. Goetz on behalf of one of the Blacks who had tried to rob him. The case dragged through the courts, using up all of Mr. Goetz' savings. Kunstler died during the process, but Kuby persevered. The case finally went to the jury last month: a Bronx, New York, jury of four Blacks and two Puerto Ricans. The jury decided that

Mr. Goetz should pay $43 million to the Black who had tried to rob him **forty-three million dollars!** The Jewish lawyer gloated over the verdict and crowed that it "sends a message to all racists with guns who think young Black lives are worth nothing. They're worth a lot."

Score another loss for decent folks. Score another win for the Clintonistas. Score another win for the forces of corruption and destruction. Score another win for the Jews.

You know, I don't want to create the impression that I believe that the destruction of America's system of justice is entirely the Jews' doing. They certainly are heavily involved in it. They were heavily involved -- decisively involved -- in all three cases I've cited as examples of what's happened to our judicial system: the O.J. Simpson trial, the George Loeb trial, and the Bernhard Goetz trial. Jews are heavily involved in the corruption and destruction of every aspect of our civilization. It's in their nature. But to be frank, our legal system was in serious trouble even before the Jews became involved in it.

Nearly three centuries ago -- 270 years ago to be exact -- the English writer Jonathan Swift wrote of the lawyers of his day that they are "men . . . bred up from their youth in the art of proving by words multiplied for the purpose that white is black, and black is white, according as they are paid." Swift went on to give a satirical illustration of the way the court system worked in the England of his day. I'll quote just a few words of what he wrote. It's from his best-known book, *Gulliver's Travels,* and I'm paraphrasing it a bit. Swift explained:

My neighbor . . . I will suppose, has a mind to my cow; he hires . . . [a lawyer] to prove that he ought to have my cow from me. I must then hire another of them to defend my right, it being against all rules of law that any man should be allowed to speak for himself. Now in this case, I who am the right owner lie under two great disadvantages. First, my advocate, being as I said before practiced almost from his cradle in defending falsehood, is quite out of his element when he would argue for right, which as an office unnatural he attempts with great awkwardness, if not with an ill will. The second disadvantage is that my advocate must proceed with great caution, for since the maintenance of so many depends on the keeping up of business, should he proceed too summarily, if he does not incur the displeasure of his superiors, he is sure to gain the ill will and hatred of his brethren as being by them esteemed one that would lessen the practice of the law.

This being the case, I have but two methods to preserve my cow. The first is to gain over my adversary's advocate with a double fee . . . . The second way is for my advocate not to insist on the justice of my cause, by allowing the cow to belong to my adversary; and this if it be dexterously and skillfully done will go a great way toward obtaining a favorable verdict, it having been found from a careful observation of issues and events that the wrong side, under the management of such practitioners, has the fairer chance for success . . . .

It is a maxim among these lawyers that whatever hath been done before may legally be done again, and therefore they take special care to record all the decisions formerly made against common justice and the general reason of mankind. These, under the name of precedents, they produce as authorities to justify the most iniquitous opinions....

In pleading they studiously avoid entering into the merits of the cause, but are loud, violent, and tedious in dwelling on all circumstances which are not to the purpose. For instance, in the case already mentioned they never desire to know what claim my adversary hath to my cow, but whether the said cow were red or black, her horns long or short, whether the field I graze her in be round or square, whether she were milked at home or abroad, what diseases she is subject to, and the like. After which, they consult precedents, adjourn the cause from time to time, and in ten, twenty, or thirty years come to an issue.

Now Swift, as I mentioned, was a satirist, but there was much truth in what he wrote about the lawyers and the judicial system of three hundred years ago. It is striking how little that system has changed between Swift's day and ours.

Four hundred years ago, at a time when there were no Jews at all in England, Shakespeare had one of the characters in his play *King Henry VI* say, "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers." And that expression of popular sentiment was already widespread in Shakespeare's day -- and not without reason.

The basic problem is that our legal profession never has been a profession devoted to justice, but rather to arguing, as Swift noted, that white is black or black is white, according as its practitioners are paid. The principal aim of the profession is the enrichment of lawyers, and the court system functions accordingly. And the lawyers who become judges and rule over this system tend not to be the most just, but rather the slickest, slyest, and most ambitious men of their profession.

It was a bad system to start with, and that's our fault. It's something we really must straighten out by ourselves one of these days. But it has been made much, much worse by the Jewish influx into the system during this century. It has gotten to the point now where Blacks can literally get away with murder, if they have the money to hire a clever lawyer and if they can get a preponderance of Blacks on the jury. And Whites can expect to be crucified by the system, in any case where race is an issue, if they either cannot afford to pay a sufficiently clever and aggressive lawyer, or if they are unfortunate enough to have a preponderance of non-Whites on their jury. Poor Bernhard Goetz suffered both from an incompetent lawyer -- Jewish lawyer, incidentally, just like his adversary's lawyer -- and from a non-White jury. The fellow's life has been ruined because he dared to resist a gang of Black muggers.

Now, all of this does not mean that it is impossible for a White person to get justice in our courts. If one is lucky, one will not have the unfortunate circumstances that George Loeb and Bernhard Goetz had. And of course, it helps a great deal to be rich. Those who are very wealthy can still hope to buy justice in the courts -- if they don't live in a place like New York or Los Angeles, of course. There are still a few honorable and competent lawyers in the profession. I know some of them personally. There may even be an honest judge or two left in the system, who still put the law above Political Correctness.

Nevertheless, those of us who have only modest means must look at an encounter with the legal justice system in America about like a game of Russian roulette, especially where there is any racial issue. We've seen over and over again, and not just in the O.J. Simpson trial, the reluctance

of Black juries to convict Black criminals for offenses against Whites. And we've seen the same sort of racially motivated verdicts when Whites are tried by non-White juries. The fact is that non-White jurors usually have a strong sense of racial consciousness. They vote in accordance with their racial feelings instead of in accordance with the law and the evidence.

And White jurors, unfortunately, lack this sense of racial consciousness. They are far more likely to vote in a Politically Correct manner, as they did in the George Loeb case, or to let themselves be intimidated into going along with the Blacks, as was the case with the two White women on the O.J. Simpson jury. White Americans have been so brainwashed and browbeaten by the controlled media that they are afraid to express even the tiniest bit of racial feeling. There is nothing they fear more than being thought to be "racist." Some of them have even let their natural racial feelings become inverted: their racial consciousness has become racial self-hatred. They automatically favor the non-White side in any racial issue.

So a judicial system which was bad enough back in the days when America was still a White country has become much, much worse in the racially polarized country we have today. Can you imagine what it will be like in another 50 years, when Whites will be a minority in America? Imagine that you've been obliged to shoot a Black or Mexican burglar in your home or to defend your wife against a gang of non-White attackers. Imagine a Jewish prosecutor then forcing you to stand trial before a jury which has a non-White majority. A frightening prospect, isn't it, regardless of whether or not the prosecutor will introduce any evidence that your opinions on racial matters are not Politically Correct?

One would think that the legal profession itself would have tried to keep matters from becoming as bad as they have, if only from self-interest. They understand as well as anyone that when the public loses its last traces of confidence in the system of justice, the lawyers will be in trouble. But instead of trying to keep the system working, they have let it be corrupted even further by Jewish pressure groups pushing for what they call "hate crime" legislation. We've all heard this yammering in the media about the need for new laws to stop "hate crimes." The Jewish groups doing the pushing -- groups such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center -- are referred to respectfully by the media as "human rights organizations," but that's a **terrible** misnomer. These organizations are working to take away our rights. They want to make it illegal to say anything they don't like. Anything they don't like they call "hate speech." In the past they used to apply behind-the-scenes pressure in order to stifle any views they didn't like. They would approach publishers and demand that any book they deemed hostile to their own interests be withdrawn from publication. They wrote to librarians and demanded that books they didn't like be taken off the shelves. They contacted the owners of bookstores with the same demand.

In fact, they're still engaged in this sort of secret censorship. The Southern Poverty Law Center and other Jewish organizations right now are putting pressure on bookstore chains in an effort to keep one of my books, *The Turner Diaries*, out of circulation. They like to wave it around on television and quote from it and tell everyone what a dangerous book it is, what a racist book it is, but they don't want you to be able to read it for yourself.

Fortunately, most bookstore owners are becoming resistant to this sort of un-American censorship effort. So these Jewish groups are lobbying the lawyers and the politicians. They want the legislators in Congress to help them abolish the First Amendment.

And they've also been lobbying for more laws against what they call "hate crime." To them George Loeb was a "hate criminal" because he defended himself and his wife against a Black attacker threatening them with a brick. And Bernhard Goetz is a "hate criminal" because he defended himself against four Black muggers on the subway. White people who defend themselves against Blacks are "hate criminals."

Now, they won't come right out and state it that plainly, of course. But that's what they mean when they talk about "hate crime." They want Whites to be afraid to defend themselves. They want White people to be demoralized and intimidated. They want every White person to feel guilty for even thinking about defending himself or his family or his property from the growing flood of non-Whites all around him. That's what the Jewish lawyer who first bankrupted Bernhard Goetz with litigation and then got a $43 million judgment against him meant when he gloatingly announced that the verdict of the non-White jury "sends a message to all racists with guns." "You can't defend yourselves from us," Kuby was smirking. In effect, he was saying, "If you don't let us do whatever we want, you're a hate criminal, and we'll use the justice system to destroy you."

And in fact, that's what's happening. The court system in America has become so corrupt that it is being used by the enemies of our people to take away our most fundamental rights. And those who have corrupted the system are working day and night to institutionalize the corruption. They are working with the politicians to ensure that the shocking miscarriages of justice they obtained in the Loeb trial in Florida and the Goetz trial in New York become the rule everywhere. And the White lawyers and judges are putting up very little resistance. They don't want to rock the boat. They don't want to endanger their own positions in the system. They know that anything they say against what is happening will be condemned by the controlled media and by many of their own colleagues as À "hate speech." So they're permitting the Jews to corrupt the system and in many cases are even helping them.

What can we do about this frightening and depressing situation, besides trying our best to avoid any encounter with courts or lawyers? Shall we promise ourselves that if we ever have to shoot a burglar we'll just get rid of the body and not call the police? Shall we promise ourselves that if we ever have to defend ourselves against a non-White mugger we'll leave no witnesses alive to testify against us?

No, that's really not practical in many cases.

The first thing that we can do is stop being frightened and depressed and instead become angry. Our enemies want us to be frightened and depressed. That's what they intend when they gloat and announce that they're sending a message to all racists with guns. So instead of being intimidated by this Jewish arrogance, we must become enraged. We must become boiling mad. We must let our anger reinforce our determination to put a final and total end to their corrupt system, no matter what it takes.

And the second thing that we must do is speak up. Don't remain silent in the face of this Jewish assault on our freedom and on our civilization. When a mostly Black jury frees a Black murderer, as in the O.J. Simpson trial, express your outrage! Don't be afraid of being called a "racist." When a White man is punished for defending himself against Black criminals, speak up! Tell people what you think.

That's what we're doing with this web page. We're telling people what we think about the destruction of our justice system. And we're finding that more and more people agree with us.

You speak up too! Don't be afraid!

The Big Picture

A Bare-Bones Outline of Our Present Predicament

What's the most important thing in your life?

Is it making as much money as possible?

Is it getting along with other people and being popular?

Is it security? Is it happiness?

Well, of course, most of us would like to have financial security, and we would like to be happy. But for some of us there's something more important than security and personal happiness. I'm addressing now the more serious-minded listeners, the ones who are capable of understanding things like duty and **responsibility.**

Duty and responsibility: those are almost bad words these days -- definitely not fashionable. We've been conditioned by the media to be suspicious of people who talk about such things. This is the feel-good generation, the MTV generation. But really, we know that more important than feeling good is **doing** good, doing right. The most important thing for us is using our lives in the right way. The most important thing is having the right purpose and serving that purpose effectively.

We need to look beyond our bank accounts and our personal hobbies and our immediate circle of friends in order to find purpose. We need to see ourselves set in a larger context. We need to understand how our own lives are important as a part of the world around us: not just the world of here and now, but also the world of the future and the world of the past. We need to see our own lives as a part of the historical process.

When we do this, when we see ourselves in context, then we begin to understand our responsibility, our purpose. We begin to understand what's really important in our lives. We see that we have a responsibility to the people who came before us and made it possible for us to live, the people whose genius and work and sacrifice built our world for us, built our civilization for us, gave us our culture. We have a responsibility to ensure that their toil and sacrifice were not in vain.

And we have a responsibility to the people who will come after us, a responsibility to all the future generations of our people. We must ensure that what we have inherited from our ancestors will be preserved and enhanced and strengthened by us and passed on to those who will follow us.

This is the most important thing in our lives: understanding this purpose, accepting this responsibility. At least, it is the most important thing for those of us who are serious about our lives, those of us who have not become corrupted and trivialized by watching too much MTV.

So we need to be concerned about what's happening to our world today. We need to become involved in it. We need to accept responsibility for it. That's the whole reason for *Free Speech* and *American Dissident Voices.* It's to help with understanding what's happening, and it's to provide a little push, a little inspiration, to get you involved.

In past broadcasts I've talked about many specific aspects of what we need to be concerned about. I've talked about specific threats to our world. I've talked about the breakdown of our system of justice, and I've given you specific examples: the acquittal of O.J. Simpson after he murdered two people, and the $43 million verdict against Bernard Goetz for defending himself against Black muggers. I've talked about the lies and the hypocrisy of the government in Washington. I've talked about the government's ruinous trade policy. I've talked about the Jewish monopoly control of the news and entertainment media in America and the destructive way in which that control is used. I've talked to you about the movement to get rid of our Bill of Rights, the movement to scrap the First and Second Amendments, the movement to make it illegal for us to write or say anything which is not Politically Correct, and to take away our means to defend our rights against those who want to abolish them.

And all of these things are important. We must look at details, we must look at specifics, if we are to understand what to do. Today, though, I'd like to look at the big picture. I want to talk to you about what has happened to us, and why, and what we must do about it.

First, let's back off a bit, so that we can see the picture more clearly. Three hundred years ago, when nearly all of our ancestors were still in Europe, we had a pretty good grip on things. We were involved in the historical process. We had a feeling for our past and a sense of responsibility to the future. No one was telling us that it was wicked or racist or anti-Semitic or hateful to want to ensure a better world for our descendants. That was because we still had our wits about us, more or less, and we did not let anyone into our midst whose aim was to weaken us and destroy us. We had no MTV. We were all Whites; we were all Europeans. We had no slaves, no non-Whites among us. We kept the Jews in their ghettos and very tightly circumscribed their activities. It was just us. We had common roots and a common concern for the future.

Now, I'm oversimplifying things a bit to make my point, of course. Europeans did have disagreements among themselves. We did have wars from time to time. We did mistreat each other. But it was just us. It was all in the family. We had no aliens among us exercising influence over us and hating us and planning our destruction. Our books and our journals were written by us and were published by us. There was no Jew-controlled television. Our young people were taught in our schools and our universities by us, not by clever aliens attempting to corrupt and subvert.

And among ourselves -- just us -- we were building a great civilization. In the 18th and 19th centuries we created a world of science and music and literature and painting which greatly surpassed anything which had come before. And we spread our dominion over the earth. Wherever we went we conquered: in the Middle East and India, in the Far East -- and in the West, in the New World. We were proud and self-confident. We knew who we were. We were White. We were European. We did not mix with those who were not European. When we needed

land for our people, we took it. If anyone raised his hand against us, we struck him down. And thus we built America. And it was a strong and good and progressive nation, a White nation.

We did make mistakes during the past 300 years, though. In America we brought in Black slaves to work the land in the South, and we brought in Chinese coolies to work as laborers in the West. We kept ourselves separate from these non-White slaves and servants, but bringing them into our living space laid the groundwork for our present disaster.

In France and elsewhere in Europe, we let ourselves be hypnotized by false propaganda about equality. We are all equal, all the same, this propaganda said, and we all should mix and be brothers, and no man should have more than another. So we let the Jews out of their ghettoes and we let them become citizens of European countries. They repaid us by corrupting our music and our literature and by subverting every European institution. One of them, a Jew named Marx, launched Communism, which eventually enslaved half of our world and murdered tens of millions of our people, often the best elements among our people. The brightest and most energetic and most successful of our people were butchered by the tens of millions by the Communists in Europe.

In America they were not able to succeed with Communism, but they infiltrated and took over our mass media of news and entertainment: our films, radio, television, book publishing, and major newspapers. And with these media they pushed the false propaganda of liberalism: We are all equal, they said, Black and White and Chinaman and Jew, all the same -- except that you Whites have the stain of guilt on you for having thought yourselves better than the rest of us, and now you must make it up to us for having mistreated us in the past.

And with this propaganda they wormed their way into our educational establishment, into our government, into all of our institutions. And because they controlled so many of the media, there was hardly a voice of opposition, hardly a voice of sanity and reason to be heard in opposition to their propaganda, and they were able to corrupt the minds of millions of young Americans. They were able to instill feelings of racial guilt and racial self-hatred into two generations of young White people.

And with their growing influence they were able to open America's borders to the non-White world, and they were able to force racial integration on our schools, our work places, our neighborhoods. They replaced our European music with jazz and rock and rap. They introduced what they fondly call "modernism" into art and literature, replacing our culture with a Judaized trash culture. They overturned the laws against miscegenation. They persuaded the leaders of the Christian churches to join their revolution against the White world. They turned our government into a cesspool, occupied by people like Bill and Hillary Clinton.

And so here we are today, at the end of the 20th century, facing the prospect of becoming a minority in our own country before the middle of the next century, and so paralyzed by fear and guilt and self-hatred that while some of us look forward eagerly to our self-extinction most of the rest of us refuse to do anything to avert it.

Quite a mess!

Now, I have greatly oversimplified the picture, just so that we could grasp the most important features. I have not mentioned the minority of Jews who never engaged in or supported the subversive activities of the majority of Jews. I have not talked about all of the criminals among our own people, besides the Clintons, who have collaborated with the Jews. Those are details which are important, and I have discussed those details in other broadcasts. But right now we want to grasp just the coarsest features of our predicament. We want to understand, in a very rough simple way, what our situation is and what we must do about it. I'll spell out these rough and simple features:

First, America has been transformed from a White country before the Second World War, a White country in which the 10% non-White portion of the population was strictly segregated from the White population, into a multiracial morass today. The non-White population in America is increasing so rapidly that it will constitute a majority, and we will be a minority, within the next 50 years.

Second, America's government is deliberately and forcefully implementing this racial transformation. The government, an institution which our ancestors created to be the guardian of our welfare, has become the deadliest enemy of our people. It is deliberate government policy which is responsible for the flood of non-White immigrants, both legal and illegal, now pouring across our borders. It is deliberate government policy which feeds and houses and encourages the breeding of the huge and growing non-White underclass in our cities. It is deliberate government policy which mixes the non-White population with the White population and encourages miscegenation.

Third, most of the White population in America is collaborating in its own destruction, partly from ignorance, partly from fear, but mostly from a blind, animalistic urge to conform to perceived norms of public opinion.

Fourth, the mass media of news and entertainment provide the guiding spirit for White America's rush to self-destruction, and those media are largely in the hands of the Jewish minority. The controlled media, with virtual unanimity, push the party line of egalitarianism and multiculturalism and racial mixing. The controlled media, with virtual unanimity, push the party line of feminism and of toleration for homosexuality and of White "guilt" for supposed historic wrongs to non-Whites. The media, by influencing the attitudes and opinions of most voters, wield the power which determines which politicians get elected to public office in America. The media -- especially the media of film and television -- have done more than any other institution to degrade the cultural and moral level of our people. And the people who wield the media as a weapon against us are Jews.

That's our situation today, in very rough outline. And, of course, I've left out a thousand details and refinements and qualifications. I've not talked about the destructive, anti-White doctrines of many of the Christian churches. I've not mentioned the slavishly pro-Jewish and anti-White policies of many powerful White politicians, such as Edward Kennedy, Bill Clinton, and Robert Dole. I've ignored economics altogether. I've not said anything about the destructive effects of the government's trade policy. I've not explored the Jews' motivation for what they're doing.

I've just pointed out four basic facts: first, America is being transformed very rapidly from a White country to a non-White country; second, the government is deliberately implementing this transformation; third, most of the White population is not resisting the transformation; and fourth, the mass media, controlled by the Jews, are providing the driving force for it all.

What this means to those of us who feel some sense of responsibility to our ancestors and to our posterity is that our people are being faced with the greatest threat ever, with the threat of **extinction,** and that we must do whatever we can to avert this threat.

And what we must do -- again in the very roughest and crudest terms -- is, first, destroy or neutralize the two hostile forces which are leading us to our destruction – namely, the government and the Jew-controlled media; and second, start our badly corrupted and misled people back on the road to duty and responsibility.

I'm leaving out many important details, of course. I haven't even mentioned how we are to deal with the Blacks in our midst, for example. But that is a detail we know that we can handle, once we have taken care of the government and the Jewish media and begun curing our own people of their present sickness.

So, we know roughly what our problem is and roughly what we must do about it. Now we must get back to the details, because that's the only way we can make plans and execute them. But seeing the big picture is important in making plans, because it sets the boundaries for us. Once we understand the urgency of our situation, once we understand the finality of the fate designed for us by our enemies, we know that we must either conquer or die. **If we do not defeat those who intend to destroy us, and defeat them soon, then our people will perish forever.** What this means for us is that no matter how small our likelihood for success, we must act. No matter how desperate the gamble, we must take it. We must not fail to act. **We must not do nothing, simply because no plan seems certain of success.** No loss as a consequence of acting can be greater than the loss from failing to act. If we are responsible adults, if we are honorable adults, then we must act. There is no acceptable excuse for not acting -- not family obligations, not personal security, not career considerations -- no excuse. If we do not act, then everything will be lost, every reason for living, every reason for which our ancestors lived and worked and sacrificed and suffered and died. The deadly filth of Jewish liberalism will spread over our entire race and destroy it -- irrevocably, forever.

I promised you details, and now I'm running out of time. But here's one detail: no matter what else we do, our first move must be to alert all of our people to the situation I have outlined today. That's the first step: education. Education alone is not enough, of course, but it is necessary.

Many people will not want to be educated. They will be afraid to listen to anything which is not Politically Correct. They will hate us when we try to educate them. They will go back to their MTV. But for every fool filled with hate and fear who will not listen, we will find a person who already has an understanding of the things I have said today and who only needs to hear us say them in order to gain enough confidence to know that his understanding is correct. And we will find other people who have not yet achieved understanding but whose hearts and minds are open, and who can accept the truth when it is presented to them.

And so that is our immediate task: yours as well as mine. We must reach out to our people. We must alert them. We must educate them. We must encourage them. We must inspire them.

And here's a beautiful, wonderful thing: when you reach out to other people to encourage them and inspire them, you yourself will be encouraged and inspired. When you find out how many other people there are who share our concerns, our feelings, our values, our sense of responsibility, you cannot help but be encouraged.

Even the hatred that you encounter from some people -- especially from people in the controlled media -- will be encouraging. For you will understand that they would not hate us so much if they did not fear us. And the reason that they fear us is that deep inside them they know that what we say is true.

So let's get out there -- all of us -- and start looking for encouragement!

What Liberals Don’t Understand

Both Terrorism and Random Violence Will Increase as Alienation Grows

I was watching the television news one evening several weeks ago, and Bill Clinton came on and made a few comments about the rash of burnings of Black churches across the South. Mr. Clinton announced that he knew that White racism was responsible for the burnings. Organized hatred was behind it, he said, and it wouldn't be tolerated.

After that I waited for the newscaster to tell us about the evidence Mr. Clinton had that some sort of White racist conspiracy was involved, but no evidence was presented. The newscaster just moved on to other news. I wondered at the time whether or not Mr. Clinton had some inside information, some secret which he didn't want to share with the public, because I wasn't sure at all that the burnings were an organized effort by White racists. I already had been following the news of the burnings for a few days myself, and I just didn't see anything that suggested a White conspiracy. A boozed-up Ku Kluxer might have torched a Black church here or there, but the multi-state string of burnings just doesn't have the feel of the work of a White racist organization.

Apparently the secret police who were investigating the burnings figured that too. They learned in school that most cases of arson are associated with insurance fraud, and so they began questioning Black parishioners and asking Black preachers to take lie-detector tests.

Well, sir, that caused an outburst of liberal indignation in the controlled media. The racist cops are blaming the victims! Quit investigating Blacks and start arresting White racists, the media were screaming. Don't worry about evidence. It's obvious that White racists are doing this, so start rounding them up. And Mr. Clinton's head secret policeman, Janet Reno, threw a real tantrum. She called in the chief investigators, stamped her feet, and ordered them to stop investigating Blacks. White racists are responsible for the fires, she said. Now, go out and arrest some White racists!

And the media kept up their wailing about White racists burning Black churches. I have dozens of the most outrageous, bigoted, irrational newspaper clippings you can imagine on the subject. I'll read excerpts from a couple of them, just to give you the flavor. A typical case was an editorial in the *Charleston Gazette*, a raving-liberal West Virginia newspaper which is an embarrassment to an otherwise decent state. On June 18 the *Charleston Gazette's* editor wrote:

. . . Raw racism seems to be the motive.

. . . As we've said before, Americans generally are decent, compassionate people who don't feel racial hate. But the nation still has a vein of bigotry -- and a few racists are brutal enough to join hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan or the Freemen.

Extreme bigots presumably are starting the fires, even though investigators haven't yet found evidence of an organized conspiracy. Our guess is that a few white rednecks, half drunk in a

Southern roadhouse, see a TV report of a black church burning and decide to inflict the same punishment on blacks in their vicinity.

Churches are a natural target for race-haters. . . . Just because they're idiots doesn't mean they aren't disgusting criminals who must be locked in prison. The wave of black church fires has gripped the conscience of America. Leaders and groups at every level are calling for a national crackdown. Decent Americans who feel no hostility should lend their voices to the outcry and exert pressure until all the arsonists are prosecuted. . .

Well, well, well! Racism **seems** to be the motive. Bigots **presumably** are starting the fires. What the editor of the *Charleston Gazette* really means is that he hopes White racists are burning the churches, so that they can be caught and punished -- **severely** . He's praying that a racist conspiracy will be discovered, so that it can be **stamped out,** hopefully with a high body count. And as for "Americans who feel no hostility," he clearly is not among them.

Or consider this bit of rabid commentary by *Washington Post* columnist Carl Rowan. It was in the June 13 edition of the *Post* and was titled "Church Bombers and *The Turner Diaries."* Mr. Rowan wrote:

I think that there is a grotesque conspiracy to "save the white race" afoot in America, and that the church bombings [sic] are part of a plot to provoke blacks to react violently, thus giving all the hate groups in the land an excuse to uncover their caches of weapons and use them against blacks and against whites who sympathize with blacks.

I have turned anew to *The Turner Diaries*, the revolutionary "bible" of the Montana Freemen, the Aryan Supremacists, and the militiamen and others who threaten to "solve the race problem" by killing blacks, Jews, and liberals. This little 210-page book written by West Virginia professor William Pierce under the pseudonym Andrew Macdonald is the most diabolically violent plan for solving America's racial and social problems that I have ever read.

Mr. Rowan follows with a long extract from *The Turner Diaries* -- a book I wrote, incidentally -- to prove his point, and then he concludes:
The bigots who seek to destroy "the system" clearly believe that even if they burned 10,000 black churches, most of "the white race" would side with them if outraged blacks or their Federal protectors took up arms against the arsonists. Federal authorities know this; thus their caution, even timidity, in cracking down on the Freemen, or the rash of new hate groups, or the weird souls who are stockpiling weapons they expect to use against their state and Federal governments.

The church bombings reflect a race madness that is far worse than we want to think it is. A lot more people are in grave danger than those who worship in black churches.

So, what do we have here? Hatred and hostility, stemming from fear, in the *Charleston Gazette;* galloping paranoia, stemming from fear, in the *Washington Post.* And these two examples are pretty typical of the liberal response everywhere to the church burnings.

The facts are not yet all in, but the arson cases which have been solved to date suggest something quite different from Bill Clinton's or Carl Rowan's assumption of a White racist conspiracy or even the *Charleston Gazette's* assumption of groups of White rednecks wanting to punish Blacks.

Alabama Fire Marshal John Robison has investigated 38 cases of arson or suspected arson of churches in Alabama since 1991. Of those 38 churches, 15 were Black churches, and 23 were White, and he's found no evidence of racial motives in any of the burnings. In one case, that of the Antioch A.M.E. Church in Fort Deposit, Alabama, the Black female minister was charged with burning her own church. I quote Fire Marshal Robison: "The pastor was upset with the congregation about money; she felt she didn't get paid enough," he said.

Last month, on June 18, four Black children, aged 12 and under, were arrested for setting a fire in a Black church in Florence, South Carolina. Of 27 church fires which have been investigated in South Carolina since 1991, 12 fires were in White churches and 15 of them were in Black churches, and a total of six Whites and six Blacks have been arrested in connection with those 15 burnings of Black churches.

The Georgia Bureau of Investigation has investigated seven church burnings in Georgia during the past 18 months. Six of the seven churches had White congregations. The one Black church which was burned, in February 1995, was torched by a Black juvenile.

On June 19 of this year two Black men were arrested in Columbus County, North Carolina, and charged with burning a building on the grounds of the Black Mount Tabor Baptist Church. The previous week a 12-year-old White girl was arrested for setting a fire which destroyed an abandoned building on the grounds of a Black church in Charlotte, North Carolina. The 12-year-old White girl was said to be emotionally troubled, but I have not heard that she was part of any racist conspiracy.

Now, all of this seems to me to be pretty inconclusive evidence -- certainly not the sort of evidence to suggest a White racist conspiracy -- although I wouldn't bet that Mr. Clinton's BATF goons and his FBI goons can't find some kind of conspiracy, if they try hard enough to please their boss.

The hysterical reaction of the liberals to these church burnings suggests several things to me. First, liberals **want** there to be a White conspiracy behind it, because that would tend to confirm their theory about race relations generally: namely, whenever things don't work the way liberal theory says they should work, the reason is White racism. That's the only Politically Correct explanation: White racism. Second, they really **believe** there **is** a White conspiracy, because so many of their plans have been going wrong lately that they're becoming a little paranoid. Third, they're **frightened;** it's clear that more and more people are turning against the government these days, or at least losing faith in the government, and the government is the only protection which stands between the liberals and the wrath of the heterosexual White males they have treated so contemptuously for so long. It is this liberal fear, I believe, which explains the increasing level of viciousness and hatred we are seeing in liberal condemnations of the government's enemies.

Do you remember the way most of the controlled media treated the standoff between the FBI and the Montana Freemen which ended last month? The Freemen had some really nutty religious ideas -- just as David Koresh's Branch Davidians at Waco did -- and they had some even nuttier ideas about finance and economics. They figured that they had just as much right to issue money and set up banks as the Federal Reserve system had, and so that's what they did -- which, of course, was technically a violation of the law. But they hadn't hurt anyone and had no intention of hurting anyone. They just wanted to be left alone. Yet the controlled media and the liberal commentators were angry that the FBI didn't go storming onto their ranch with tanks, flame-throwers, and helicopter gunships. The liberal media wanted blood. The liberal media hated the Freemen.

Why is that?

I'll tell you why. The liberals hated the Freemen, because the Freemen had challenged the authority of the government. There's hardly anything that frightens a liberal more than the thought of losing the government's backing, the government's muscle for forcing the public to submit to liberal policies and programs. The liberals have built up an unnatural coalition of minorities and abnormal people -- a coalition of Blacks and other racial minorities, of homosexuals, of militant feminists, of perennial welfare recipients of all races -- to keep a grip on government. They have built a coalition of people who depend on the government to guarantee their special privileges and protections. This is the coalition which put Bill Clinton into office.

If normal people -- if White, heterosexual, working men and women -- were allowed to just tell the government to go to hell, the way the Freemen did, the whole liberal house of cards would come tumbling down. People would be free to hire or fire or rent to or not rent to anyone they wanted. Schools could set their own admission policies. People who have come to feel that they are entitled to a handout from the government would suddenly be faced with the prospect of working for a living or starving. Perverts of various sorts would suddenly find themselves shunned by normal, decent people and would have to retreat back into their closets.

And what could the liberals do to save their skins? Where could they hide to escape retribution for what they have done to our society these past 50 years or so? Where could they run that the lynch mobs wouldn't find them?

That's why they hate anyone who threatens the authority of the Federal government. That's why they're terrified by the idea of people just deciding to opt out of the system.

You know, if there is any conspiracy connected to the burnings of Black churches, it is a conspiracy among liberals and Blacks to use the burnings to bludgeon White Americans with more White guilt, with more demands to outlaw racism and make still more concessions to non-Whites. Virtually every news report and every editorial in the controlled media about a church burning has attributed the burning to **White racism.** Some of them even say something like, "The police haven't caught the White racist who did this yet, but we know it had to be a White racist." And, of course, the news reporting on this subject is very selective. If they catch a White suspect, it's front-page news. If they catch a Black suspect, it's buried in the classified section.

And if it's a White church that burns instead of a Black church, it doesn't even make the national news.

And this White guilt campaign seems to be working with some folks. Various White Christian groups have been rending their garments and beating their breasts and crying, "Mea culpa! Mea culpa!" Ralph Reed, the head of the Christian Coalition, one of the largest fundamentalist Christian groups in the country, fell into that trap last month. He went to an association of Black preachers in the South with his hat in his hand and essentially accepted White Christian responsibility for the burnings of Black churches.

This is the same sort of guilt racket the Jews have been working for the past 50 years. They've been saying, in effect, "You could have stopped the Holocaust if you had really cared about us, but you didn't. You let the Germans gas us. And so now you owe us." It worked for the Jews, so why not for the Blacks?

Now, please note that I'm not saying that Blacks or liberals are in an organized conspiracy to burn Black churches. I'm saying that it certainly looks like the liberals are in a conspiracy to use the burnings for their own ends by misrepresenting them in their news coverage and commentary.

My guess is that what we're seeing in these burnings is simply an increase in random violence as our society continues to decay under liberal policies. Today it's churches, because churches, being unoccupied most of the time, are easy targets. Six months from now it could be empty school buildings -- or banks or whatever the fad happens to be at the time. This is something I predicted 20 years ago in my book, *The Turner Diaries,* just as I predicted a great increase in political terrorism. We're certainly seeing the increase in terrorism: the World Trade Center bombing, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Unabomber, the bombing in Saudi Arabia. And I think we'll see a lot more random violence and destruction like these church burnings -- not because of White racism, but because the policies of the liberals and the mass media and the government are destroying our society, alienating our people, and causing more and more individuals to lash out violently, in one way or another.

The liberals and the minorities and freaks who make up their coalition can't understand this. To a homosexual or a militant feminist or a liberal booster of the New World Order this is the best of times. Things have never been better. We have more of their beloved diversity than ever before; more multiculturalism; more miscegenation; more democracy; more degeneracy in art, literature, and music; more permissiveness and depravity in our social life. Everything is more cosmopolitan, everything is more Jewish than ever before. There has never been another time when one could see so many racially mixed couples on the streets, never another time when homosexuals and their life-style have been held up to such public admiration, never another time when there were two Jews and a Negro on the Supreme Court, never another time when half of the President's cabinet consisted of Jews and other minorities. Wonderful, wonderful, wonderful! How could anyone be against such things? Except, of course, those awful heterosexual White males, those awful White racists!

They don't understand why we hate their government, why we hate them, why we hate what they've done to our civilization and to our people. But they do know that we hate them. And they are frightened.

They are mistaken, of course, when they blame us for every blow that is struck against them. They don't understand that a great many ordinary people without any real sense of purpose or any racial feeling one way or another -- even many Blacks -- are frustrated and unhappy and alienated in this unnatural society that the liberals have forced on all of us, and that more and more of these alienated people are striking out randomly at any target they can find.

No, the liberals don't understand that -- but, believe me, they will see more and more of this random, purposeless violence, just as they will see more and more very purposeful terrorism. And in their bigotry and their fear and their lack of understanding they'll continue to blame everything on organized White racism. But one day -- one day before too long -- understanding will come to the liberals. It will come on the day that they have been having nightmares about. It will come on the day when an awakened White public rises up and begins a great cleansing of this land of ours.

Feminism: The Great Destroyer

An Interview of Dr. William L. Pierce

By Kevin Alfred Strom

K.A.S.: *There is a continuing public debate about the role of women in our society and the related subjects of sexism and feminism. One example was the hullabaloo that occurred during the confirmation of Clarence Thomas's appointment to the Supreme Court. Feminists and their claque in the media charged that this confirmation was an affirmation of the "sexism" rampant in the U.S. political establishment. The cure for this alleged problem is to get more women into positions of political power, according to many people in the media.*

Another example was the uproar about a drunken party several years ago in Las Vegas for Navy fliers at which several women who showed up were manhandled -- in particular, a female flier who later complained to the media about her treatment. The news coverage of the Las Vegas party brought demands from media spokesmen and politicians for rooting out the "sexism" in the armed forces and giving women equal roles in everything from infantry combat to flying fighter jets. Do you see any real or lasting significance in this debate?

W.L.P.: Oh, it's certainly a significant debate. The significance is perhaps not exactly what the media spokesmen would have us believe it is, but there is a significance there nevertheless. Getting at the real significance, pulling it out into the light where everyone can see it and examine it, requires a little care, though. There's a lot of misdirection, a lot of deliberate deception in the debate.

Look at the first example you just mentioned. The controlled media would have us believe that the approval of Clarence Thomas by the Senate Judiciary Committee in the face of Anita Hill's complaints about him demonstrates a callous insensitivity to women's welfare. But what were Anita Hill's complaints? They were that when Thomas had been her boss in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission he had asked her several times for a date and that on one occasion he had begun describing to her a pornographic film he had seen the evening before. She never alleged that he had demanded sexual favors from her, threatened her, or put his hands on her. Her complaint was that he had shown a normal, healthy interest in her as a woman. He had asked her for a date.

Talking to her about a pornographic film may have indicated a certain lack of refinement on his part -- at least that would be the case if the two of them were members of a traditional White society, in which gentlemen didn't talk about pornographic films in the presence of ladies, at least not in the office -- but what the hell, the folks who were raising such a fuss about Thomas's behavior are, like both Clarence and Anita themselves, all members of the brave, New World Order society, which is neither White nor traditional. It's a so-called "multicultural" society in which there are no gentlemen and there are no ladies; there are just male and female people, and the female people are no different from the male people: they are just as bawdy, just as vulgar, just as aggressive.

K.A.S.: *So you believe that the whole thing was just a tempest in a teapot, that it really wasn't significant?*

W.L.P.: A tempest in a teapot, yes, but still very significant. One aspect of the Clarence and Anita circus was that it was simply seized on and used by people with a certain political agenda, and so of course their tendency was to make as much ado as they could about it. But another aspect is that many of the feminists who were screeching against Thomas and against the Senate's approval of him really were indignant that the man had asked Anita Hill for a date. They really were outraged that he had an interest in her as a woman and did not simply treat her as another lawyer in his office. Men are not supposed to notice women as women, but only as people, and radical feminists really do become angry if one drops this unisex pretense even for a minute. Open a door for one of them and you'll get a nasty glare; call one of them "my dear" or refer to her as a "girl" and you'll be slapped with a civil rights lawsuit.

The fuss about this Tailhook Association party in Las Vegas reveals the same sort of nuttiness. I mean, what do you expect when a bunch of Navy fliers throw a wild, drunken orgy? They had held their party in Las Vegas several years in a row, and the party had gained a bit of a reputation. It was notorious. Everybody in Naval aviation knew all about it. The Navy women who went to the party knew what to expect. They joined the orgy. Any woman who didn't want to be pawed by drunken fliers and have her panties pulled off stayed away. Certainly, if these Navy fliers had shanghaied some unsuspecting woman off the street and forced her to submit to indignities, I would be the first to call for their being put up against a wall. I'll go further and say that I really don't approve of drunkenness under any circumstances -- although I believe it's only realistic to accept drinking as a fact of military life. But I cannot work up much sympathy for a woman who, knowing what the Tailhook parties are like, decides that she will pretend that she really isn't a woman but rather is a genderless Navy flier and so can go to the Tailhook party without worrying about her panties.

K.A.S.: *That's really irrational isn't it? It doesn't make sense to ignore human nature like that.*

W.L.P.: Irrationality seems to be the rule rather than the exception in public affairs these days. Feminism, of course, is just another exercise in reality denial, which has become such a common pastime. There are too many people out there who seem to believe that if we pretend that men and women are the same, they really will be; that if we pretend there are no differences between Blacks and Whites except skin color, the differences will disappear; that if we pretend that homosexuality is a normal, healthy condition, it will be.

Feminism is one of the most destructive aberrations being pushed by the media today, because it has an immediate effect on nearly all of us. There are many sectors of the economy, for example, in which racial-quota hiring and promotion – so-called "affirmative action" -- isn't a real problem, and so White people who work in those sectors remain relatively unaffected by the racial aspects of America's breakdown, but feminism is becoming pervasive; there are few relationships between men and women, especially between younger men and women, which will not suffer from the effects of feminism in the near future.

K.A.S.: *You just referred to feminism as "a destructive aberration" and spoke of the breakdown of America. Are the two things connected?*

W.L.P.: When homosexuals come out of the closet and women go into politics, empires crumble. Or, to say that a way which more accurately reflects the cause-effect relationship, when empires begin to crumble, then the queers come out of the closet and women go into politics. Which is to say, that in a strong, healthy society, feminism isn't a problem. But when a society begins to decay -- when the men lose their self-confidence -- then feminism raises its head and accelerates the process of decay.

K.A.S.: *Before we go further, exactly what do you mean by feminism? Can you define the word for us?*

W.L.P.: Feminism is a system of ideas with several distinguishing characteristics. First, it's a system in which gender is regarded as the primary identifying characteristic, more important even than race. Second, and paradoxically, it's a system in which men and women are regarded as innately identical in all intellectual and psychical traits, and in all physical traits except those most obviously dependent on the configuration of the genitalia. Third, it's a system in which filling a traditionally male role in society is valued above being a wife and mother, a system in which the traditional female roles are denigrated. Finally, it's a system in which men and women are regarded as mutually hostile classes, with men traditionally in the role of oppressors of women; and in which it is regarded as every woman's primary duty to support the interests of her fellow women of all races against the male oppressors.

I should add that not every woman who describes herself as a feminist would go along 100% with that definition. Real feminism is not just an intellectual thing; it's a sickness, with deep emotional roots. Some women just want to be trendy, but are otherwise normal. They just want to be fashionable, and feminism is held up by the media as fashionable these days. It's Politically Correct.

And while we're at it, we should note that there is an analogous malady, usually called male chauvinism, which expresses itself in a range of attitudes toward women ranging from patronizing contempt to outright hatred. Feminists often attribute the growth of feminism to a reaction against male chauvinism. Actually the latter, which never afflicted more than a minority of White men, has been more an excuse for the promoters of feminism than a cause of that disorder.

K.A.S.: *OK. So that's what feminism is. Now, in what way is it destructive? How is it connected to America's decline?*

W.L.P.: Feminism is destructive at several different levels. At the racial level it is destructive because it divides the race against itself, robbing us of racial solidarity and weakening us in the struggle for racial survival; and because it reduces the White birthrate, especially among educated women. It also undermines the family by taking women out of the home and leaving the raising of children to television and day-care centers.

At a personal or social level feminism does its damage by eroding the traditional relationship between men and women. That traditional relationship is not based on any assumption of equality or sameness. It's not a symmetrical relationship, but rather a complementary one. It's based on a sexual division of labor, with fundamentally different roles for men and women: men are the providers and the protectors, and women are the nurturers. Men bring home the bacon, and they guard the den; women nourish the children and tend the hearth.

Many people today sneer at this traditional relationship. They think that in the New World Order there is no need to protect the den or the condo or whatever, because these days we're all very civilized, and that all one needs to do to bring home the bacon is hop in the car and drive to the nearest shopping mall, and, of course, a woman can do that just as well as a man. Therefore, because the times have changed, roles should change. There's no longer any reason for a division of labor; now we can all be the same, claim the apologists for feminism.

Now, I have a couple of problems with that line of reasoning. First, I'm not as eager to toss million-year-old traditions in the ash-can as the New World Order enthusiasts are, because I'm not as confident in the ability of the government to provide protection for all of us as they are, nor am I as confident that there'll always be bacon at the neighborhood shopping mall and we won't have to revert to earlier ways of getting it. Actually, I'm an optimist by nature, but I'm not so optimistic as to believe that I'll never be called on to use my strength or my fighting instincts to protect my family. In fact, every time I watch the evening news on television, I become more convinced that there's a very good chance we're going to end up having to fight for our bacon within the next few years.

In the second place, Mother Nature made a very big investment in her way of doing things over the past few million years of primate evolution. It's not simply a matter of our deciding that we don't like Mother Nature's plan because it's not fashionable any longer, and so we'll change it. We are what we are. That is, we are what millions of years of evolution have made us. A man is a man in every cell of his body and his brain, not just in his genitalia, and a woman is a woman to the same degree. We were very thoroughly and precisely adapted to our different roles. We can't change reality by passing a civil rights law. When we deceive ourselves into thinking that we can, there's hell to pay. Which is to say that we end up with a lot of very confused, disappointed, and unhappy men and women. We also end up with a lot of very angry men and women, which accounts for the feminists and the male chauvinists.

It's true, of course, that some women might be perfectly happy as corporate raiders or professional knife fighters, just as some men have willingly adapted to the New World Order by becoming less aggressive and more "sensitive." But it doesn't work that way for normal men and women. What the normal man really wants and needs is not just a business partner and roommate of the opposite sex, but a real woman whom he can protect and provide for. And what a normal woman really wants and needs with every fiber of her being, regardless of how much feminist propaganda she's soaked up, is a real man, who can love and protect her and provide for her and their children. If she's watched too much television and has let herself be persuaded that what she wants instead of a strong, masculine man is a sensitive wimp who'll let her wear the trousers in the family half the time, she's headed for a severe collision with the reality of her own nature. She'll end up making herself very neurotic, driving a few men into male chauvinism, and

becoming a social liability. Our society just can't afford any more of that sort of foolishness. If feminism were only making individuals unhappy, I wouldn't be very concerned about it. I've always believed that people were entitled to make themselves as unhappy as they wanted to. But unfortunately, it's wrecking our society and weakening our race, and we must put a stop to it soon.

K.A.S.: *How do you propose to do that? The feminist movement really seems to be snowballing, and as you noted the mass media are all for it. It would seem pretty difficult to stop. Anyone who opposes the feminists is perceived as a male chauvinist who wants to take away women's rights and confine them to the kitchen and the bedroom.*

W.L.P.: Well, of course, I'm not in favor of taking anything away from women. I'd like to give women the option of being women again in the traditional way, in Nature's way, the option of staying home and taking care of their children and making a home for their husbands. It wasn't the feminists, of course, who changed our economy so that it's no longer possible for many families to survive unless both the man and the woman are employed outside the home. A society which forces women out of the home and into offices and factories is not a healthy society. I'd like for our society to be changed so that it's possible once again for mothers to stay at home with their children, the way they did back before the Second World War, back before the New World Order boys got their hands on our economy and launched their plan to bring the living standard of the average American wage earner down to the average Mexican level. I think many will want to stay home when it's possible to do so. And I am sure that if we provide the right role models for women, most will want to. If we regain control of our television industry, of our news and entertainment and advertising industries, we can hold up quite a different model of the ideal woman from the one being held up today.

Most women, just like most men, want to be fashionable. They try to do and be what's expected of them. We just need to move that model back closer to what Mother Nature had in mind. Then there's no need to take away anybody's rights. A few female lawyers with butch haircuts can easily be tolerated in a healthy society -- a few flagpole sitters, a few glass eaters, a few of all sorts of people -- so long as their particular brand of oddness doesn't begin undermining the health of the whole society.

K.A.S.: *But what about the people who control the media now -- what about the legislators -- who are on the feminist bandwagon? They are very powerful. What will you do about them?*

W.L.P.: We'll do whatever is necessary. Now we're helping people understand feminism and the other ills which are afflicting our society. Understanding really must come first. After understanding comes organization. And then, as I said, whatever is necessary.

And I should add this: Whatever flies in the face of reality is inherently self-destructive. But we cannot wait for this disease to burn itself out. The toll will be too great. We have to stand up against it and oppose it now. We have to change people's attitudes about feminism being fashionable. We have to make the politicians who've jumped on the feminist bandwagon understand that there will be a heavy price to pay, some day, for their irresponsibility.

K.A.S.: *Do you really think that you can change the behavior of the politicians?*

W.L.P.: Perhaps not, but we must at least give them a chance to change. Unfortunately in the case of the politicians most of them have many crimes besides an advocacy of feminism to answer for, and they know that they can only be hanged once.

Understanding Our Enemies

The U.S. Government and News Media Are Waging a Propaganda War Against White Americans

I spoke a couple of months ago about the exploitation by the government and the media of Black church burnings. I discussed the way in which the Clinton administration and the controlled news media were claiming these burnings were the work of organized White racists, without a shred of evidence to support their claim.

I pointed out in my earlier broadcast that it was possible that a couple of boozed-up Kluxers might have started one or two of the fires, but that as many Blacks as Whites had been arrested in the burnings, that collecting insurance money was a more likely motive than racism, and that it was very unlikely that any organized White group was involved. As time passes, it becomes clearer that our analysis of the situation was on target, and that of the government and the media was not. Sure enough, the government has arrested a couple of Kluxers for burning two churches, and sure enough they've been unable to find any White racist conspiracy, no matter how hard they've tried. I suspect the issue of burning Black churches will now fade quietly into the background, just like a thousand other phony issues before it.

Another of these phony issues was the painting of swastikas on the barracks doors of several Black soldiers' rooms at the Army's Fort Bragg, in North Carolina, a few weeks ago. The politicians and the media raised another big hullabaloo about "White racism" in the military and called for a new crackdown on what they like to call "hate crimes." The military brass were so panicked by the media fuss that White soldiers were confined to their barracks while the matter was being investigated. When it turned out that two Black soldiers had done the swastika painting, the issue quietly faded away. The people in the media who had been making the biggest fuss about "White racism" before the two Blacks were caught weren't even embarrassed. They just moved on to another phony issue and kept beating the drums about "White racism."

Now, one of the reasons why these media people weren't embarrassed is that many of them belong to a race which is biologically incapable of feeling shame. And the ones who don't belong to that race have trained themselves to think and behave just like their Jewish bosses. That's one of the reasons for the shameless behavior of the controlled media.

A more important reason, however, is one that I mentioned briefly in my earlier talk with you. The criminals in the government and in the media who have been lying to us and taking advantage of us and wrecking our society for so long now are desperate to keep normal, decent, working White men and women morally disarmed, to keep us on the defensive, to keep us feeling guilty and confused, because they know that if we ever begin thinking clearly, if we ever take stock of our situation, if we ever decide to straighten out the mess they've made of things, there will be hell to pay. They know that if White Americans ever wake up and get their act together, most of the media bosses and the politicians won't live more than a day or two before they're hunted down and dealt with.

Let's look at the details of what's happening. I talked a little about this earlier, but we need to go over it again and again, until everyone understands it. One of the things we talked about before was that it's not just the media criminals and the politicians who want to keep us morally disarmed. It's also the whole Clinton coalition -- including the ones who vote Republican. It's all of the freaks and the perverts and the minorities who see their own interests tied to the status quo. It's everyone who can't make it on his own in a normal, healthy society and so depends on the government in one way or another.

It's the members of the welfare class, who've come to believe that they really deserve to be supported by the rest of us and who realize that they'll be strictly on their own and will have to either work or starve if the productive people ever reassert themselves.

It's the crazed feminists, who are afraid that they won't be able to be Air Force generals or military school cadets or top corporate executives if the government's drive to ban traditional sex roles is halted.

It's the homosexuals and other degenerates, who depend on a police state to force people to tolerate their behavior.

It's the members of all the non-White minorities -- the Blacks and the mestizos and the Asians and the rest -- who know they'll be sent packing to live among their own kind instead of continuing to drag us down into a multiracial and multicultural and mongrelized chaos.

All of these people have an instinctive understanding that they have to keep us feeling sorry for them, feeling guilty for wanting to be rid of them, feeling too confused to look out for the interests of our own people, our own civilization. They know that if we ever regain our wits, their goose will be cooked.

Finally, there's one other bunch of people who have an interest in keeping normal, working White men and women confused with lies about Black church burnings and swastika-painted barracks doors. Those are the liberal trendies who grew up during the Vietnam era and now are heavily entrenched in the government, the media, and the educational establishment. During the Vietnam conflict the Jewish leaders of Students for a Democratic Society, Americans for Democratic Action, the National Student Association, the Student Mobilization Committee, and a hundred other leftist organizations were using the war as a pretext to turn American society upside down.

These groups had virtually taken over the university campuses in America, because the university administrators were afraid that they would be accused of anti-Semitism if they took a stand against them. And the trendy airheads on the campuses, who had been spoiled rotten by a permissive upbringing, easily fell for the propaganda of these organizations, which essentially told them that they could do whatever they wanted to and had no responsibility to anyone or anything. In particular, they could avoid military service and continue smoking dope, partying, and going to rock concerts. These were the Bill Clinton types: the rotten, selfish, little bastards who got a big kick out of parading around with Viet Cong flags and thumbing their noses at mommy, daddy, and their country. Not all of them grew up to be chosen President of the United

States by the media and the political bosses, but they did grow up to have a powerful grip on our schools and other institutions. They are still irresponsible, they are still essentially hedonist in their outlook, they still believe that they should be able to get away with anything, so long as the government -- now in their hands -- won't let mommy and daddy spank them for it.

Of course, that's just a figure of speech. These liberals, now approaching middle age, aren't really worried any longer about being spanked for making mud pies or smoking dope or having Viet Cong flags in their dormitory rooms. But they are worried that if normal, decent, responsible White Americans ever get the upper hand again, the aging liberal trendies will be dragged out of their offices and their condos and their country clubs and beaten to within a quarter-inch of their lives for the mess they've made of things, for what they've done to our world, to the heritage that our ancestors struggled and bled to preserve. They're worried that a lot of them will end up swinging from the end of a rope. And, believe me, that's a well justified worry.

So, all of this is why we keep having our faces rubbed in "White guilt" with phony White racist conspiracies to burn Black churches or intimidate Black soldiers with swastikas. This is why we're lied to by the government and the media. This is why Bill Clinton wants to shut down radio programs which are critical of the government. This is why the media folks become hysterical whenever new signs of popular opposition to the government become visible, whether in the form of a terrorist bombing or a group merely wanting to be left alone, like the Branch Davidians or the Montana Freemen. It's why we have a major assault underway on the First and Second Amendments by left-wing academics, who want to limit what we can say and also take away our means to protect our right to say it. It's why any questioning of even the most far-fetched "Holocaust" claims or any comment about the Jewish control of the mass media or any scientific inquiry into racial differences or any public statement which might offend feminists or homosexuals or non-Whites brings such an intolerant, closed-minded, and spiteful response from the liberal/Jewish/media/government sector. It's an attack on their coalition. It may be a sign that we're waking up. Remember what they did to poor Marge Schott when she made a couple of comments they deemed offensive?

They really are afraid that we'll wake up. They really are desperate to keep us confused, demoralized, and on the defensive. They know that if we ever go on the offensive, they will be finished. Our job, the task of *American Dissident Voices,* is to wake our people up, to help them straighten out their thinking, to give them moral courage, and to prepare them to take the offensive.

That's a formidable task. The majority of our people have let themselves be convinced that a normal, healthy, instinctive racial attitude -- the desire to live and work and play and mate with one's own kind, what our enemies call "racism" -- is wicked. Our enemies call this healthy, natural racial attitude a "sickness." They have been able to make many of us feel guilty for having such an attitude, much like the prudes of a century ago were able to make many people feel guilty for having a normal, healthy interest in the opposite sex.

So we can understand the motives of the elements who are destroying America and destroying our people, the motives of the filthy creatures who are deliberately sapping the will of our people to resist this destruction by pumping poisonous propaganda into our minds. We can understand

their motives. They want to live too, but their way of life is to suck our life blood, to cling like leeches to our society and warp it to fit their needs, and they know that they can only do this by keeping us confused and morally debilitated. They know that if we become morally healthy again, they will die. We can understand that.

We can even understand how they accomplish their destructive work. We can understand both the organizational aspects and the psychological aspects. It's easy enough to understand why the controlled media are so ferociously determined to keep the flood of Third World immigrants pouring across our borders, why they become hysterical whenever anyone suggests restricting immigration, and why the government refuses to do more than make the flimsiest pretext of guarding our borders. Every Mexican and every Haitian and every Vietnamese and every Chinaman who sneaks into the country is a new member of their coalition against White America.

There are other aspects of this numbers problem too. Every sexually confused kid who grows up in one of these "modern," mixed-up families without strong sexual role models and ends up being lured into the homosexual life style is a new recruit for their coalition. That helps us understand the hatred the Clintonistas have for the traditional family and for traditional sex roles.

It's the psychological war our enemies have been waging against us which we must address before we can hope to do much about their efforts to outnumber us and divide us, however. We White people have a fatal compulsion to be "nice": to try very hard not to give offense or hurt the feelings of others. Actually this compulsion wasn't a bad trait in past centuries, when our society was racially and culturally homogeneous. It's a trait which serves as a social lubricant, minimizing conflict and abetting cooperation. But it really has been used against us by Jews and other non-Whites now living among us. There are far too many of our people who are bright enough to understand what's happening to our world, but who just can't bring themselves to say or do anything about it, because they've let themselves be persuaded that would be bad manners. It's rude to talk about racial differences, because if a non-White overheard it his feelings might be hurt. It's not polite to discuss the effects on our society of Jewish media control, because such a discussion is offensive to Jews.

Does it hurt our feelings to be called "honky" or "goy" or "gringo"? Not really. We listen without objection to the most scathing criticism of our people and our ways by aliens, but we're afraid to criticize them for fear of hurting their feelings. Republican Presidential candidate Bob Dole has told us that he won't even use the word "alien" in talking about the immigration problem, because he's afraid that would be offensive to aliens, who don't like to be reminded of their irregular status. It will be a real struggle for some of us to put racial survival ahead of politeness.

In addition to convincing us that any discussion of the real issues we are facing would be bad manners, our enemies have made good use of the psychological trick of pretending to be weak and helpless, because they have discovered that we have a trait, apparently unique among the races of man, of feeling sorry for those who are helpless. When we are confronted with an obviously dangerous and aggressive enemy, who scowls and threatens as he advances toward us with a weapon, we know what to do. But if that same enemy shuffles toward us with his eyes averted and his hat in his hands, begging for a little welfare, we feel guilty for even thinking

about chasing him away or killing him, no matter how strongly we would like to avoid his company.

Try that trick in Africa or Asia, and it will get you killed in a hurry, but in Europe and North America it works. Some of us are so overwhelmed with feelings of racial guilt, after being pumped full of propaganda about how our ancestors mistreated the defenseless Brown man, and the helpless Black man, and the poor, inoffensive Jew, that we have become moral basket cases and can't defend ourselves today, even when we can see all around us the depredations that non-Whites are making against our people.

And so now we can understand the reason for all of the headlines in the controlled media about "hate crimes" by White skinheads against poor, inoffensive non-Whites in our cities today and for all of the Hollywood films about the way the wicked White settlers abused the unsuspecting and unresisting Indians a century ago. Now we can understand why they invent White racist conspiracies to burn down Black churches.

They play on our reluctance to give offense, on our inability to resist an aggressor who pretends to be helpless, and on the ease with which we can be morally paralyzed by artificially induced feelings of guilt. These are powerful weapons they use against us. They use them with diabolical skill. All of us have felt the powerful temptation, even when we understood what they were doing to us, just to be nice, not to resist, not to oppose them.

What they are doing to us is almost hypnotic. "It is so easy for you to remain asleep," they tell us. "It is so easy just to let us have our way," their propaganda tells us. "It is so easy just to let your people die, let your civilization fall into ruin, let us have it all. No one will blame you for that," they smile. "That's the polite way. Don't resist us. Just let us have it all. That's the way to soothe your guilt. That's the way to avoid criticism. That's the easy way." Over and over and over again, that's their message for us: "Don't resist." And then more guilt-inducing stories about the Jewish "Holocaust," about burning Black churches, and about White terrorists -- and then heartwarming stories about struggling Third World immigrants working hard to achieve the American dream. Over and over.

Yes, we understand these tactics of our enemies. Understanding them is not the same as overcoming them, of course. But understanding is a necessary first step. What we must do after we have wiped the sleep from our eyes and flushed our enemies' poisonous propaganda from our minds is reestablish contact with our instinct, with our inner wisdom. That wisdom will tell us that the guilt we feel because our ancestors did what they thought was necessary to protect our people, to gain new living space for us, and to build the civilization that we inherited from them -- that is false guilt.

One does not become guilty for doing anything which is necessary or helpful for the survival or progress of one's people in this competitive and unforgiving world. Guilt comes from failing to accept the responsibility we have to our own people. Guilt comes from letting ourselves be deceived by our enemies. Guilt comes from losing the struggle for survival.

And our inner wisdom also will tell us that we can be polite once again, we can concern ourselves with not hurting anyone's feelings once again, when we have cleared away the last threat to our people and once more are living only among ourselves.

And with this wisdom guiding us, we will be immune to the deceit of our enemies, and we will overcome them.

The Meaning of Democracy

The Controlled Media Have the Most Say in Who Is Elected

As November approaches, the controlled news media are focusing the attention of Americans more and more on that quadrennial ritual of our democracy: choosing a new Maximum Leader to occupy the big, white fortress on Washington's Pennsylvania Avenue for the next four years. They're working hard to make us all breathless with excitement trying to guess whether it'll be Bill or Bob, but my guess is that the winner this time will be "none of the above," by a wide margin. Which is to say, I believe that we'll see more qualified voters staying away from the polls than actually voting for either candidate this time. That will be a continuation of an already well established trend, but the characters of the two candidates this time (or rather, the all too evident lack thereof) will give a big boost to that trend.

I should confess right now that I have an essentially bottomless contempt and loathing for Mr. Clinton. I believe that he should be given a speedy trial and then publicly hanged for treason. It is a disgrace to every citizen of our republic that we are governed by a system which permits men like Clinton to hold any sort of public office. I'd as soon see O.J. Simpson in the White House as Bill Clinton.

Clinton is a man who during the Vietnam war counted as his personal friends people who were doing everything they could to aid the Communist enemies of America. He partied and smoked dope with these people while the Communists were killing 58,000 American soldiers. He collaborated with the same people after the war. One of his closest advisers during and after the 1992 presidential election was David Ifshin, a Jewish friend from the Vietnam war days who went to Hanoi and made radio broadcasts for the Communists, urging American soldiers to turn their guns against their own officers. Ifshin was frequently invited to the White House by Clinton and was consulted on matters involving Jewish political support.

Back in Arkansas, before he came to Washington, Clinton partied with and accepted money from drug dealers and other common criminals. Clinton's own brother is a convicted drug dealer who used to run his drug business right out of the governor's mansion in Little Rock when Bill Clinton was governor of Arkansas. While he was governor Clinton used his office to extort sexual favors from female state employees. He used state police officers as procurers.

Clinton is the sort of man who 100 years ago would have been publicly horsewhipped, tarred and feathered, and ridden out of town on a rail if he weren't hanged. We simply didn't tolerate his sort of filth. He is a scoundrel, a cad, a reprobate, a louse, a dastard, a wretch, a poltroon, a lowlife, a degenerate, and a barefaced liar, as well as a traitor to his country.

And what do the voters have as an alternative to this charming piece of filth with the boyish smile? Why, they have Bob Dole! Now, Mr. Dole has quite a different personality from Mr. Clinton. Mr. Dole never dodged the draft or demonstrated on behalf of the Viet Cong, palled around with drug dealers, or sent aides on the government payroll out to scout up whores for him. Does that mean that he would make a better President than Clinton?

The answer, unfortunately, is no. The reason is that, despite all their differences in personality, Mr. Clinton and Mr. Dole have one very important thing in common: they both have based their whole political careers on subservience to Jewish interests.

With Clinton this catering to the Jews is especially obvious, because he is in the media spotlight. Clinton has appointed a higher percentage of Jews to important positions in his administration than any other American President, including even Franklin Roosevelt and Lyndon Johnson. Clinton has put a Jew in charge of our Treasury Department, a Jew in charge of our Agriculture Department, a Jew in charge of our Commerce Department, a Jew in charge of our Labor Department. He has put our Central Intelligence Agency entirely in the hands of Jews, with Jews in the top three CIA positions. He is the only President who has ever put two Jews on the nine-judge Supreme Court. And he has appointed literally hundreds of Jews to less visible but still very influential positions in his administration. He has appointed Jews to high public office at a rate more than ten times their percentage in the U.S. population.

Clinton has made all of these Jewish appointments because he, like every other politician in Washington, understands that no one can be elected President if the Jews, with their control of the media, oppose him. However, most politicians, despite their understanding of Jewish media power, exercise some degree of restraint in licking the Jews' feet. They would be embarrassed to overdo it. But not Bill Clinton. He is so accustomed to being a crook and getting away with it just by flashing his smile that he has lost all sense of shame and all caution. He is a man who will do anything to advance his political career, because he is convinced that he can get away with anything.

Should that be surprising in a man who dodged the draft and supported the Viet Cong in the 1960s and 1970s and now pretends to be a patriot who is defending America from Saddam Hussein? Should it be surprising in a man who was immersed in the drug culture while he was working his way up in Arkansas politics, taking big donations from drug racketeers, and now claims to be fighting an all-out war against drugs? Should it be surprising in a man whose friends, family members, and former business associates have been convicted of felonies in record numbers: a man, in other words, who has associated with felons throughout his career, and who now claims to be seriously concerned about America's crime problem?

Now, Bob Dole, on the other hand, is not the sort who believes that he can steal your wallet, seduce your daughter or your wife, and blow marijuana smoke in your face -- and then charm you into voting for him anyway. Bob Dole knows that he couldn't charm his way out of a parking ticket. Bob Dole is one of the most uncharming politicians in Washington. He is dull, dull, dull. It's embarrassing to watch him campaign and pretend to be alive. Bob Dole is a man who serves the Jews not because he's a crook who believes that he can get away with anything, like Clinton, but because he knows that he could never hope to advance his career under his own steam. He has gained the Jews' support by being an errand boy for them throughout his Washington career.

Dole will, just like Clinton, get America involved in another war in the Middle East, if the Jews tell him to. He will no more solve America's immigration problem than Clinton will, because he knows that the Jews don't want it solved. He won't move radically against crime, or drugs, or America's declining educational standards. He won't do anything that he's not told to do. Clinton

is the Jews' Tweedledum, a bit to the left of what they define as the center. Dole is their Tweedledee, a bit to the right of what they define as the center.

What I'm saying, in other words, is that despite their big personality differences and despite the fact that Dole talks a more conservative line on economic and social issues than Clinton, there's no real difference between the two men on the most important and fundamental issues, because they both take their orders from the same men behind the scenes.

But the voters don't know that. That's what's really depressing. You see, the average American voter only knows what he sees on television. That's where he learns everything he thinks he knows about politics and the world. Now, the Jews who control television certainly aren't going to tell the voters that Clinton and Dole are both in their pockets. But they have let the voters know that Clinton is a draft dodger, that he is being sued by an Arkansas state employee he tried to force to have sex with him when he was governor of Arkansas, and that many of his friends and business associates have been sent to prison. All of that has been so noticeable that it would have been hard to keep it away from the public's attention. And the average voter also knows that Dole is a war hero who doesn't pal around with convicted felons or extort sex from women. So far as the public is aware, Clinton is a crook and Dole isn't. But that doesn't seem to help Dole. The public prefers Clinton, because he smiles more.

What does that say about democracy?

Now, to be fair, if one polls only White men, then Dole is preferred over Clinton by a few percentage points. But White women prefer Clinton, by a substantial margin, simply because he projects a friendly, boyish image -- and because the media masters clearly prefer him and portray him as a more fashionable candidate than Dole. Women always want to do what is fashionable, which is why normal, decent White people aren't able to outvote the members of the Clinton coalition -- the queers and the feminists and the Jews and the moral cripples and the non-Whites -- despite the fact that we outnumber them. We aren't able to outvote them, because as long as the controlled media are able to portray their candidate as more fashionable, our women will vote for him.

That is tragic; but, as I said, it doesn't really matter in the election that's coming up, because both sides are controlled by the enemies of our people.

What can we do about that situation?

It is clear that most people prefer to do nothing. Even the majority of White men who reject Clinton for what he is still respect the system. They still respect the idea of democracy. They're willing to be governed by a crook, a liar, a filthy degenerate, and a traitor, if that traitor can win a majority of the votes.

But I believe that the only reason most White men still respect the system enough not to rebel against it is that they don't fully understand the situation. They don't understand that the system has been secretly taken over by their enemies. They don't understand the decisive influence of the controlled news and entertainment media in determining the outcome of elections. They

aren't aware that the media are, by and large, under the control of Jews. They don't read the Jewish community publications in which the Jews crow about the fact that Dole and Kemp are just as much their men as Clinton and Gore are, and that there's no way the Jews can lose the election, regardless of whether the Democrats or the Republicans win.

Most White men, in fact, haven't really assimilated the publicly known facts about Bill Clinton. Sure, they've heard the rumors about his drug-dealing cronies back in Arkansas, but the facts haven't really sunk in. When his brother went to prison for dealing cocaine right out of the governor's mansion, it made the headlines for a day, but most men have forgotten that, because it didn't stay in the headlines, and the controlled media haven't brought it up recently. Most White men would be surprised if you reminded them of that today.

Twenty-four years ago a small group of Republican zealots burgled the offices of the Democrats in Washington's Watergate Hotel. A couple of those Republicans had connections to the Nixon White House. If the controlled news media had treated that incident the way they treated the conviction of Clinton's brother for selling cocaine from the governor's mansion in Little Rock, Nixon would have served out his second term as President, and the name "Watergate" would have no special significance. On the other hand, if Clinton's drug connections had been publicized the same way the Watergate burglary was, keeping it in the headlines and on the television screens day after day, for months, leaking out a few more titillating tidbits each week, Bill Clinton never would have gotten to the White House in 1992.

Or think about Clinton's activities during the Vietnam war. Most White male voters have heard about that, but just like the drug dealing it hasn't really sunk in. Remember, while 58,000 young Americans were being slaughtered by the Reds, Bill Clinton was demonstrating for those Reds. Now his apologists will tell you that was 25 years ago, and all of the trendy-lefty people on the college campuses were doing the same thing back then. We should forgive him for what he did 25 years ago and let him get on with his present job of being commander-in-chief of the military forces he refused to serve with then and whose enemies he gave aid and comfort to then.

Well, actually it's not that simple. Bill Clinton was still entertaining his good Jewish friend and adviser, David Ifshin, in the White House as late as last year, until Ifshin became too ill from cancer to party. That's the David Ifshin who went to Hanoi during the Vietnam war and made those radio broadcasts urging U.S. servicemen to shoot their own officers and come over to the Communist side. It's David Ifshin's good buddy who is now the commander-in-chief of our armed forces.

Now, even the facts of the relationship between Clinton and Ifshin aren't a secret. When Ifshin died in April of this year there were news articles about his career buried deep inside the *New York Times* and other publications. But it wasn't on television, and so 50 million Joe Sixpacks never had a clue. Even if it had been on television, they wouldn't have gotten the message -- I mean really absorbed the fact that their President was inviting a Jew to the White House who had made treasonous radio broadcasts for the Communists during the Vietnam war and deliberately tried to incite mutiny and the murder of U.S. military officers -- they wouldn't have absorbed and understood that message, unless it had been repeated every night for at least three months on prime time, Watergate style. If it had been, I am sure that the polls would show heterosexual

White males against Clinton about ten to one, although his boyish smile would perhaps still win him the votes of many White women.

The Jews who control our mass media understand mass psychology and the manipulation of public opinion better than anyone else, and they know that they don't really have to run a tight conspiracy in order to maintain their grip on the American political process. They don't have to keep all of their shenanigans a secret. All they have to do is control most of what the boobs see and hear. And, of course, make sure that both candidates are in their pockets, so that it really doesn't matter too much which way the boobs vote. The Jewish media bosses would rather have Clinton than Dole, because Clinton serves them willingly, while Dole serves them because he has to, but it doesn't really matter a great deal to them. It's one of those "heads they win, tails we lose" propositions.

Anyway, as I said, all of this hasn't really sunk in, even among that half of the White males who despise Clinton. If it had sunk in (or, I should say, when it finally does sink in) then they'll be ready to do something about the system itself. They'll be ready to clean out all the filth, and not just the figurehead at the top.

Now, I know that there are pessimists who believe that the average White male never will understand what's going on, never will wake up, never will raise a hand against the system, because he's too stupid, too selfish, too cowardly -- and all too often just as much a slave to fashion as the women.

But I am an optimist. I know that more people are awake today than ever before, and I know that more people are waking up every day. I get letters from them. And I see what's happening to the society around me. I can see the growing rottenness, the growing corruption in every phase of our lives: the divorce statistics, the abortion statistics, the suicide statistics, the drug and alcohol abuse statistics. I can see it on the streets of our cities. I can see it in the sort of television people watch. Things are falling apart. The center isn't holding.

Other people see this too. Even if they don't study the statistics, they can feel what's happening. Our civilization is dying. Our culture is being killed. Honor, morality, nobility: those are all things of the past now. What we have now is Jewish democracy, Jewish equality, Jewish diversity and multiculturalism, Jewish crookedness and deceit and degeneracy in every aspect of our lives.

And people think about the future their children will face in this increasingly Jewish world. And even though they haven't yet figured out who's responsible for what's happening, who's pulling the strings, who's controlling the politicians and the system, rage is beginning to build in them, rage against whoever has destroyed their children's future, rage against anyone who has collaborated with the destroyers, rage against the system which has implemented the destruction.

That rage will continue to grow, because the process of destruction will continue. It will grow until it overcomes timidity. It will grow until it overcomes selfishness. It will grow until it no longer can be restrained, until no amount of television brainwashing can keep it under control.

Our job is only to provide some understanding, to provide some direction.

The Texaco Fiasco

The Nature of Corporate America Is Clearly Revealed

There's a very old saying, often attributed to the fifth-century BC dramatist Euripides, and also to many others over the years, which runs, approximately: Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

The reason this saying has endured for so long is that it expresses a truth which often has been observed in the lives of men and nations: Death, in the case of an individual, or the loss of physical or political power, in the case of a nation, is preceded by a loss of contact with reality. We might call this loss of contact with reality senility; or, as Euripides said, madness. It is a loss of the ability to observe, reason, and draw hardheaded conclusions in dealing with the world around us.

If Euripides was on target, then the gods have all of their thunderbolts aimed at America today. What could any nation be called, other than mad, which twice in a row would choose a creature like Bill Clinton as its President?

Perhaps you think I say that just because I regard Bill Clinton the way I would the sort of stinking filth I might have to clean off my boots after a careless walk in a dog kennel. So let's look at another sign of America's national madness that has less to do with Presidential politics. Let's look at what might be called the Texaco fiasco.

This particular evidence of national madness first came to my attention while I was watching the *NBC Evening News* in mid-November. Tom Brokaw, the boyish-looking actor who is paid to mouth the news script for NBC every evening, put on a very stern face and warned parents that what was to follow was "shocking" and "graphic" and might not be suitable for children to hear. Of course, I perked up my ears in the hopes of hearing something really titillating. And what we all got, of course, was a noisy, distorted recording of a couple of Texaco executives talking about "black jelly beans." And, although I couldn't really make it out myself, Brokaw told us in tones of shock and horror that the dread "n" word was spoken.

If it had ended there, this little episode might have been good for a laugh and then been forgotten. But it didn't end there. Brokaw, and the news actors at the other networks as well, went on and on and on about this bit of idle chatter on the part of a couple of Texaco executives. They treated the matter as if the president of Texaco had been caught sexually abusing little boys in his presidential suite.

Well, perhaps *that* wasn't a good example! Pederasts are becoming one of those officially favored minorities about whom one must say nothing disrespectful. If the president of Texaco had been caught buggering little boys, the networks would have taken the attitude that that wasn't really news and that to report it with a tone of disapproval would have been tantamount to what they call "homophobia." And "homophobia" these days is becoming almost as much a sin as using the "n" word!

Brokaw and the other news actors treated the matter as if it were a grave national crisis calling for action of the most drastic sort. They polled people on the street and quoted a few trendy air-heads saying that, yes, they were suitably shocked and horrified, and they intended to sell their stock in Texaco and to buy their gasoline elsewhere in the future. Then, of course, the politicians and the church people began getting into the act. They talked about "racism" and "hatred" and about the need to make everyone understand how "hurtful" the things the Texaco executives said were.

Then Jesse Jackson got into the act. He said it was time for Texaco to pay for using the "n" word -- pay with lots of money. Otherwise he would organize a boycott of Texaco products. This is the sort of extortion racket that Jesse and his so-called "Rainbow Coalition" have worked on dozens of other businesses: Cough up some money, or we'll organize a boycott against you. That would be a felony if you or I tried it, but Jesse has been getting away with it for years. I think it may have something to do with his color.

The most astounding performance of all was put on by the president of Texaco, Peter Bijur. Instead of telling the media that his employees' private conversations were nobody else's business and then denouncing the treacherous former employee who had made the surreptitious recording of what should have been a private conversation, he outdid Tom Brokaw at professing his horror and shock over the discovery that anyone at Texaco had ever had a Politically Incorrect thought. He practically rent his garments and beat his breast in his expression of repentance for the White guilt of Texaco executives. It was embarrassing to watch him. Finally he promised to cough up $176 million to placate Jesse Jackson and Texaco's offended Black employees.

Texaco is a big and very successful company. I can only assume that the people who run the company are not idiots. But if Peter Bijur is not an idiot, then he is a crook: a man without scruples or principles who will do anything, no matter how dishonest or treacherous, in order to keep his job.

I say that, because if he is as smart as I think he is, then he certainly could see through Tom Brokaw's act and understand what is behind it. He must understand that the whole pretense of shock and horror by the controlled media is part of a deliberate conditioning effort aimed at establishing a conditioned reflex against so-called "racism" in the more suggestible and easily manipulated segments of the population and intimidating the more independent-minded segments into going along with the mob.

We're all supposed to be horrified -- or at least pretend to be horrified -- that anyone at Texaco would use the "n" word, even in a private conversation. We're all supposed to side with Jesse Jackson in a crusade to punish Texaco for having executives who joke with each other about "black jelly beans." Those of us who can't simply close our eyes to reality and actually think whatever thoughts are fashionable at the moment, no matter how much at odds with the facts they are, are supposed to be afraid to tell a joke about Blacks or to use the "n" word even in a private conversation, because someone might be secretly recording our remarks, in which case we'll be fired by our employers, have our homes and cars repossessed, and be shunned by all right-thinking members of society.

That's the sort of conditioned reflex Tom Brokaw and the other media actors, following the policies of the media bosses, were trying to implant in us with their big hullabaloo about black jelly beans at Texaco. And Texaco's boss made a conscious decision to go along with this attempt to control the minds of his fellow Americans. He decided to collaborate rather than fight, because he figured that if he went up against the Jewish media bosses the fight would become too expensive, even for Texaco.

Actually, Peter Bijur and corporate America generally made this decision to collaborate with the Jews a long time ago. The campaign by the media bosses to control the thinking and behavior of Americans has been going on ever since the Jews began establishing their stranglehold on the mass media, more than 60 years ago. The Texaco hullabaloo was only one small event in that continuing campaign. Over the years a few of the big corporation bosses refused to go along with them, but only a few. Henry Ford, Senior, was one example. Most of the big capitalists put their profits ahead of everything else. They decided that it would not be profitable to get on the wrong side of the Jews, and so they collaborated with them, either actively or passively, regardless of the consequences for America and for our people.

Peter Bijur and the other big corporation bosses are intelligent enough to understand the general sort of damage to a people and a nation that must follow from permitting a small, alien minority to brainwash the public, to control the minds of its more suggestible elements, to shape public opinion, and to exercise a correspondingly powerful influence over governmental policy.

Yes, they have subtle enough minds to understand these things in a general way. For those who need very specific examples in order to grasp the significance of this sort of mind control exercised by the media, I'll give a very specific example.

Think for a moment about the current uproar in the Army as a result of the revelations about the wide-scale rape of female soldiers by drill instructors and officers at Aberdeen Proving Ground and other bases. This is really a shameful and intolerable situation. It is totally different from the drunken party a few years ago in Las Vegas by Navy fliers -- the so-called "Tailhook scandal" -- in which some women who attended the party were fondled and subjected to other indignities. The Tailhook Association parties were well known among Navy people as drunken orgies, and all the women who attended did so voluntarily. The Tailhook behavior was certainly nothing to be proud of, but it did not involve rape or coercion.

In the Army, on the other hand, female soldiers have been subjected to systematic sexual harassment, not at drunken parties they attended voluntarily but in connection with their military training, and many actually have been raped. Drill instructors and officers came into their barracks, grabbed them, dragged them into the bathrooms, and forcibly raped them, then threatened to cut their throats if they told anyone. This sort of thing happened not just once, but many times. It was a systematic thing. It is absolutely intolerable that we should have such a situation in the U.S. Army!

When the news finally broke a couple of weeks ago about what was happening to women recruits in the Army, the question which naturally arose was, why wasn't something done to stop the rapes a long time ago? Why did the Army brass tolerate this behavior for so long?

Amazingly, the answer to this question was provided by *Time* magazine in a November 25 news story on the Army rapes. The Army had been investigating the situation for some time but was moving very slowly and very cautiously, according to the *Time* story. And why was the Army cautiously sitting on its hands and doing nothing to stop the rapes it knew were happening? The reason, according to *Time,* was that most of the rapists were Black drill instructors and Black officers, and most of the women being raped were White recruits. The Army brass were afraid that if they moved against the Black rapists they would be accused of racism.

The implication of this *Time* magazine story was that if the rapists had been White, the Army would have moved against them instantly and stopped the rapes. But because most of them were Black, the Army leaders were afraid to take action. And why were they afraid to take action? Because of the sort of brainwashing campaign that the controlled media have been engaged in for so long, a campaign to make people fear being accused of racism more than anything else, to make them fear that an accusation of racism will cost them their careers and ruin their lives, whether or not there is any substance to the accusation.

It is this campaign by the controlled media to develop a Pavlovian reflex in the American public, so that they will be afraid to criticize Blacks, which kept the Army from moving against its Black rapists. And it is the same campaign which led so many of the White women in the Army to become rape victims. They were easy targets for the Black rapists because they all had been subjected to a brainwashing campaign that conditioned them to be especially receptive to Blacks, a campaign which cleverly insinuated the idea into their minds that there's nothing inherently wrong with interracial sex, that sex with a Black man is somehow more "progressive," more "tolerant," more Politically Correct than sex with a man of their own race; that to reject a Black man might be interpreted as an expression of racism. We've all seen this propaganda a thousand times in the mass media. All of the new films and television shows are full of it.

I'll go a bit further. This same Jewish media brainwashing campaign has been responsible for putting Blacks into positions of authority over Whites in our armed forces. That's something we never had until after the Second World War. And it has been responsible for removing the protections that we once gave to women. This Jewish media campaign is behind the move to mix women with men in every military role, including combat, and to treat them just like men.

It is a campaign to persuade us to ignore reality and to pretend that the world is not what we know it to be but instead to try to make it conform to some lunatic model of Political Correctness, in which everyone is equal, men and women, Blacks and Whites, and we all think and behave the same way. This campaign is destroying our society, destroying our country, destroying our people. And it is this campaign which the chairman of Texaco chose to collaborate with rather than risk a fight with the Jewish media bosses. That is truly shameful.

Twenty years ago I wrote a political novel, *The Turner Diaries,* in which I predicted situations we are seeing all around us today, but which seemed wildly fantastic to most people at the time I wrote about them in the 1970s. I looked at the policies being pushed by the Jewish media bosses at that time, I looked at the directions in which those policies were leading us, and I extrapolated 20 years ahead. I not only predicted greater governmental intrusions into the lives of our people and governmental efforts to take away our freedom of speech and our freedom to keep and bear

arms, I predicted the advent of domestic terrorism in the United States in response to this governmental repression. And I also predicted the fate of White women as the government moved to enforce a Jewish concept of equality on all of us. I predicted a great increase in the incidence of rape, and I specifically forecast the rape of White women by Black soldiers and the unwillingness of the Army brass to deal with this situation. I am horrified to see this scenario I imagined 20 years ago as fiction becoming reality today.

And I believe it goes without saying that I am not horrified at all by talk of black jelly beans or the use of the "n" word by Texaco executives. But I am horrified when men in positions of power and authority, men like Texaco boss Peter Bijur, choose to collaborate with those who are destroying America, choose to collaborate with those whose propaganda campaign has led to the systematic raping of our young women in the Army, rather than take a forthright and honest stand against this destructive campaign and the evil creatures behind it.

You know, there are plenty of idiots in this country who can't figure these things out, idiots who believe that the really big problem we have to solve in this country is learning to be one big, happy family: Blacks and Whites, Jews and Arabs, homosexual activists and normal people, *mestizos* and Vietnamese immigrants and those of us whose ancestors came from Europe and built a new civilization here. They wring their hands and think, "Oh, if we could just get along peacefully with each other!" They believe that we must be very careful what we say, very careful never to give offense, very careful never to use the "n" word, and then maybe all those people who are so different from us will come to like us, and we will somehow be able to live together without violence and hatred.

The idiots believe that, but the big corporate bosses like Mr. Bijur certainly don't. They have a little better grip on reality than the idiots do. They understand that if they tried to run their corporations that way, they would become snack food for the ones who play by rougher rules. The Army brass understand that too. And both the corporate bosses and the Army's generals understand that when you have something that someone else is determined to take away from you -- in this case, our country, our civilization -- you don't get him to change his mind by trying hard not to offend him, by being careful never to use the "n" word.

Yes, the generals and the bosses understand this -- but they don't really care. What happens to the country is not important to them. What happens to our people is not important. The only thing that's important is their careers. And we tolerate people with these attitudes, with these values, as the leaders of our society!

That too is a part of America's madness.

Get Set for War

Will the Next Four Years See Americans Dying for Israel?

Mr. Clinton has chosen the members of his government who will have charge of America's national security during his second term. They are Madeleine Albright as secretary of state, William Cohen as secretary of defense, Samuel Berger as chairman of the National Security Council, and Richard Holbrooke as ambassador to the United Nations. That's a lineup which should give nightmares to every American patriot -- and also to everyone who would like to avoid another war for a while.

Why are these four Clinton appointees likely to get us into a war during the next four years? In the first place, all four are Jews. Don't let the Gentile names Albright and Holbrooke fool you. These two appointees are just as Jewish as Cohen and Berger are. Jews make up two and one-half per cent of the U.S. population -- and 100 per cent of Mr. Clinton's national security team. That's quite a striking contrast! Especially for a President who has told us often that he wants his administration to "look like America," to be a reflection of America. I think what he meant is that he wants his administration to be a reflection of the behind-the-scenes power structure in America. It is the most Jewish administration our country has ever had -- by far.

And let us consider, in the second place, Mr. Clinton's reason for appointing these Jews to the top national security positions. Why didn't he appoint his friends and cronies to these positions instead? Why not appoint the drug dealers and pimps and money launderers he used to hang out with in Arkansas? He can't be re-elected President for a third term. He doesn't need the support of the Jews and their mass media any longer. Or does he?

You bet he does! Bill and Hillary Clinton are in a heap of trouble, and the heap is getting deeper by the week. Their Arkansas buddies are being packed off to prison one by one, and the trail is getting closer and closer to the Clintons. And I'm not the only American who would like to see Bill and Hillary led out of the White House in handcuffs and leg irons. The Republicans would love to get even for what the Democrats did to Richard Nixon 23 years ago. They would love to inflict as much damage as they can on Clinton and his party, because they hope to fill any resulting power vacuum.

But the amount of damage inflicted on Clinton depends much more on the controlled media than it does on the Republicans. Everything that happens in Washington is orchestrated by the men who control the mass media. The politicians all dance to the media's tune. They know that the way they are treated by the media determines whether or not they will be re-elected. Everything the politicians do and say is done and said with the media in mind. The media provide the link between the politicians and the voters. Mr. Clinton understands that as well as anyone else. And Mr. Clinton knows exactly who controls the media. He knows that whether or not he goes to prison depends more than anything else on how useful he remains to the Jews.

It was the enormous publicity given to the Watergate burglary by the controlled media 23 years ago which forced President Nixon from office: the intense media focus on this one subject day after day, for months, until it finally sank into the consciousness of Joe and Jill Sixpack. If the

media had given Watergate the sort of cursory, ho-hum coverage they gave to the Paula Jones case recently, Nixon would have been able to finish his second term. And on the other hand, if the media had focused on the Paula Jones scandal the way they focused on Watergate, Clinton would not have been re-elected.

You remember Paula Jones, don't you? She's the Arkansas state employee that Clinton dropped his trousers in front of and tried to pressure into having sex with him when he was governor of Arkansas. Her sexual harassment law suit against him will be coming to trial soon.

Bill Clinton has a lot more problems than the Paula Jones law suit to worry about, though. He is facing the likelihood of felony indictments on several charges during the next year or two, as the investigations into various of his criminal activities continue. In each case the attitude of the media bosses will be of critical importance to him. If the media give any case against him the Watergate treatment, with lots of negative coverage, day after day, that will generate a feeding frenzy among the Republicans, and they will be relentless in pushing for his prosecution. On the other hand, if the media ignore the investigations and scandals, that will take most of the steam out of them and discourage the Republicans from pursuing them.

The Jews, in other words, have Mr. Clinton exactly where they want him. He dare not disobey them. He must do everything they tell him, in the way of appointments and otherwise. Which is why Madeleine Albright, William Cohen, Samuel Berger, and Richard Holbrooke are where they are today.

The third thing to consider is the character and personality of these Jewish appointees. They are not just bureaucrats who happen, incidentally, to be Jews. They are a ruthless crew who know exactly where their loyalties lie. When the Jewish media were trying to force Richard Nixon out of office, for example, William Cohen was the first Republican in the Congress to abandon his party and join the media campaign against Nixon.

Madeleine Albright is an even better example of Jewish ruthlessness and Jewish loyalty to her fellow Jews. I remember seeing her interviewed on the CBS program 60 Minutes last May. The program was exploring the suffering of the Iraqi people under the total embargo placed on Iraq at the insistence of the United States -- which means at the insistence of the Jews, who wanted to punish the Iraqi people for being a threat to Israel's domination of the Middle East. *60 Minutes* took us on a tour of an Iraqi hospital, where children were dying by the dozens, because there was no medicine to treat them. The interviewer, Lesley Stahl, pointed out to Albright that 500,000 Iraqi children are reported to have died as a result of the embargo. And Stahl was obviously distressed by the plight of the Iraqi people and by all of those Iraqi children who had died as a result of this Jewish policy intended to cripple Iraq. I could see the distress on her face and hear it in her voice when she asked Albright, "Is the price worth it?"

And I'll always remember Albright's harsh, arrogant, and unapologetic answer. Without hesitation, almost with a sneer, she answered, "We think the price is worth it."

In other words, "Certainly, it's worth having 500,000 Iraqi children die in misery in order to safeguard Israel's position. After all, they're only Gentiles, they're only *goyim;* they're not Jews,

so who cares." What a vicious, hardhearted Jewess! And, you know, it was Madeleine Albright, who while she was Mr. Clinton's ambassador to the United Nations during his first term was continually urging that the United States use its armed forces for military intervention around the world, wherever some country needed to be made Politically Correct. And this Jewess will be in charge of the foreign policy of the United States for the next four years. That is really horrifying.

Now, these considerations I've just mentioned are not sufficiently persuasive by themselves for me to be convinced that our country will be led deliberately into another war. That is, I'm not predicting a war just because we have the amazing coincidence that Mr. Clinton chose Jews for all the key positions in his national security team, or because he desperately needs to do something, anything, to head off the investigators who are closing in on him, or because the Jews he appointed happen to be an especially bloodthirsty bunch.

The really frightening thing about these coincidences is that they just happen to have occurred at the precise moment in history when the Jews need another war, when it is essential for the Jews to get the United States involved in another major war.

They need to get us involved in a war for two reasons. The first reason is that, after nearly 50 years of turmoil, bloodshed, and minor wars in the Middle East, they still haven't been able to build a viable country for themselves on the land they stole from the Palestinians. Their neighbors hate them as strongly as ever -- and their neighbors are becoming more sophisticated as time goes on. Without the billions of dollars in military and economic aid the Jews extort from the United States every year, they could not maintain their military superiority over the rest of the Middle East. If U.S. aid to Israel is ever cut off, Israel will be finished in short order.

Furthermore, the growth of Islamic fundamentalism is a real threat to the Israelis. If Islamic fundamentalists gain power in Egypt or Saudi Arabia, then the rest of the Arab world is likely to go the same way soon, and the Islamic fundamentalists are people who do not compromise with what they view as fundamentally evil. They are determined to free the Middle East from Jewish domination. And they are growing in strength every year.

The Jews need a major Middle Eastern war to crush their enemies decisively and to make it impossible for them to wage war against Israel. Now, with Bill Clinton in office, and with Clinton surrounded by Jews, is the time to strike. If they do it now they can use America as their weapon, and it will be Americans rather than Israelis taking all the casualties. If they don't do it in the next four years, they may never have another chance.

The second reason the Jews need a war is to put down the growing dissent against them and their policies in the United States. The natives are becoming restless and have to be put down. The Internet is buzzing with questions the Jews don't want asked, with complaints the Jews don't want heard, with facts the Jews don't want you to know. The Internet is a communications medium unlike any of the others we are accustomed to, such as radio, television, newspapers, and so on, in that the amount of money a communicator has is irrelevant. They can rigidly control the ideas and information that the public has access to through television, because no dissenter has enough money to buy his own television network. To a lesser extent the same thing applies to radio, newspapers, and the other information media. The program on which this

publication is based, *American Dissident Voices*, is on radio, of course, but there are only a few stations from which we can buy time. The rest are afraid to carry our program because of the threat of Jewish boycotts. Most Americans aren't able to listen to *American Dissident Voices* unless they have a good shortwave receiver or a satellite system.

That is, they weren't able to listen to *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts until we began making them accessible through our two Internet web sites. Now, if you are able to connect to the Internet, and if you have the proper computer equipment, you can hear this and other *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts just by going to either of our two web sites, which are http://www.natvan.com and http://www.natall.com. And you can listen to us anywhere in the world at any time of the day or night.

Of course, NBC and ABC and CBS also have their web sites, but we are on an equal footing with them. You can find our sites just as easily as you can find theirs, and you can read or listen to what we have to say just as easily as you can to them. Our voice is just as loud as theirs. That's true only on the Internet. They can control the flow of ideas and information to you through television, but they can't control the Internet, and it's driving them crazy.

All of the big Jewish pressure groups -- the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Southern Poverty Law Center -- they're all screaming about the need to stifle Politically Incorrect ideas and inconvenient facts on the Internet. But they're having a hard time convincing the American people. They've tried to establish censorship of the Internet with new laws, but so far it hasn't worked. They've come forward with all sorts of new proposals for Jewish control of the Internet.

For example, they have Internet software which to a certain extent can filter out Politically Incorrect information, and they want to make the use of this software mandatory.

If that sounds like a pretty desperate proposal, believe me, it is. They know that they cannot maintain their control over the minds of Americans unless they can control the flow of information and ideas. And if they lose their control over what Americans think, they eventually will lose their political power as well.

And it's not just the Internet which is a problem for them in this regard. The American people as a whole -- even Joe and Jill Sixpack -- are becoming disillusioned and unhappy. Only 23 % of the electorate voted for Bill Clinton in November. More than half the electorate didn't bother to vote at all. The media have downplayed these facts, but the Jews are concerned about them. The people are being kept in line at the moment, because there are still lots of shiny new things for them to buy. But more and more Americans are beginning to look beyond their immediate material comfort and to worry about the long-term moral slide of their country. If the economy slips badly, there will be hell to pay. More and more people will listen to the dissidents.

A big problem for the Jews is how to silence the dissidents now, how to stifle the people who are asking inconvenient questions and thinking dangerous thoughts, before these thoughts spread to other people. They've tried to do it with legislation, but the country isn't yet in a mood to be told what it can think.

What the Jews need is a nice, big war. Then they can crack down on the dissidents. Then they can call us "subversives." Then they can call us "unpatriotic," because we will be against their war. Then the government can pass laws against us, and Joe and Jill Sixpack will go along with it.

Does that still sound pretty farfetched? I guess it does to many of you who haven't been keeping up with what the Jews have been doing and saying during the last few years. If you're a lawyer, though, you will know that the Jews have been sending up trial balloons for years, arguing that the First Amendment needs to be rewritten so that the only speech which is protected is Politically Correct speech. And if you're an Internet person who is knowledgeable about the big debate on Internet censorship, you know how hard the big Jewish pressure groups are pushing for censorship. And if you're just a person who pays attention to what other people are thinking and feeling, you know that the discontent about the course America is on has reached an all-time high. People are worried. People are heartsick. People are asking questions they were afraid to ask a few years ago.

The Jews need to squelch this incipient revolution before it grows. They have a window of opportunity during the next four years. After Bill Clinton leaves office, anything can happen. There undoubtedly will be a wave of popular revulsion against him and a demand for substantial change. The Jews may never again have such a pliant tool in the White House. They may never again have the power over the U.S. government that they have now.

That's why the alarm bells went off in my mind when Mr. Clinton announced who would be in charge of America's national security during the next four years. That's why I am convinced that there will be a strong effort to involve America in another major war during the next four years.

This effort will be disguised, of course. It will be cloaked in deceit, as such efforts always are. While the warmongers are scheming for war, they will tell us how much they want peace. They're good at that sort of thing. They've had a lot of practice.

But they will be scheming for war, believe me, no matter what they say. And when that war comes, remember what you have read today.

Thoughts on Discrimination

A Word that Once Meant "Good Judgment" Now Implies Sinfulness

A lot of crazy things are going on these days, some of which strike us as more obviously crazy than others. One of the more obviously crazy things which has come to my attention recently is a fight between two associations of high school wrestling coaches and referees in Texas on the one hand and feminist groups on the other hand. The feminists are insisting that high school girls be permitted to wrestle high school boys. The Texas Wrestling Officials Association and the Texas Interscholastic Wrestling Association are saying, "No way." So the parents of a couple of high school girls in Texas, backed by the feminist groups, have sued the wrestling officials, charging them with bigotry, sexism, and all the usual things. The wrestling officials say that they are willing to sponsor separate wrestling matches for girl wrestlers, but no girl-vs.-boy matches. The feminists claim to be insulted by this offer. They are demanding sexually integrated wrestling. The American Civil Liberties Union, among the groups backing the feminists, has announced that the wrestling officials clearly are guilty of "discrimination."

You know, it used to be that "discrimination" was considered an essential faculty of every adult person. An undiscriminating person is a person without taste or judgment, a person who does not distinguish between the good and the bad, between low quality and high quality, between what is acceptable and what is not. But nowadays, in this Alice in Wonderland world we're living in, "discrimination" has become the ultimate sin, and every Politically Correct person must declare himself free not only of any actual practice of discrimination but also of any tendency or desire to discriminate.

Actually, it's not quite that simple. Politically Correct people do not discriminate between Black and White, between male and female, between homosexual and heterosexual, between crippled and healthy, and a number of other things: the list of categories which are not subject to discrimination seems to grow a bit every year. But Politically Correct people are permitted to be discriminating about some things. They discriminate between "good" people and "bad" people, for example. "Good" people are Politically Correct people. "Bad" people are people who are still discriminating about things which it is no longer Politically Correct to be discriminating about.

Actually, the situation eventually will become much simpler, if the trend of the last 20 years or so continues for a few more years. Eventually everyone will be Politically Correct, and no form of discrimination at all will be tolerated. Already we can see broad, new categories developing which will not be subject to discrimination a few years from now.

Consider, for example, the difference between bright people and not-so-bright people, or between capable people and not-so-capable people, or between industrious people and lazy people. For years the forces of Political Correctness have been waging a campaign in our schools and universities to eliminate such discrimination. They have been arguing that intelligence cannot really be measured and that IQ tests and other tests of intelligence or aptitude should be done away with.

Now, part of the reason they don't want anyone to discriminate on the basis of intelligence is tied to their objections to discriminating between Blacks and Whites. But it goes further than that. They really are opposed to making any sort of distinctions between people based on ability: either natural ability or acquired ability. They want to do away with grades in school courses and with examinations. Giving grades makes those who don't get "A"s feel bad, they complain. And, really, they say, all such distinctions are meaningless, because everyone is born with the same abilities, and if some of us don't do as well in our school work as others, it's only because we didn't get the right kind of potty training or something of the sort. Right?

You know, if I'd talked like this ten years ago about discrimination based on intelligence, you would have thought I was going overboard. You would have thought I was being unfair to accuse people who were against discrimination on the basis of race also of being against discrimination on the basis of ability. You would have thought that being against racial discrimination is one thing, but being against discrimination based on ability is something quite different. If we couldn't discriminate on the basis of ability, our country couldn't survive; we'd sink back into savagery, you would have thought. And you would have been right about that last part.

And actually, the reason we *are* sinking back into savagery, the reason our country already has been half destroyed, is largely because we stopped discriminating on the basis of race and sex and sexual orientation and a number of other things some time ago.

And now the campaign to stop discrimination on the basis of ability has gained enough ground that you realize I'm not exaggerating when I talk about it. If you examine your own feelings, I'll bet that you'll find that the media brainwashing campaign against ability discrimination already has had an effect on you. I'll bet that if you are a teacher you will feel a little squeamish about opposing those who want to do away with grading. You'll flinch at the thought of the torrent of hatred and abuse you know the anti-discrimination types will pour on you. I'll bet that if you are the personnel director for a company, you'll be hesitant to initiate a program of intelligence testing for new job applicants. I mean, after all, doesn't it seem somehow . . . not quite *democratic* . . . to make distinctions based on ability or intelligence? Isn't that a little like *racism?*

You wouldn't have believed me if I'd told you ten years ago that the people opposed to the concept of racial discrimination also would oppose the concept of physical beauty. You'd have thought me crazy if I'd told you that the racial equality people eventually would be arguing that it's not *fair* to judge people on the basis of physical appearance or to deem some people as better looking than others. You would have thought me completely out of touch with reality if I'd told you that beauty contests soon would become Politically Incorrect.

And when the feminists really began to get noisy with their demands for "equality" 20 or 30 years ago, I'll bet you didn't believe that the government and the media ever would go so far as to force military academies to accept women as cadets and integrate women into our armed forces right alongside the men, subjecting them to rape by Black drill instructors. And I'll bet some of you slow learners out there still don't believe that the government will be sending women into combat within the next three or four years.

One can see the same sort of progression in the matter of discrimination between homosexuals and heterosexuals. Ten years ago the anti-discrimination people offered a carefully limited view of what they wanted to achieve in ending discrimination involving homosexuals. They just wanted to get rid of the laws making homosexual activity illegal, they said. They just wanted homosexuals to be able to have their gay bars and their gay bath houses and to be able to kiss and fondle each other in public without being harassed by the police.

Then, after that, they wanted laws making it illegal to refuse to hire a homosexual or to refuse to rent an apartment to a homosexual couple. A little later they wanted the armed forces to scrap their rule against homosexuals in military service.

And now they are demanding a total lack of discrimination between homosexuals and heterosexuals -- and also an end to discrimination between homosexuality and heterosexuality as paradigms, as models for life. Now the Politically Correct position is that homosexuality is just as natural and acceptable an orientation and lifestyle as heterosexuality, and that we should not distinguish in any way between the two.

And it wasn't too long ago that the anti-discrimination people began pushing their program for equalizing women and men in sports and athletic activity. At first the demands were only for giving women whatever men had: if a school had a men's football team, then it had to have a women's football team also, with all of the same facilities; just having a women's volleyball team wasn't good enough. Then women journalists had to have access to the locker rooms of male athletes, just the way male journalists did. And now, in Texas, we're seeing the next phase of the program, with the demand that we pretend that there's no difference at all between men and women, and so we must sexually integrate wrestling matches: we must let the girls wrestle the boys.

Now, there are several lessons for us in all of this craziness. First, it's easy to see that this compulsion to be undiscriminating is a progressive disease: it doesn't stop at any point; it just gets worse and worse. It starts off as a mildly wacky denial of reality and progresses to total insanity.

Second, it is a disease to which most normal, otherwise sane people are susceptible. They don't ordinarily develop the disease by themselves, but it can be induced in them by a sufficiently skillful and prolonged brainwashing campaign. What I'm saying is that ordinary, reasonable people can be made to believe the most extraordinary and unreasonable things, if they are subjected to prolonged brainwashing. Of course, it must be done in stages. If you want to convince a group of people that all-male wrestling matches ought to be made illegal, because they discriminate between men and women, you don't start out with that proposition. If you do, you'll be laughed out of town: or better yet, ridden out of town on a rail after being tarred and feathered. You start by persuading the people that it's not fair for schools to spend more money on athletic programs for boys than on athletic programs for girls. After you've done that, you persuade them that equally funded but separate athletic programs for boys and girls are inherently unfair to girls, that the programs ought to be integrated. And so on. You get the picture.

And if you want to persuade a whole race that it is unfair and unreasonable for it to use its schools and its universities to pass on *its* traditions and *its* history and *its* myths to the next generation of the race -- if you want to persuade them that it would be wrong to teach young people that *their* history is more important or relevant than the history of the Tutsis or the Zulus or the Hottentots, and so the schools either should teach no history or they should devote equal time and emphasis to the traditions, history, and myths of every race -- you don't start out with that proposition. You gradually work up to that over a period of 20 years or so, taking the people one step at a time.

And, of course, if you want to persuade a nation's people of something that really goes against their grain, something that is completely at odds with reality and contrary to common sense -- for example, that there's no difference between Blacks and Whites except skin color -- you really need to have a powerful brainwashing tool at your disposal: something like television, say. But if you and your fellow brainwashers own Hollywood and constitute the most powerful single group in the radio and television business and besides that own the three or four biggest and most influential newspapers in the country, and if you are willing to spend 20 or 30 years at it, you can convince people of just about anything, no matter how absurd or outrageous. You can even convince them that discrimination, instead of being a faculty necessary for human survival and progress and the maintenance of a civilization is an evil thing and ought not to be used at all.

It's possible to do this, because most people desperately want to be like other people. They want other people to think well of them, to approve of them. They want to behave in a way they believe is expected of them. This need to conform is so strong in most people that it can override reason. It is a much older and more primitive, more deeply rooted faculty than reason.

This need to conform, this need to believe whatever you think other people believe, is what lies behind the social phenomenon known as "fashion." It is what causes everybody to hum the same popular ditty at the same time, and then to forget it at the same time. It is what makes so many children want exactly the same type of toy, a Tickle Me Elmo or whatever, at the same time. It is what made people cheer the burning of witches 300 years ago. It is what makes people today parrot the idiotic notion that more racial and cultural diversity in a community leads to greater strength.

Now, this need to conform that most people have is not a bad thing in itself. In fact, it is a necessary social trait. Just as the ability to discriminate leads to progress, the need to conform leads to social cohesion and stability.

It poses a great danger to us now, however, because the development of the mass media during this century and the concentration of the control of the mass media in the hands of a small, tightly cohesive, alien group makes it possible for this alien minority to manipulate people, to manipulate their beliefs, in destructive ways.

The Jews who dominate the mass media understand the dynamics of manipulating public opinion. The brainwashers understand that they don't have to convince people that something is right or good; in fact, they don't even try. They just convince people that other people believe it

is right or good. They convince people that a new idea is becoming fashionable, and that in itself is enough to make the new idea actually become fashionable, if the campaign is kept up.

Thus, for example, if the aim is to persuade White Americans that the government should not try to halt illegal immigration -- that it would be bad to do anything really effective to halt illegal immigration, such as telling our Border Patrol to shoot anyone seen trying to cross our border illegally -- the brainwashers don't actually argue the pros and cons of illegal immigration. Instead they'll insinuate the idea into people's minds that other people don't approve of using strong measures against illegal immigrants. For instance, they'll focus news coverage on a case where the police chase and catch a truck full of illegal immigrants and are a little rough in arresting them. And then they'll have some politician say that the police were too rough. And then they'll report that the police have been reprimanded by their superiors. And thus the idea will be formed in the public mind that the behavior of the police is disapproved by many people. And then they'll use another incident in a similar way. And then another and another and another. And gradually they will build up the idea in the public mind that most people disapprove of getting tough with illegal immigrants. And so, in order to conform to this artificially manufactured perception, they themselves will disapprove of getting tough with illegal immigrants.

So if you're a person who still has a little contact with reality and you believe that it's crazy to force high school wrestling teams to be sexually integrated, you can understand now that the right thing for you to do is not waste your time arguing that it's not good for boys and girls to fight against each other on the wrestling mat. The right thing to do is help me to continue building alternative media for reaching the public. We cannot win the struggle to save our civilization and our people from the craziness that is overtaking us until we regain control of our mass media. We must take them out of the hands of the Jews and return them to our own people. And a step on the way to doing that is to support this program, to tell your friends about it, to send donations, and to do everything else you can to help us reach more people.

The End of the Millennium

What Will the Next Thousand Years Bring?

As we move into the last Presidential administration of this millennium, it may be useful for us to survey our recent past and think about how we can do better in the future. If we are to survive the next millennium, we really must avoid some of the mistakes we made in this one: especially in this last century of the millennium.

The 20th century has not been a good one for us. In the 19th century we were doing pretty well. Our people ruled the planet, and no other race posed a threat to us, either demographically or militarily. The 19th century was a wonderfully creative century for music, for painting, for poetry, for literature, for philosophy, for fundamental science. It was a wonderful century for our race and for our civilization generally.

And in the 19th century we had more freedom than we had experienced in a long time -- and a lot more freedom than we have left at the end of the 20th century. Of course, you won't agree with that if you think of freedom as something which the government gives you: a handout or special protection or a law requiring other people to give you something you couldn't get on your own. In the 19th century our people were much more free than they are now to do what they wanted without government interference. They had more elbow room and fewer taxes, fewer laws, fewer meddling bureaucrats. Ideas flowed more freely. No one had invented Political Correctness. The 19th century was the White man's century.

Of course, the 18th century and the 17th century and all the centuries before that had been White men's centuries too. It had always been a White world -- until the latter half of this century. In the 19th century, however, we made some big mistakes, which paved the way for the disasters of the 20th century. In the United States we freed all of our slaves and then failed to get rid of them by sending them back where they'd come from. We just turned them loose to fend for themselves among us -- and to multiply. In Europe we opened the ghettos and permitted Jews to begin participating in our cultural, political, and economic life: a really big mistake, but one whose consequences didn't hit us until the present century.

In the 20th century we have let ourselves be maneuvered into two disastrous world wars, in which we destroyed much of our best racial stock. We permitted Jewish Bolshevism to rise up and consume half of Europe. In this century we saw the rise of the mass media under Jewish influence. We saw the breakdown of most of our traditions, our morals, our manners -- and the rise of a lunatic egalitarianism which has made a shambles of our civilization. We saw the corruption of our culture by a wave of lunatic modernism in music, in the graphic and plastic arts, and in literature. We saw the rise of "diversity" and "multiculturalism" and miscegenation and the destruction of our cities. We saw the rise of feminism and homosexuality and every other sort of perversion and filth. We saw this filth declared normal, even admirable, by the media and

sanctioned by legislation. We saw our political system become an obscenely corrupt circus, culminating in eight years of Bill Clinton.

The disaster of the 20th century has been concealed from us to a certain extent because the scientific advances we made in the 19th century led to enormously powerful technological developments in this century. The flowering of our technology and the overwhelming effect technology has had on our economy and our lifestyles has fooled many of us into believing that our civilization is still making progress. The intellectual developments leading to the automobile, the airplane, radio and television, and even the computer all had been made in the 19th century, but only in this century were these advances translated into large-scale applications affecting the lives of everyone. We have many more shiny toys and appliances and tools today than ever before, but we have practically destroyed the civilization out of which these things grew -- and we are well on the way to destroying the race which created that civilization.

The greatest physical threat our people are facing today is that of what our enemies worship as "diversity." It is the threat of becoming overwhelmed everywhere by hordes of non-Whites. It is the threat of being outnumbered even on our own turf. It is the threat of losing our breeding area and becoming submerged in the rising tide of non-Whites everywhere. It is an urgent, immediate threat. If we do not eliminate it in the next few years, then in the coming century it will destroy us completely.

That is the great physical threat to our existence which we must fight. But before we can hope to eliminate that threat we must eliminate the moral threat to our existence which has caused the physical threat. We must deal with the moral breakdown which has led so many of our own people to look forward eagerly to the physical annihilation of our race. We have an utterly sick moral atmosphere nearly everywhere which makes many of our people feel that it is wicked to be concerned about the survival of our race. It is a moral sickness which makes so-called "racism" the greatest of sins and equates any concern or feeling for our own race with that sin.

It is perfectly all right, of course, to be concerned about the survival of Blacks or Indians or Jews -- but not Whites. White children are being taught by television and by their churches and by their schools that White people are responsible for everything that is bad in the world, and that the world will be a better and happier place when there are no more White people in it -- and that to try to protect or preserve the White race is to commit the unforgivable sin of "racism."

Of course, much of that teaching is still tacit, still implicit, but it is becoming more and more explicit every day. The government is involved in it, the churches are involved in it -- but the driving force behind that teaching is in the mass media, especially the entertainment media. Nearly every film, nearly every new television show pushes the same ideas over and over: racial mixing is good; miscegenation is good; more non-White immigration is good; more "diversity" is good; more multiculturalism is good; more affirmative action is good; and any opposition to these things is bad, bad, bad.

Perhaps you think I exaggerate this situation, but I do not. As I said, much of this poison which is being pumped into the souls of the American people is disguised and indirect and implicit, but

believe me, it is there, and it is deliberate; it is calculated by the people who control the mass media.

I'll give you an example of my own experience in this regard. The organization which I head, the National Alliance, distributes a three-inch by five-inch sticker with a simple message, intended to be as inoffensive as possible. The message is: "Earth's most endangered species: the White race. Help preserve it." That's all -- plus our mailing address, so people can write for more information. We've distributed literally millions of these little stickers during the past ten years, and we've made contacts with a lot of good people through these stickers. But we've also been surprised to find out that a great many White people are embarrassed, angered, and offended by the simple message on our stickers. We will receive letters from people who've seen one of our stickers, and they'll say, "Stop putting up your racist stickers in my neighborhood. We don't want any more of your hate. I intend to notify the FBI if I see another of your stickers."

Occasionally I've had a chance to talk to one of these people directly, and I'll say, "What do you find hateful or racist about our stickers?" A typical response will be, "Well, what about Black people? Don't they deserve to survive too?" And I'll say, "This sticker doesn't say anything about Black people one way or another. The survival of Black people is another subject. I'm White, and I'm concerned about the survival of my people. That's what this sticker is about." And this will result in another hostile outburst: "See! That's the trouble! You don't care about Black people or Jewish people or anybody but Whites! You're a racist! You're a hater!"

Now, everyone listening today understands that if our stickers asked people to be concerned about the survival of Black people, say -- just Black people, or just Jews, or just Indians -- these Politically Correct types who are horrified by our stickers now would find nothing objectionable about them at all. They wouldn't have the confused notion that it's somehow illegal to be concerned about the survival of Indians and that they ought to go running to the FBI. They wouldn't see anything hateful in a sticker suggesting that Blacks should be concerned about the future of their people. They are brainwashed. They are conditioned by the controlled media. They are reacting in an irrational way. But there are tens of millions of these authoritarian-type people out there, who absorb every bit of poison from the mass media and take it to heart. There are enough of them to swing elections and determine public policy. And the poison continues to flow, more and more of it in every new batch of television programs and Hollywood films. And as I said, it is calculated poison. It is poison designed by the controllers of the media to have exactly the effect it does.

Of all the evils which have befallen our people in this century, the rise of the mass media in Jewish hands has been the worst. What I am trying to do with these radio broadcasts is counteract this evil, this moral sickness, this moral paralysis being promoted by the controlled media, which keeps our people from taking action against the physical threat of racial annihilation facing us. It is an enormous task, because the resources of the television networks and Hollywood and Madison avenue and the government are so much greater than ours, but it is by no means a hopeless task. We reach new people every day and help them to see the truth and to understand what is happening, and we motivate many of them to join us in fighting the evil which threatens our race. But it is reality itself -- the growing nastiness of life in multicultural

America -- which is making people face the facts more than we can hope to with our present resources.

Most ordinary Americans have been trying to ignore what is being done to our country. They want to be nice to everybody if they can. They don't want to offend anyone. They don't want the busybodies in the Clinton government to put their names on a blacklist of Politically Incorrect citizens. They just want to be left alone to live their lives and take care of their families and raise their children in peace. But it's becoming harder and harder to do that. Reality keeps getting in the way. No matter how hard they try to avoid the nastiness, it keeps finding them.

Now more and more of them finally are deciding they can't keep ignoring the assault on our people. If nothing else, the increasingly blatant and obvious and vicious anti-White propaganda on television has forced them to the realization that there will be no future for their children if things keep going along the same course. They're finally beginning to realize that they must do something, that the nightmare won't go away if they just ignore it. And so my voice and other American dissident voices are doing more than just competing against the Jewish media for the attention of the people. We are more like a catalyst now. Conditions themselves are making the people pay attention and are turning them against the poison of the controlled media. My voice and a few others just need to give a hint, make a suggestion, point the direction, help people get started on the way back to freedom and health. Even though the controlled media can speak much more loudly than we can, we still are being heard by more and more people.

And let me tell you, the people who are destroying America, the people who want to destroy our race, the people who are cooking the television poison don't like that a bit. They understand what they're doing. They know that as their destructive efforts become more evident, there will be a growing backlash against them. They are afraid of that backlash. They are desperate to silence every voice in opposition to theirs. They believe that if no one is allowed to contradict them, then our people won't know whom to blame for the destruction and that they'll be able to continue leading us into the slaughterhouse.

That is why they have been pushing so hard in recent years to abolish the First and Second Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. That is why they have been trying to convince us that dissident voices just cause trouble, and that the public would be better off if no one were permitted to criticize their policies or alert the people to what they're doing. The second Clinton administration will be their big chance to silence their opponents, to make dissent illegal, and to keep anyone from exposing what they're doing.

The next four years is their opportunity. There's no telling what will happen after the year 2000. They've been able to control the electoral process so far through their control of the media, but the natives are becoming restless. It's not likely, but it is possible that someone with some principles, someone with some patriotic feeling might win an election after Clinton is out. So now, while they have a totally unprincipled President who is completely under their control and will do absolutely anything they tell him, now is the time for them to push through new laws making it illegal to say or write anything which is Politically Incorrect. If they can count on the FBI and the other secret police agencies to lock up anybody who says anything against them, it will be a lot easier for them to keep a lid on unrest and dissent after the end of the millennium.

And now, with the economy still relatively strong, all of the authoritarian types -- the ones who want to call the FBI when they see one of our stickers -- will go along with an abolition of free speech rights. If they wait until the economy collapses and a lot of people are angry and frightened, they will have a much harder time taking away what's left of our rights and keeping us quiet.

I previously predicted that Clinton's new all-Jewish national security team would attempt to lead us into a major war during the next four years. My new prediction is that the Clinton government, with the collaboration of the Republican Congress, will respond to media demands and move to restrict our First Amendment rights. I predict that we'll see a major push during the next four years to criminalize political dissent.

Of course, they won't call it that, just like they won't tell us that they're leading us into a war because a war serves their needs. Instead the media and the government will tell us, "Oh, we've been attacked by Saddam or whomever! Now we must respond to protect our national security."

And they won't say, "We're taking away your freedom of speech because we're afraid of what you may say." Instead they'll say, "We're all in favor of political debate . . . between Republicans and Democrats. We believe in free speech for nearly everyone. It's just those nasty extremists, those haters, who must be silenced. We have to lock them up, because otherwise they'll say things which will get people upset, and the first thing you know we'll have another Oklahoma City bombing or another race riot.

That's what we're facing as this century and this millennium roll to an end. If our enemies have their way, it'll be the last millennium on earth for our race, forever. We haven't got much time. Let's see what we can do to upset their applecart before this millennium is over. Let's do whatever we have to do to get ourselves back on track and make sure that the next millennium belongs to us too.

The Rule of Law

When It Is Disobeyed Tyranny and Anarchy Result

What are the principal characteristics which distinguish a civilized society from a savage society? What outstanding features have distinguished the societies our people created in Europe from the much more primitive societies formed by other races which we encountered in Africa, America, and Australia?

We might note that our societies were literate, and the others were not. We might note that our societies had a much more highly developed technology, much more complex tools and techniques, than the primitive, non-White societies. We might note that the concepts of the individual, of individual rights and responsibilities, and of private property always were much more characteristic of our societies than of theirs.

All of those are important distinguishing characteristics between civilized societies -- at least, *our* civilized societies -- and uncivilized societies. But there is one other characteristic of a civilized society which is more fundamental than anything else, and that is the rule of law. A truly civilized society, whether it is organized as a monarchy or a democracy or a dictatorship, must have a generally recognized and a generally respected set of rules or laws, obeyed by everyone, from the king or the president or the dictator down to the humblest peasant or factory worker. The laws may specify certain powers for the king or the president that the peasant or the factory worker does not have, but the king is just as much bound by the law as anyone else in a civilized society. He may no more break the rules with impunity than anyone else.

In our societies the basic body of law, the common law, evolved together with the societies themselves over periods of many generations. The law reflected the nature of our people. It governed the basic structure of our society and the relationships of our people to our society and to each other.

The law, of course, is not a static thing. Even the common law changes. It evolves to meet new needs as the society evolves. And statutes -- written laws crafted by parliaments or king's councils -- change even faster. But as long as the society recognizes and respects the laws and is ruled by them, then it can claim to be a civilized society.

When respect for the law disappears, and powerful people or groups can break the law with impunity, then the society no longer is civilized. Even when the outward form of the law is maintained, but the respect for the law is gone and people feel only the need to make a pretense of being ruled by the law while ignoring its spirit, then their society can only pretend to be civilized. That is the situation we are dangerously close to in America today.

The re-election of Bill Clinton as President is one example of the general lack of respect for law which exists in this country. Clinton is hardly the first President who is a lawbreaker, and he certainly is not the only prominent politician today who is in trouble for breaking the law. But his reelection is still the most blatant example of the widespread lack of respect for the law in this country. Clinton is a man who has been heavily involved in all sorts of illegal activity -- the drug

trade, money laundering, racketeering -- illegal activity which was by no means a secret. When he was governor of Arkansas his brother Roger was running a flourishing drug business, selling cocaine right out of the governor's mansion. No one in Arkansas who knows Clinton believes that he didn't know what his brother was doing prior to his arrest and conviction for drug dealing. Many of the people Clinton ran around with and received donations from were gangsters or drug dealers.

Clinton was a draft dodger. He associated closely, intimately, with people like the late David Ifshin, who committed treason against the United States. Ifshin went to Hanoi during the Vietnam war and made radio broadcasts for the Communists, urging American soldiers to turn their guns against their officers and come over to the Communist side. Clinton considered Ifshin a close personal friend and an adviser on Jewish affairs and often had him as a guest in the White House during his first term.

And when Clinton was governor of Arkansas he used the Arkansas state police as his own personal pimp squad, sending them out to scout up women for him. One of these women was Paula Jones, an Arkansas state employee, and her lawsuit against him for sexual harassment is a matter of public record.

And despite all of this, 23 per cent of the American electorate voted for Clinton. They ignored his lack of respect for the law, because they wanted him to continue the government's programs favoring homosexuals, feminists, Blacks, and the other minority groups which make up the Clinton coalition, and thus they demonstrated their own lack of respect for the law. It is true, of course, that Clinton has not yet been convicted of anything and sent to prison like his brother and many of his other former associates, but if there were real respect for the law in our society, a man as tainted by suspicion and association with criminals as Clinton is could not even be considered as a candidate for President.

Of course, we still have the pretense of rule by law, and so the investigations into various of Clinton's illegal activities continue. These investigations, however, are not driven by respect for the law, but only by partisan politics. If the Democratic Party had its way, the investigations would all be halted immediately. And if Clinton were a Republican instead of a Democrat, the Republicans would not have demanded the investigations in the first place.

It is not just electoral politics which becomes corrupted when a society loses its respect for the law. Eventually everything becomes corrupted, and the pretense of respect for the law becomes more and more transparent as the process of decay advances. I'll mention a couple of more examples.

One example is provided by an American named Gerhard Lauck, who is now sitting in a prison in Germany, convicted of violating German law by publishing materials in the United States which the German government finds offensive. Another American, Hans Schmidt, was arrested while visiting Germany and charged with publishing illegal ideas in his newsletter in the United States and mailing copies of his newsletter to subscribers in Germany. Mr. Schmidt was fortunate enough to be able to escape from Germany before the German government could put him on trial.

Mr. Lauck, of Lincoln, Nebraska, was not so fortunate. Like Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Lauck has done nothing illegal in Germany. And he has done nothing in the United States which is contrary to U.S. law either. He has simply exercised his freedom to speak and write. But because the ideas he wrote about in the United States are illegal in Germany, where there has been no freedom of speech since 1945, and because he mailed some of his publications to subscribers in Germany, the German government issued a warrant for his arrest. When he visited friends in Denmark in 1995 the German government had him arrested and extradited to Germany, where he was put on trial last August and then sentenced to four years in prison for publishing illegal ideas.

Not only did the U.S. government make no protest against this violation of an American citizen's rights, but the U.S. government actually collaborated with the German government in having Mr. Lauck arrested. Before Lauck was arrested, Louis Freeh, Mr. Clinton's ambitious FBI boss, traveled to Germany for a conference with the secret police boss there and publicly expressed his agreement with Germany's laws restricting speech. He said that it is too bad that we don't have similar laws in the United States, because without such laws he could do nothing to stop Mr. Lauck from publishing the ideas the German government doesn't like. What he did do, however, was furnish the German secret police with information about Lauck's travel plans, so that they could have him arrested in Denmark.

I'm not enough of a lawyer to know whether or not Louis Freeh actually broke any U.S. laws in helping the German government arrest an American citizen for exercising his constitutional rights in the United States. But it is perfectly clear that Mr. Freeh has only contempt for the law and contempt for the rights of American citizens. And what he has done can only lessen respect for the law among everyone else who knows of it, and that includes everyone in the secret police community.

There's more involved in this than Mr. Freeh's contempt for the law. Jews everywhere have been pushing for restrictions on speech, so that people cannot criticize or contradict them. They would like to make it illegal to question their exaggerated claims about the so-called "Holocaust" or their version of events in the Middle East or to talk about their role in the origins of Communism. They have been able to enforce their policies on Germany ever since that country lost the Second World War. They try to silence their critics in the United States by other means. Mr. Freeh, who obviously aims to please the people who control the media, is helping them. But the real point here is that Mr. Freeh and the government of which he is a part have no respect for the law, no respect for the Constitution which prohibits the government from interfering with free speech, and the citizens who elected that government also have no respect for the law. That is a very bad situation, a very dangerous situation for what's left of our civilization.

To better understand the significance of the Lauck case, imagine an alternative incident. Imagine that a Jewish writer in the United States, who has written some unfavorable things about the Islamic religion, say, is visiting Turkey. Imagine that the head of our FBI tips off the secret police in Iran that the Jewish writer is in Turkey, and the Iranians send a police team across the border into Turkey to kidnap the Jew and take him into Iran, where he is put on trial for blasphemy and sentenced to prison.

Can you imagine the reaction of the Clinton government? Can you imagine the reaction of the Jewish media? Can you imagine the reaction of our prostitute politicians in the Congress? They all would be screaming for blood. The politicians would be on television every day demanding action. The Clinton administration would be threatening war. Our armed forces would be mobilized for an all-out assault on Iran. The head of the FBI would not only lose his job, he would be facing criminal charges of some sort, you can be sure.

But Mr. Lauck is not a Jew, and Mr. Schmidt was not a Jew. More than that, they both have said and written things that the Jews would like to make it illegal to say or write in America, and so the Clinton government has collaborated with a foreign government in the persecution of these men, while the politicians and the Jewish media have pretended not to notice. That's worse than a lack of respect for the law. That is using the power of the law in a lawless way. That is tyranny.

You know, the problem isn't just that we've got more crime these days, both inside the government and among the citizenry. There always have been lawbreakers, and there always will be. And the crime rate has been going up for a long time. What's different and dangerous today is that such a tolerant attitude toward crime is permeating our society. It used to be that a politician as crooked as Bill Clinton had to be very careful to keep his criminal activity secret. Today a substantial portion of the electorate don't care whether their President is a criminal or not, so long as he keeps their favorite government programs going. And the government in turn feels that it no longer has to hide its contempt for the rights of its citizens. It can do the things Mr. Freeh's FBI did at Waco, and it can conspire in the violation of Mr. Lauck's constitutional rights, and it doesn't have to worry about public opinion, because the public doesn't really care. That is frightening.

This is not just an abstract problem. You may think, "All right, our society is becoming uncivilized because it has lost its respect for the rule of law. Ho hum. Too bad for our society, but that doesn't affect me." If that's what you think, you're wrong. What is happening will have very concrete and immediate and unpleasant consequences for many of us, not just Gerhard Lauck or the children the Clinton Justice Department incinerated at Waco in 1993.

Every society has its quota of amoral, antisocial individuals, who prey on others if they can. In a civilized society, the law keeps these antisocial predators under control. In a savage society, where each man is a law unto himself, the predators are likely to be killed as soon as they make themselves known. But in a society such as we have in the United States today, where the legal establishment itself is becoming lawless, many of the predators are able to prey on society without fear of the law -- in fact, under the protection of the law, with the cooperation of the legal establishment -- yet the citizens are not free to protect themselves from these predators. The *form* of the law -- the pretense of lawfulness -- protects the predators, but not their victims. What we have developing in the United States today, in fact, is the worst of all possible situations, where a corrupt and lawless legal establishment has formed a partnership with the most predatory and destructive antisocial elements in our society: we have growing collaboration between an increasingly unpopular government, the Jewish mass media, and special interest groups which hope to win gains for themselves at the expense of the general public.

The basis for this unholy collaboration is the continuing dispossession of the White majority by the Clinton coalition: the homosexuals and the feminists and the non-Whites -- and, of course, the Jews. Our basic body of law, the law which grew up with our civilization, is inconvenient for them. It is not favorable to the homosexuals and the other perverts. It does not make special provisions and quotas for non-Whites. And it does not give a preferred status and exemption from criticism to Jews. And so the members of the Clinton coalition have been working hard to change and corrupt our body of law and replace it with law more favorable to themselves. And when the process of change and corruption is not fast enough for them, they turn to other methods. That is why the FBI collaborates with the secret police in other countries to punish our citizens for the exercise of their legal rights. That is why the Clinton government and the controlled media collaborate with special-interest groups to harass and vilify law-abiding American citizens who continue to exercise rights that the members of the Clinton coalition find threatening.

The rights that are especially threatening to the Clinton coalition are those specified in the First and Second Amendments to the U.S. Constitution: our rights of free speech and of self-defense. These are the rights they fear most. And these are the rights they will be using extra-legal means -- and sometimes even illegal means -- to combat during the second Clinton administration. It was their fear of the Second Amendment which led them to commit the massacre of the innocents at Waco. It was their fear of the First Amendment which led them to betray Gerhard Lauck to the German secret police. And it will be their fear of the First Amendment also which will lead them to use surrogates in their attacks against me and other critics in the future.

And, you know, their fears really are justified. They don't have much time left. The vigilantes haven't started dealing with them yet, but with only 23 per cent of the electorate behind them during the last election, they must be wondering how long it will be before the other 77 per cent finally loses its patience with them. They still can strike at me and a few others, but eventually the time will come to strike back. And when there is no law left to protect them from retribution, they will have only themselves to blame for destroying that law.

Hope for the Future

If Our Enemies Were Secure They Wouldn't Be so Worried

When I talk with people in the United States about the problems our country is facing and about the need to organize everyone of good will into an effective force for dealing with these problems, the most common complaint I hear is: "People don't care." Or: "People are afraid to talk about the real problems. They just want to complain, but as soon as you start talking about doing something they become frightened."

In other words, the people I talk with tell me, "White Americans are like ostriches with their heads in the sand, hoping that things won't get much worse if they just pretend not to notice what's happening and don't think too much about it."

Now, that's partly true, but there are many different types of White Americans, and not all are afraid to face the real problems in this country. Let's take a look at some of these different types.

First, let's note that there are a great many White Americans who do care about what's being done to our country and our people. Some of them are afraid to talk about it, but others are not. Some are confused about what's happening, but others have a pretty good understanding.

It's also true, of course, that many Americans don't care. There are millions of couch potatoes, of Joe and Jill Sixpacks, of sports fans, of disco-goers, of trendy air-heads who believe whatever they see and hear on TV and try to learn all of the latest cliches and imitate all of the current fads. As long as their refrigerators are full, their brains will be turned off. But White Americans today are not much worse in this regard than other people at other times. Most people always have been like that: without initiative or imagination or curiosity or independence. Let's not concern ourselves with them now. Later, when their refrigerators are empty, we'll see what can be done with them.

Let's look at the Americans who do care. Let's look at the ones who are observant enough to know that something is wrong and are responsible enough to be concerned. That's probably a good half of the adult White population. The question is, why aren't more of them doing something about their concern?

We know that Bill Clinton was elected to his second term as President with the votes of only 23 per cent of the electorate, fewer than one in four. Of course, some of the other 77 per cent voted for Bob Dole or Ross Perot, but two-thirds of this other 77 per cent said, in effect, "To hell with the whole business. I'm not voting for any of those clowns."

Now, that's something! That's a new record for voter alienation. That's a clear sign that a substantial portion of the population is fed up. It's a real reason for hope, and it's no wonder that the controlled media have not had much to say about the election statistics. But the question remains, why aren't the people who're fed up doing more than simply choosing not to play the game any longer?

I know that many of them are too frightened to do anything. They're afraid of the government, which they have come to realize is no longer an institution to serve the people but instead has become a dangerous and powerful enemy of the people.

Do you remember the FBI's response to the terror-bombing at the Atlanta Olympics last year? The FBI didn't have a clue as to who the bomber was, so they fingered the security guard who had found the bomb, Richard Jewell; told the media that he was their prime suspect because he was a heterosexual White male with an interest in firearms; and then during the next few months proceeded to ruin the poor man's life, hoping that some evidence might turn up to implicate him or that he might crack under the pressure. Eventually they had to admit, very grudgingly, that they'd made a mistake.

Perhaps you saw the televised news conference held by Jewell and his lawyers after that. I saw it on the *NBC Evening News*, and I remember one of Jewell's friends who made a very moving statement at the conference. He said that he realized that living in the sort of country the United States has become is inherently dangerous. He said he realized that he could be killed by a terrorist bomb at any time. But, he said, after seeing what the FBI had done to his friend Jewell and the way they had done it, he was far more afraid of the FBI than he was of terrorists.

I think many people feel that way today. They feel intimidated by the government and the media. They've seen too much abuse of power, and they're afraid that if they open their mouths, if they criticize the government, if they become known as dissidents, the government will retaliate against them. Others are aware of the bias of the controlled news media. They have seen the vicious treatment the media give to anyone who is Politically Incorrect.

Do you remember the way the media hounds tore apart poor Marge Schott, the Cincinnati baseball team owner, after she made a couple of Politically Incorrect remarks last year? People are afraid of being attacked and hounded by the media if they do or say anything the media bosses don't approve of. They are afraid that the media will cause their employers to fire them or will incite minority criminals to attack them or their families. It has happened -- too often -- and people are frightened.

Many people also are discouraged. They see the jungles our cities and our schools have become after decades of destructive immigration and suicidal race policies. They see the terrible condition of our racially integrated armed forces, and they see the decline in the quality of law enforcement in our cities. It seems impossible to them that things can ever be sorted out and cleaned up. They look at the immense power wielded by the media and by the government, and they see no way to overcome that power. They see things getting worse and worse every year, and they conclude that the country cannot be saved, our people cannot be saved. And so they give up on trying to do anything more than looking out for themselves and their families. They don't want to sacrifice themselves in what they view as a hopeless cause. There are really a lot of people who feel this way.

And many of these people are not cowards. They understand the power and the ruthlessness of the government and the media, and they are wary of this power, but they have not let themselves be conquered by unreasonable fears. They just don't believe that anything useful can be done,

and so they don't try. If they did believe something could be done, then they might be willing to defy the government and the media and take their chances.

There are millions of people like this. They know that things aren't the way they ought to be, even though they don't completely understand why. They aren't cowards, but they aren't inclined to be heroes or martyrs either. They concern themselves almost exclusively with their own security and comforts, yet they aren't entirely without a spark of idealism and altruism. They're ordinary White men and women: moderately perceptive, moderately brave, and capable of becoming moderately idealistic.

What these millions of ordinary White men and women need is understanding and hope. Understanding, so that they can see what has happened to our country and our people and what needs to be done to set things right; and hope that what needs to be done actually can be done, so that they become willing to take a chance and participate in a struggle for the future that no longer seems hopeless to them.

Giving understanding and hope to our people are our two tasks, the two reasons for these *American Dissident Voices* programs. Of the two, giving understanding is the easier -- and it is necessarily the first. Each week I use this radio broadcast to explain one facet or another of this confusing world around us, so that our people can have a clearer picture of what is happening, what has happened, and what is likely to happen in the future. And this program's sponsor, National Vanguard Books, publishes many books and periodicals which also provide understanding.

One of the books published by National Vanguard Books is a novel I wrote more than 20 years ago, *The Turner Diaries,* in which I tried to look into the future and project where the trends I could see around me in the 1970s would take us. One of the things I saw coming was a great increase in terrorism in the United States as resentment against the government and its policies grew. Another thing I saw coming was a great increase in violence against our women: I predicted the rape of our women by Blacks in our minority-pampering Army under a government unwilling to stop it for fear of being charged with "racism." And I have been very gratified by the many people who have written to me and told me that their eyes were first opened when they read *The Turner Diaries:* that after reading the book they not only could understand what is happening now but also could have some inkling of what will happen next. These people who had read my book weren't surprised by the World Trade Center bombing and the Oklahoma City bombing and the Atlanta Olympics bombing and other acts of terrorism which have occurred recently, and they weren't surprised by the revelation of the widespread sexual harassment of White female recruits in our Army by Black drill instructors and the unwillingness of the Army brass to stop it before it attracted public attention. They had seen these things coming from reading my book.

The difficulties we face in providing understanding are primarily economic difficulties. We should have this radio program on every station in America, but air time is expensive. We would like for every adult White person in America to read *The Turner Diaries,* but so far only about a quarter of a million have. We need to expand our outreach greatly and reach many more of our people with our message, but that will require many more helpers working with me, and it will

require much more money. We are slowly doing what needs to be done, but we could do it much faster with more help. Fortunately, we gradually are getting additional help, but we need much, much more.

The bigger part of our task is giving our people hope. Understanding what has happened and what needs to be done is not enough for most people. Of course, if all of our people were heroes by nature, then understanding would be enough. They would consider only what it is necessary and proper to do, and then they would be willing to die trying to do it, whether it were possible or not. But most of our people are only slightly heroic. Most people not only need to understand what they should do; they also need to believe that it is possible to do it. And so our task is to persuade them that what we are trying to do is not only necessary and proper, but also possible. Then they will join us. Then we will sweep the enemies of our people, who now seem so powerful, into the trashbin of history.

And so how do we give hope to intelligent, perceptive people, who look at the situation around them and see this powerful and corrupt government steamrollering anybody who gets in its way? How do we make them believe that it is possible to successfully oppose such a government?

Well, first we simply focus their attention on some of the things they already know but perhaps haven't thought enough about: things like the utter moral corruption of the government, a corruption which robs it and its supporters of any conviction that their cause is just. A morally crippled enemy is a mortally weakened enemy. A government led by a moral cripple like Bill Clinton may still be able to do a lot of damage, punish a lot of its enemies, and keep many people frightened into silence and inaction -- but it is vastly more vulnerable than it would be if were not corrupt, and its corruption increases every year. Certainly, it would be depressing to see support for such a government remaining strong. We kindle hope in patriots by as simple a thing as reminding them of the recent election results, which show the great withdrawal of support from the government: results which show them that fewer than a quarter of the eligible voters voted for Clinton and his government.

It is important to continue emphasizing these things, because the controlled media deliberately create the false image of great popular support for Clinton and the government. They deliberately create the impression that what is happening is inevitable and unstoppable. The media spokesmen show us great crowds of smiling faces: everyone is happy, they tell us, because we have more minorities than ever before, more feminists, more proud homosexuals, more equality, more "diversity." Sure, we have a few little problems, the media tell us, but people generally are happy with the way things are going, and if those awful patriots, those awful extremists and dissidents would just keep quiet, everything would be wonderful.

I believe that it's important to contradict this lie with the facts, with the real numbers, so that people can have hope, so that they can see that the evil forces destroying our country and our people are not as strong, do not have as much support, as the controlled media would have us believe -- and that the support they do have is declining.

For most people, though, real hope will come not just from realizing that our enemies aren't quite as strong as we'd thought they were: it will come more from having a realistic goal before their

eyes instead of a hopeless goal. When they look at the mess our enemies have made of America and they try to figure out how to straighten it out, of course that seems hopeless to them.

Imagine that you are a doctor, and you have two hospital beds before you. In one bed is an old man of mixed race whose health has been ruined from a lifetime of depraved living, an old man riddled with AIDS and a dozen other incurable and infectious diseases. In the other bed is a healthy White infant. You should not waste your time working to make the old man healthy again by trying to undo what cannot be undone. The thing to do is pull the plug on his life-support system before his disease has a chance to sicken the healthy White infant in the other bed, and then to devote all of your energy and skill and resources to ensuring that the infant stays healthy, that he doesn't grow up to lead a life like the old man did and fall prey to the same diseases. That can be done. That is something which is possible.

Now, the choice facing the ordinary American of good will today is not quite that simple, but there are strong similarities. What we need to do is stop worrying about undoing the awful, mixed-up mess our enemies have made. Instead let's let the process of self-destruction proceed as quickly as it will, so that it is finished before it has infected the lives of all of our people. We can't stop it anyway. I mean, what can you do with a city like New York or Washington, except try to keep it from spreading, by whatever means are necessary? What can you do with a political system like the one in Washington, except encourage it to even further excess? Let's not waste our time and energy trying to undo what cannot be undone. Let's pull the plug and focus all of our efforts on salvaging what is still healthy and then ensuring that it stays healthy. That can be done. That is something which is possible.

Let the fire which is coming take care of New York and Washington. Let's try to show as many healthy people as we can how to keep from becoming infected, and then how to avoid being burned when the fire comes. Let's show them how to avoid becoming discouraged by enemy propaganda. While the controlled media gloat over the rising rate of racial intermarriage and over the rising number of White families adopting Black children and over the darkening of America from the non-White immigration flood, let us keep pointing out to people the numbers that show the declining level of support for this rotten system. While the enemy rejoices over the new destruction he is accomplishing, let us rejoice over the new people whose eyes are being opened by this destruction, and let us reach out to these people.

Let us realize that we cannot save everything. We cannot save what has become sick and corrupted. But we can save many of those who are still healthy and who are repelled by the sickness. Let us do a better and better job of that, because in that is our hope for the future.

Shakespeare and Democracy

Our Culture Is Not Being Passed on to Future Generations

William Shakespeare is out. Maya Angelou, Frantz Fanon, and W.E.B. DuBois are in. I'm talking about fashion at American universities.

There's been some discussion in the mass media recently about the fact that American universities are phasing out Shakespeare and the other creators of our European culture and replacing them with non-Whites of various stripes, such as the three Black writers I just named. The impression is left by the media discussion that this is some sort of fad, which, hopefully, will pass soon. The discussion was sparked by a decision on the part of the faculty at Georgetown University, the prestigious Jesuit school in Washington, to drop the requirement that their English majors study the works of at least two authors from among Chaucer, Milton, and Shakespeare. Now Georgetown's English majors can graduate without ever having read anything by Shakespeare. I'm not talking about Georgetown's basketball players or her business majors. I'm talking about the students who are seeking degrees in English literature. An acquaintance with Shakespeare is no longer necessary. Nor is an acquaintance with the writings of any other dead White European males, or "dwems," as they are referred to contemptuously by the Politically Correct elements at our universities these days.

And this is not a fad, nor is it restricted to Georgetown University. After Georgetown made its move, a survey was conducted among the top 70 universities in America by the National Alumni Forum, and it was found that two-thirds of them have made similar moves. Instead of studying *Hamlet* or *Julius Caesar* or *Macbeth* . . . or Milton's *Paradise Lost* or *Il Penseroso* or the works of any other great writers of English literature . . . students of English literature are studying the scribblings of miscellaneous non-White nonentities, or they are taking courses in such pop-culture topics as "The Gangster Film," which is now offered to English majors at Georgetown in lieu of Shakespeare, or "Melodrama and Soap Opera," which Duke University offers to its English majors instead of Milton and Chaucer.

Other universities have courses on comic books or checkout-stand tabloids or rap ditties. The ones with real pretensions to seriousness have scraped together English literature courses which actually require the study of books written in the English language, so long as they were not written by a White male -- at least, not by a White male who has been dead for a long time. Jewish males, of course, are A-OK, and so the students spend plenty of time with the works of J.D. Salinger, Saul Bellow, Bernard Malamud, Herman Wouk, Norman Mailer, Philip Roth, and scores of other Jews. Unfortunately, the students are taught that the books of these Jews constitute serious English literature. It was a little harder to convince students of that when they also studied Shakespeare and Milton and could compare their writing with that of the aforementioned Jews. Now it will be easier.

As I said, this is not just a passing fad, something very trendy and liberal to suit the Clinton era. It is the outcome of a campaign which goes back more than 30 years. In the 1960s, when I was a university professor myself, anyone who had suggested that Shakespeare should be phased out of university teaching would have been thought crazy -- at least, he would have been thought crazy

at the university where I was teaching, which was a bit more conservative than some. But even at my university there were faculty and administration people pushing for more democracy and more "diversity." They were promoting the idea that universities were too White and too elitist, that we needed more "diversity" among students and professors and that we should give the students more of a say in the running of the university and not leave it all to the professors.

It was really very subtle. It wasn't until they had established their idea about the need for more democracy and more "diversity" that they moved to the next phase and began suggesting that the traditional courses in history and literature were actually a bit . . . ah . . . racist and needed to be, well . . . cleaned up a bit.

And then a few years ago you had groups of the more trendy students marching around on some campuses and chanting, "Ho, ho, ho, Western culture has got to go." They wanted the traditional courses in Western civilization to be replaced with courses which treated all cultures equally, instead of focusing primarily on European culture. And, of course, all along Shakespeare was gradually being eased out the door. It's just now that a few people have noticed it and raised the alarm.

And even now the anti-alarmists are telling us that it's all much ado about nothing: that English literature students still can study Shakespeare if they want to -- and that some universities still require their English literature majors to study Shakespeare -- so stop worrying. And, of course, that is true: students still can study Shakespeare if they want to -- but there's no denying the trend. There's no denying that Shakespeare actually is being eased out the door, and that the curricula at our universities are being filled with courses which at best are worthless and at worst are destructive of the central purpose of a university, which is the training of an elite to carry on and enhance the cultural traditions of our people. Our universities actually have been subverted. They actually are being turned against us and used as weapons to destroy the civilization of which they used to be a part.

How did that happen, and why did it happen? There still are many bright people, as well as honest and well-meaning people, on the faculties of our universities. How could they let anyone subvert their institutions without noticing what was happening and opposing them?

First, I'll give a very brief answer, and then I'll go back and explain it in detail.

Our universities were subverted without any effective opposition because, first, the subversion was done very gradually, over a period of more than three decades, and it was done by a very clever group of very determined and very well organized people who already had infiltrated our university faculties and administrations. Second, the people who should have opposed the subversion already had been morally and ideologically disarmed, so that they could only fight tactically, but not strategically. They could oppose the details of the subversion, but they could not oppose the overall campaign of subversion -- and in particular, they could not attack the subverters themselves. They were fighting the subversion, in other words, with both hands tied behind their backs.

Now I'll explain this answer. Before this century, our universities more or less served their two basic purposes, one of which is to train scholars in a technical sense -- the mathematicians, the chemists, and the physicists -- and the other of which is to instill in a leadership elite of our young people an understanding of and a sense of commitment to our civilization, so that they can maintain that civilization and add to it. The civilization that our universities were a part of was unmistakably and unapologetically Western, which is to say, European -- or if you prefer, White.

This fact did not suit some people. In particular, it did not suit the Jews, a people of Asian origin with quite different traditions and a quite different way of looking at the world. To them our universities were an obstacle which stood in the way of their penetration and domination of our civilization. And so they set about eliminating this obstacle, in their usual very carefully planned way. They were very unobtrusive at first, just infiltrating themselves gradually into university faculties and more or less behaving themselves, trying hard to convince the people at the universities that they were harmless. They worked to get rid of the restrictions the better universities had to limit their numbers, and they very cautiously pushed such ideas as democracy and equality.

It was only after the Second World War that they really came out of the closet and began pushing hard for the changes they wanted in the universities. The Second World War, after all, had been fought for the sake of democracy and equality, we all were told. We had killed millions of people in Europe in the name of democracy and equality and had turned half of Europe over to Bolshevik butchers to kill millions more after the war. After that, how could we oppose democracy and equality in our universities? We needed to open the doors of our universities to everyone, regardless of race, creed, sexual orientation, national origin, et cetera. We not only needed to open the doors, we needed to reach out and pull in hundreds of thousands of young people who before never would have thought of attending a university.

Of course, there was some opposition to all of this. Some university people expressed concern about the lowering of standards required to accommodate all of the new students, especially the Black students. And they were assured by the proponents of democracy and equality that standards would not be lowered: that the universities could absorb Black students and all sorts of other students without lowering their standards at all. To suggest that they couldn't was tantamount to racism; it was tantamount to claiming that Black students could not graduate in significant numbers unless standards were lowered. And this was where the people who should have defended our universities against the subverters were stuck. They didn't want to admit to *racism,* so they really couldn't fight effectively to maintain standards that clearly worked to the disadvantage of Blacks. And they didn't want to admit to anti-Semitism, so they couldn't really take off the gloves against the ringleaders of the subversion. So they retreated, step by step.

Of course, pretty soon many more people than the original Jews were involved in the subversion. As the number of students at the universities increased enormously, many empires were built and many vested interests established. The salaries of many people at the universities have become dependent on how many students they have. Professors who teach courses in basket-weaving or golf or the-comic-book-as-literature become fiercely defensive and can give you all sorts of reasons why their courses are important. And there has been a growing tendency to cater to the desires of the students: not to teach them what the professors know they ought to be taught, but

instead to teach them what they think they want to learn. For young people raised on television and permissiveness, what they often choose are fun courses, trendy courses, trivial courses, and what they often neglect are the serious and more demanding courses. Universities, instead of scholarly institutions, have become to a large extent economic enterprises: that is, commercial institutions selling education, and the customers all too often are assumed to be right. Sometimes when a university offers a huge assortment of Mickey Mouse courses, it's hard to separate the economic motive of wanting to keep the customers coming in the door and lining up at the cash register, from the ideological motive of wanting to be democratic by having curricula that will be easy enough for everybody.

But despite the economic factors and other factors which have degraded American universities, the motive to destroy our culture and undermine our civilization continues to provide a powerful driving force for subversion. Political Correctness was born at our universities, and it reigns supreme there. University professors must toe the party line on race, on equality, on history, and on matters relating to sex and sexual orientation. And the party line is anti-White, anti-European, anti-Western. It is strongly influenced by the interests of feminists, homosexuals, and Jews.

One factor which obscures the seriousness of this problem is its uneven effects. It has devastated some academic disciplines and left others relatively undamaged. If one wants to become a mathematician, for example, there are many universities which still offer top-quality mathematics curricula. The Red Guards have not yet gotten around to applying the canons of Political Correctness to mathematics. It helps, of course, that most basketball players don't care much for math.

But if a young person is interested in literature or history, he is likely to be badly shortchanged at most American universities. These are subjects on which the Red Guards have left their mark, and it is easy to understand why.

History is an inherently racist subject, although I can hear the gutless wonders who try to teach it squealing in protest at that verdict. History is racist because, in the first place, it involves the study of what various peoples and individuals actually have done, not what the theorists of democracy and equality would like to have us believe they have done. History gives us a continuing proof of the fact that there is no equality in the world. It is a record of heroic accomplishment and outstanding virtue on the part of some, contrasted with chronic ineptitude and appalling iniquity on the part of others.

In the second place it provides the indispensable basis for a sense of peoplehood, a sense of rootedness, a sense of racial identity. It is not something you want spread around when you are trying to reduce a population to a mass of rootless, cosmopolitan, interchangeable human atoms.

Finally, history gives us some very inconvenient truths, especially about the origins and conduct of the two world wars in which we have participated in this century. Perhaps the undergraduates will sit meekly in their classrooms and soak up whatever lies the professor dishes out, but it's still dangerous because some of the students may develop a real interest in the subject and do some reading or real research on their own, and there's no telling what sort of Politically Incorrect things they may discover.

And literature . . . well, that's at least as dangerous as history. Who can read the *Iliad* without his blood beginning to race and without feeling a connection to those ancient people and events? Who cannot be moved by the same spirit which moved Homer? And that spirit has nothing to do with the sickly spirit of democracy and equality. Dangerous stuff, indeed!

And then there's Shakespeare! There was never a man who observed the human condition with truer eye than he. He stripped away every pretense and showed us as we are, the good and the bad -- but hardly equal! The great danger in literature -- in real literature, in great literature -- for the democrats and the egalitarians is that it helps us to understand ourselves and to place ourselves in the context of our people. It helps us to complete ourselves and to become whole. It expands our horizons, helps us to see the big picture. It gives us ideals, models -- and those ideals, in our literature, are not egalitarian ideals. Nor are the models Politically Correct: in fact, they are much more likely to be heroes than democrats.

And the people who run most of our universities these days are frightened by that prospect. In their view it is much better to feed our young people the sick, Semitic, anti-heroic blather of a Bellow or a Malamud or a Mailer than to let them get carried away with the dangerous, undemocratic ideas of Homer or Shakespeare.

And so our universities have become what they have become. And the people who should have stopped it from happening didn't, because they were afraid to deal with the fundamental issues. They were afraid to deal radically with the problem.

And now, looking at the situation objectively, it is still possible to study hard and to learn at our universities -- at least, in most curricula. That is undeniable. But it also is undeniable that the average graduate of our universities is seriously deficient in the arts of civilization. And that's the way the subverters of our universities want it.

It's a serious problem. We have a job to do at our universities someday which will make Hercules' cleansing of the Augean stables seem like good, clean fun. Let's hope that we can begin that job before Shakespeare has disappeared completely down the Memory Hole.

Skating on Thin Ice

Those Who Would Destroy Us Are Getting Worried

I've been astounded by all of the public attention focused on the decision of a school board in Oakland, California -- a Black district -- to treat the Black version of English, or "Ebonics" as they call it, as a separate language in the schools. What goes on in their schools is their business, and if they want to learn Swahili or invent a pseudo-grammar for Black English, let them. So far as I'm concerned, the farther they separate themselves from White America, linguistically or otherwise, the better.

But the liberals in the media don't look at it quite that way. They're fascinated by the Ebonics issue, but they don't know quite how to deal with it. On the one hand they hate to see anything which separates Blacks from Whites or calls their ideology of egalitarianism into question. On the other hand, they have long had such a patronizing attitude toward Blacks that they can't quite bring themselves to respond negatively to anything Blacks do, no matter how foolish. The liberals have encouraged the development of "Black studies" programs in the schools and then have smiled patronizingly when Blacks have gone off on wild and nutty "Black history" tangents: for example, their claim that the ancient Egyptians and Carthaginians were Blacks. They even claim that the Greek queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, was Black.

In fact, the latest craze among "Black history" enthusiasts is a curriculum called the "African-American Baseline Essays." Courses based on this curriculum teach students in our public schools that not only were the ancient Egyptians Negroes, but that they were great scientists and inventors, who developed quantum mechanics and the theory of evolution and built airplanes, which they used to fly around the pyramids for business and pleasure . . . until, of course, the evil Europeans appeared on the scene and enslaved them and stole their inventions. They're actually teaching such things to children in the public schools in Milwaukee and a number of other cities, and it's beginning to make the liberals a little uncomfortable. To the liberals, Blacks are above reproach. So how to tell them that they're on a self-destructive course with Ebonics and their Black Egyptian aeronauts?

Well, anyways, bro,' dat' be de way I sees it.

Actually, it's good to have a little comic relief occasionally. What the liberals and their pets are doing to our world usually isn't very funny. Have you seen some of the newer programs on television? If you haven't looked recently at what MTV is offering to our teenagers, make a point to survey their programs. They are pushing as hard as they can the idea that miscegenation -- that sex between Whites and Blacks -- is a natural and good thing, a fashionable thing. They are deliberately and blatantly encouraging teenaged White girls to have sexual relations with Blacks.

Now, I don't mean to imply by what I've just said that the Jewish owner of MTV, Mr. Sumner Redstone, as he calls himself these days, is a fuzzy-minded liberal. Mr. Redstone is no liberal. He is a hardheaded man who knows exactly what he's doing. The liberals are the trendy Gentile idiots who smile approvingly at Mr. Redstone -- and who frown disapprovingly at me when I point out that he is a Jew and that he is doing what he does because he is a Jew.

Mr. Redstone and his fellow Jews are far more dangerous and destructive than the liberals, even though they depend on the liberals to make their destructive work possible and to protect them from retribution. Liberals are essentially irrational, and left to themselves can easily wreck a society, but the damage liberals do is usually inadvertent. When they encouraged Blacks to believe themselves equal in ability to Whites, they didn't really anticipate the nutty extremes to which this would lead Blacks. And when liberals cheered the drive by the controlled media for all of those "civil rights" laws of the last few decades, they didn't really anticipate the wrecking of our schools and our cities that would result. Liberals always are wringing their hands, lamenting the mess their programs have made of things, and then pushing for even nuttier programs to try to fix the mess.

Mr. Redstone and the other media bosses are quite different. They know with a satanic certainty what they are doing. When Mr. Redstone encourages teenaged White girls to date Blacks, his motivation is purely satanic. His conscious and deliberate aim is the destruction of our race. But the liberals aren't capable of understanding that. To them Mr. Redstone is a nice man, a progressive man, who just wants us all, Black and White, to love each other.

In addition to the media bosses, who're deliberately destroying America, and the liberals, who're helping them without really understanding what's happening, there's another really big group of people who must take some of the blame. Those are the folks we might call individualists. They don't actively collaborate with people like Mr. Redstone, the way the liberals do. And they generally have only contempt for the liberals. They figure that their job is to look out for themselves, and everyone else can do the same. I run into a lot of these people among White businessmen, but they're really spread through our society, in all occupations. Most of these individualists aren't malicious, like the Jewish media bosses, and they have a much better grip on reality than the liberals do. What they lack is any sense of responsibility. Ask one of these individualists what he thinks about the fact that some public schools are teaching that the ancient Egyptians were Black and were flying airplanes 4,000 years before the White man flew. His one concern will be that *his* children not be in such a school. If the schools want to teach that to the children of other Whites, that's not his concern. He may agree with you that such teaching is ridiculous, but he knows that anybody who says so publicly risks being branded a "racist," and that's bad for business.

Ask an individualist what he thinks about Mr. Redstone's poisonous race-mixing propaganda on MTV, and he will back away from you in a hurry. His thought will be that he has nothing personal to gain from being involved in that dispute. Mention to him Redstone's Jewishness, and he will turn around and start running. He knows that any criticism of the Jews is *very* bad for business. If you try to drag him into that, he will become hostile to *you*, not to Mr. Redstone. And he'll be thinking, "Hey, I can keep my own daughter away from Blacks, and I don't have time to worry about what Mr. Redstone does to other people's daughters." And, unfortunately, all too often he'll be dead wrong about his ability to keep his own daughter safe.

Many individualists have a strong authoritarian streak in them. They respect not only authority, but also money and power. They have a subconscious conviction that anyone with as much money as Mr. Redstone has can't be all bad. They can't help but admire him as a smart and successful businessman, even if his business is genocide. An authoritarian individualist is a

person who habitually ignores facts which lead to inconvenient conclusions. He is a person who may despise draft dodgers and drug abusers and men who use the power of a public office to coerce women into having sex with them -- and yet he will jump at the chance to shake hands with a man who is all of those things, if that man happens to be the President of the United States. He'll say, "Yes *sir,* Mr. President!" with a proud grin on his face, no matter what sort of filth happens to be President.

Now, if you add up all of the people I've mentioned so far: the soft-brain liberals, the no-brain couch potatoes, and the individualists, you've got a majority of the White population. So how can the minority of us who're concerned about what Mr. Redstone is doing and believe that he must be stopped at any cost . . . how can we hope to prevail? How can we stop Mr. Redstone and the other media bosses from completing their program of destroying our people, when the liberals are against us, when the individualists will take orders from whoever has the power at the moment, and when most of the rest of the people neither understand nor care what's going on? How can we prevail?

Perhaps you believe that I make these broadcasts just because it is my moral responsibility to do so, that I expose myself to the hatred of the government and the controlled media and all of their supporters just because it is the right thing to do, whether there is any chance of making a difference or not.

I must tell you that I believe that every man and every woman should do what he or she believes to be right, without regard for the personal consequences. I believe that every White person has a moral obligation to oppose Mr. Redstone, whether he can see a way to defeat him or not -- and I often am disappointed that so few actually accept this responsibility.

But I also must tell you that there is more than a sense of moral obligation which compels me to work for the future of our people and to expose myself to the hatred of our enemies. There is also my conviction that, powerful as our enemies may seem now, ultimately they cannot win. The liberals cannot win, because the world that they want cannot exist. The liberals believe in equality, and there is no equality, there never has been, and there never will be. They want a world which is contrary to Mother Nature and to human nature, and there is no way they can have it. That is why every program the liberals have been able to persuade the government to enforce on us has been a failure.

And Mr. Redstone and his fellow Jews cannot win because they are destroyers, not creators. Throughout history they have destroyed nation after nation, but it is because of their inherently destructive nature that they never have been able to fasten their grip on any nation permanently. Their own account in the Old Testament of what they did to Egypt before they moved on serves as a paradigm for what they have done always and everywhere.

Of course, it is not enough that our enemies eventually should fail. They must fail before they have completely destroyed every prospect for a healthy future for us. We must get rid of them while there is still a possibility for rebuilding, while there still are enough sound White people left to make a new start. I believe we can do that.

I believe that the enemies of White America will fail, will become weak enough for us to destroy them, soon enough for us to salvage a future for our people, because I can see the clear signs of their impending failure all around me. I can see the signs that their system is coming unglued, that they are losing their grip on things already.

What most of us are able to see of the world outside our own neighborhoods is only what we see on television, only what the controlled media let us see. And of course, they want to convince us that their grip is still very firm, that they still have everything under control, that their programs are working, that most people are satisfied, and that there is no stopping them, that they are inevitable, the wave of the future.

But if that were so, why would they choose as badly flawed a front man as Bill Clinton? Why not choose someone who could win the respect of a substantial portion of the public? If they really had a grip on things they wouldn't need a President so crippled by scandal and by his own obvious moral inadequacies that he could win the support of only 23 per cent of the electorate. They chose Clinton only because they need someone who will be completely under their control: someone who needs them as much as they need him. They are afraid to have someone in office who might be strong enough to oppose them -- or have enough public support to oppose them -- because they know just how quickly the game would be over for them if any President stood up against them and called on all decent people to stand up with him and rid the country of people like Mr. Redstone. They know just how unstable the country has become, just how much anger and resentment is boiling right under the surface, just how precarious their position really is.

If most Americans felt like the ones they show on television, bubbling about how wonderful all of the "diversity" in our society is, the media bosses and their collaborators wouldn't be so desperate to silence dissent. But they really are desperate. The big Jewish organizations, like the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center, and the B'nai B'rith, are constantly agitating for new laws to silence people like me -- and, in fact, to silence everyone who doesn't like Mr. Redstone and his program to mix the races. If they were confident that the public agreed with their programs, they wouldn't need to silence us. They could just laugh at us. But they're not laughing. They're sweating.

There's a new book out by the best-known Black newspaper columnist in America, Carl Rowan. It's called *The Coming Race War in America*, and it's absolutely nutty. It is completely paranoid. Rowan, as a long-time journalist, has a little better view of what's going on and what people are thinking than most of us. He gets a lot of letters from angry people -- mostly angry White men. And they've scared him out of his wits. He really believes that Newt Gingrich, Patrick Buchanan, Gordon Liddy, and I -- along with many, many other White men -- are engaged in a gigantic conspiracy to overthrow the government and get rid of all the non-Whites.

I wish it were so; I really do. But the fact is that Rowan, like many other liberals, Black and White, is very jumpy, very nervous, very worried, very insecure. They are seeing conspiracies where there are none -- yet. It is because they know how much anger there is out there, how fed up many people are. They know that the house of cards the media bosses and the liberals have built is in danger of getting knocked down. But their fear makes them imagine dangers that don't really exist -- yet.

Yes, Carl Rowan has gone around the bend with his paranoia. But where he imagines dangers, I see real prospects for hopeful developments. The biggest hope I have is based on what I have learned about public opinion. There's a huge swing element out there, which right now is supporting the status quo, because the people in this element are to a very large extent the individualists and the authoritarians. These people are not ideologues. They have no commitment to liberalism or to what Mr. Redstone is doing. They give passive support to these destructive policies now, because most of them don't yet feel personally threatened or personally damaged by them -- and they still look to the government and to the mass media as authorities which should be respected and obeyed.

Furthermore, the alternative to the status quo is unacceptable to the individualists. The prospect of chaos and conflict is unacceptable. They know that a strong move against the government at this time would lead to conflict and chaos. They know that a strong move against the minorities would lead to rioting and conflict. They don't want that. The status quo, no matter its problems, seems better -- for now, anyway.

They always respect power, and as long as Mr. Redstone and his fellow media bosses seem powerful, the individualists will go along with them and will not oppose them. But when they no longer seem powerful, the individualists will withdraw their support. They will not fight for Mr. Redstone and his policies like the liberals will. And when the status quo becomes bad enough that conflict and chaos no longer look so bad in comparison, they also will withdraw their support for the status quo.

So to a large extent it's a matter of perception, and that's a rather fragile thing. And it's evident to everyone that perceptions are shifting, that they're not what they used to be even ten years ago. There is much more of a feeling of instability and uncertainty in the air. And that feeling will increase. Perceptions will continue to shift, because the destructive process which has been set in motion by Mr. Redstone and the other enemies of our people will continue. Things which used to be solid and safe will continue to be undermined. And there's not too much our enemies can do about that. It's the price they must pay for carrying on their destructive activity.

The recent Presidential election is an example. They wanted a completely pliable tool in the White House, someone who will do whatever they tell him, someone utterly without principle or scruple. Well, they got their tool, but the price they paid is a lowering of respect for the government. The price they paid is getting their tool in with the support of only 23 per cent of the electorate, a new low. And the process will continue. Carl Rowan and the liberals know it -- or at least sense it -- and that's what makes them paranoid. They sense that the ice they're skating on is getting thinner and thinner.

The ice will break sooner than anyone imagines. Our responsibility is to remain a beacon of truth and of hope for a healthy future, and to become a brighter and brighter beacon, so that when the ice does break, enough people will know which way to turn.

Thoughts on the "Holocaust"

The Dishonest Label "Holocaust Denier" Is Used to Prevent Questioning

There has been a lot of commotion in the controlled media recently about Swiss bankers who supposedly are hiding the assets of various Jews who perished more than 50 years ago, during the Second World War, in the so-called "Holocaust." The idea is that during the war Jews in Germany, France, and other European countries squirreled their money away in secret Swiss bank accounts so the Germans couldn't get it. Then the Jews were hauled off to concentration camps or otherwise came to an end, and their money still remains in the secret Swiss accounts. The news stories have hinted that the Swiss bankers have been remiss in simply keeping the money in the accounts, rather than searching for heirs or turning it over to Jewish organizations. It has been suggested that billions of dollars of Jewish money is being kept from the Jews to whom it rightfully belongs. Jewish groups are demanding that the Swiss set up a fund immediately to reimburse "Holocaust" survivors.

The Swiss, who are proud of the integrity of their banking system, are naturally indignant about these Jewish allegations that they have behaved improperly. The outgoing president of Switzerland, Jean-Pascal Delamuraz, called the Jewish media campaign "extortion" and "blackmail." The Jews and the media have responded by clamoring even more insistently that the Swiss should pay billions of dollars to the Jews. In fact they now have begun making demands against Sweden as well. The Jews claim that the Germans bought raw materials from Sweden during the war using gold that had been confiscated from Jews, and that now Sweden owes that gold to Jewish "Holocaust" survivors.

It's really an amazing campaign. The Swiss bankers have said repeatedly that they have checked their inactive accounts in the past, and that they are holding at most a few million dollars which may belong to the relatives of Jews who died during the war, that it could not possibly amount to the billions of dollars the Jews are claiming, and that they have treated the accounts of their Jewish depositors just like they treat all of their accounts. Yet the media virtually ignore what the Swiss say and continue to raise a huge hullabaloo about the poor, persecuted Jews and how they are being done wrong by the Swiss and the Swedes. And, of course, the U.S. politicians are jumping into the act, demanding that the Swiss and the Swedes satisfy the Jews. It's really amazing.

You know, I haven't talked much in the past about the so-called "Holocaust," because I've felt that really is a job for the historians, and I'm not a professional historian. Unfortunately, however, the "Holocaust" is one of those politically sensitive subjects which makes professional historians very nervous. Jews -- and apologists for the Jews -- have written literally thousands of "Holocaust" books during the past 50 years, and many of the claims made in these books are patently false. The professional historians know that, but they hesitate to say anything, lest they be branded as "Holocaust deniers" by the powerful Jewish organizations and by the controlled news media.

Because of this timidity on the part of the professionals, perhaps we amateurs really have an obligation to speak out more. This whole "Holocaust" business is a fascinating subject, and

there's much to be learned from looking into it, even if one isn't a professional historian. Take, for example, the label of "Holocaust denier," which is pasted on anyone who dares to ask questions about the "Holocaust." If I comment publicly that the official figure for the number of Jews who died in the big concentration and labor camp at Auschwitz, in Poland, has been revised downward recently by the Polish government from an earlier figure of four million to about one million, and I suggest that perhaps that means that the famous figure of "six million" Jews killed by the Germans also needs to be revised downward -- if I make such a suggestion, then I'm immediately denounced as a "Holocaust denier." That's the standard phrasing that's been agreed on by all of the big Jewish outfits, the news media, the bought politicians, and so on: "Holocaust denier." That's what you're called if you question anything about the official myth It's a crooked tactic. It deliberately makes it look like you're denying that there ever was any such thing as a "Holocaust." It's a label that's designed to make any questioner look like some sort of extremist who denies that anything at all happened to the Jews during the Second World War. That's crooked, isn't it?

I know that Jews were killed during the war. I've talked with German soldiers who shot Jews. In the war against the Soviet Union and Communism, the Germans found that virtually all of the Jews they encountered on the Eastern Front were Communist partisans, that Jews were heavily involved in Communist guerrilla activities, in sabotage, and in other hostile actions against the Germans. Often the only way to pacify an area was to round up all of the Jews and ship them off to a concentration camp or to shoot them. Most of the other folks on the Eastern Front -- the Poles, the Ukrainians, often even the Russians -- were happy enough to have the German Army get the Communists off their backs, but the Jews were fanatically pro-Communist. The Soviet Political Commissars who were attached to all Red Army units to spy on ordinary Russian soldiers and look for any signs of Political Incorrectness nearly always were Jews, and the German Army in many cases separated these Jewish Political Commissars from their Russian prisoners of war and shot the commissars.

I also know that Germans didn't like Jews, and Hitler especially didn't like them, and as a consequence the German government tried very hard to encourage Jews to leave Germany, even before the war. Laws were passed limiting Jewish participation in some professions -- such as the law and publishing -- where they were heavily overrepresented.

So I know that something did happen to the Jews in Europe both before and during the Second World War, and if they want to call that something a "Holocaust," that's all right with me. I don't deny that something did happen. I don't deny that there was a "Holocaust." I'm just interested in checking the details, in checking the facts. But as soon as I or anyone else does that, we're called "Holocaust deniers."

That's interesting, because the obvious intent of the people who use that label is to discourage us from asking questions. They don't want the details checked. They don't want anyone looking for any facts other than the official facts they present to us. And after being called a "Holocaust denier" a hundred times or so, I've come to believe that the reason they don't want their facts checked is that they know that in many cases their facts are false. That's really crooked -- but I believe that to be an accurate assessment of the situation.

I first became interested in the "Holocaust" enough to want to check it out when I encountered some especially fanciful accounts by so-called "survivors." I read accounts by Jews who claimed that they saw German soldiers grabbing Jewish babies by their legs and swinging their heads against brick walls to smash out their brains. One Jewess told of witnessing German soldiers carrying Jewish children one at a time up the stairs to the top of a building, throwing them off, and laughing when they hit the pavement below and were killed. Other Jews made the claim that they saw German guards separate Jews out from prisoners arriving at concentration camps, pour gasoline on them, and set them afire, right on the train platform. And there were other stories about Jewish prisoners with colorful tattoos being selected from the camps and then skinned so that their tattooed skin could be made into lampshades. Now, these stories just didn't jibe with what I knew about the German Army and the German government during that period. I knew that the Germans didn't like Jews, but I also knew that the German Army was the best disciplined army in the world. I knew that they had a better record of behavior in the countries they occupied than any other army in the Second World War -- including the U.S. Army. I had until that point believed the stories that the Germans had methodically herded the Jews into gas chambers. But I really doubted that any disciplined army would tolerate its soldiers just killing prisoners for sport.

If you saw the anti-German propaganda film which came out a couple of years ago, *Schindler's List,* you will remember that it portrayed the German commandant of a labor camp shooting Jewish inmates with a hunting rifle from his balcony. That was the sort of thing I had questioned when I first encountered these stories. And yet, very few other people were questioning these accounts. Newspapers and magazines and books were reporting them as if they were unquestionably true.

I began looking into the matter in detail, and I discovered many interesting things. I discovered that some Jews had been killed, and I discovered the circumstances under which they were killed. I discovered that many more Jews simply died under the conditions that existed toward the end of the war, when malnutrition and disease were rampant in the prison camps. I discovered that the total number of Jews who were killed and who died of disease was substantially less than the six million claimed by the Jewish propagandists. Most important, I discovered that a great many lies had been told about what had happened during the "Holocaust." I discovered that most of the tales about gas chambers -- that is, the ones that could be checked out -- were not true. I discovered that not a single one of the stories about bashing out babies' brains or throwing children off buildings or shooting prisoners with hunting rifles for sport, a la *Schindler's List,* could be substantiated, and that they were all almost certainly false.

All of this is interesting in itself; at least, it is interesting to me. It is a part of our history. I could talk all day about the details, about the facts that I discovered when I began looking into the "Holocaust," but I don't want to bore you. If you really want to know the details, write to the Institute for Historical Review. They're experts, and they're honest. Their address is:

Institute for Historical Review
P O Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659

To me what's even more interesting about the "Holocaust" story than all of the holes in it is the motivation behind it, the way the story is being used today, and the response of various elements of our society to it. Let's go back for a moment to that deliberately misleading label of "Holocaust denier" that I mentioned earlier. If you've spent any time exploring the Internet -- especially some of the political discussion groups on the Internet -- you'll have heard that term "Holocaust denier" often enough. It's not that the "Holocaust" is a hot topic of discussion on the Internet. It isn't. But it is discussed occasionally, along with just about every other topic under the sun, and it's discussed openly, without fear. The Internet is just about the only place left where one can discuss politically sensitive topics openly. And that just drives the big Jewish censorship organizations crazy. They don't want any open discussion of the "Holocaust." They're terrified of it. The Simon Wiesenthal Center has been especially loud in its complaints about the lack of censorship on the Internet. Without censorship, they complain, the "Holocaust deniers" can say anything they want. If we don't censor the Internet, the "Holocaust deniers" can come right into your home and contaminate your child's mind while he's using his computer to do his homework.

They've tried to intimidate people into silence. They'll have one of their own people claim to be a World War II veteran, and his standard line will be, "Hey, don't try to tell me there wasn't a Holocaust. I was there. I saw the bodies. So don't try to tell me there wasn't a Holocaust."

Now, that sort of tactic may work on television, where they control the whole medium and no one can contradict them. But on the Internet people have been contradicting them. People have been saying, "Hey, we're not trying to tell you there were no bodies. We just want to know how many bodies. We want to know how they died." But they will not engage in a rational discussion with you. If one trick won't silence you, they'll try another. They'll say, "What difference does it matter how many? If only one Jew were killed just for being a Jew, that's a terrible crime. That's a Holocaust." That's supposed to embarrass you into shutting up. But on the Internet you can come back and say, "Well, what about the Germans who were killed just because they were Germans. What about the Russians and the Ukrainians and the Hungarians who were killed by some Jewish Commissar just because they were anti-Communists? Don't they count? Wasn't that a crime for which someone should be held accountable?"

They don't like to hear that. They really don't. Try it sometime, if you have a thick skin and don't mind having them shriek insults at you.

Their final line of defense is governmental force, governmental repression. If they can't embarrass you into silence, they turn to the politicians and demand laws to make you shut up. That's what they've already done in Europe and in Canada, where you can be jailed for being a "Holocaust denier" -- which means, for questioning anything at all about what really happened. There are many people in German prisons now who made the mistake of saying, "Hey, I was a guard at such and such a prison camp during the war, and there was no gas chamber there." In Britain, they already have laws against criticizing Jews, but they want the laws toughened, and so they've turned to the politicians. And, I'm sorry to say, the politicians in Britain are just about as crooked a lot as we have here. The chairman of the British Labor Party, Tony Blair, is a real piece of filth, of about the same quality as Bill Clinton. He hopes to be the new prime minister after the parliamentary elections coming up in May. He has announced, with a little prodding

from the Labor Party's Jewish backers, that when he is prime minister he will propose a new law making "Holocaust denial" a specific crime, so that anyone who questions whether or not there was a gas chamber in such and such a place can be locked up, just as in Germany.

And that's what they want in America too. The Jewish lawyers and journalists and professors -- and their Gentile collaborators -- already are working hard to persuade people that the First Amendment to our Constitution needs to be scrapped, or at least rewritten. The Founding Fathers never intended to protect all types of speech, they say. They never intended to protect indecent or hurtful speech. And to deny the "Holocaust" is indecent and hurtful. They're working hard on it. The trendier Gentiles already are falling into line. Believe me, they'll be making a strong push to abolish free speech in America soon. They'll tell us that it's for our own good.

But it's for their own good, not ours. That's the most interesting insight I gained from checking out the "Holocaust." I learned why they push it so hard, why they've made so many Hollywood propaganda films like *Schindler's List,* why they've told so many whoppers about bashing out babies' brains and making lampshades out of skinned Jews, why they talked the politicians into letting them have a Holocaust Museum in Washington, why they've gotten politicians at the state level to pass laws requiring that the public schools carry "Holocaust" indoctrination courses, and why they're so desperate to stop people from asking questions.

It's not just because they're afraid of being exposed as liars if they stop defending their old lies with new lies. It's not just because they hate the Germans and like to beat them over the head with the "Holocaust." And it's not just because they find the "Holocaust" a convenient excuse for the crimes they have committed and still are committing against the Palestinian people. There's a much bigger reason than all of these things -- and a much more dangerous reason for us, for our people. But you are an intelligent person with at least a little bit of open-mindedness, a little bit of mental independence, or you wouldn't be reading this magazine. Why don't you discover for yourselves why the Jews are so defensive about the "Holocaust," why they are so afraid for anyone to ask questions about it? It's an easy thing to do, and I believe it'll be much more convincing if you find out for yourselves, instead of having me tell you. There are thousands of books out there that they've written. Go into any large bookstore or library and you'll find books about the "Holocaust" by the top "Holocaust" promoters, Jews like Elie Wiesel and Simon Wiesenthal. Read these books with an open mind, with a questioning mind. Think about the claims they make. Then get a copy of our book catalog and read a couple of the books we sell -- or read some books from the Institute for Historical Review -- and think about what you read in these books too. Make up your own mind. I believe you'll find it an illuminating and rewarding experience.

Time to Stop Listening

I don't watch much television, but I do try to catch the *NBC Evening News* every day, so that I can keep up with the party line. Tom Brokaw is an excellent actor, and I can tell from the expression on his face and the degree of enthusiasm in his voice -- or the degree of disapproval -- as he reads the news just what line the media bosses are pushing on each issue which comes up. Of course, I try to find out what really happened from more reliable sources, but I always like to know what the official version is, a la NBC, as well as the true version.

Usually Tom Brokaw is very good at appearing credible. That's what he's paid for more than anything else, of course. The media bosses don't want the lemmings doubting the party line, and so Brokaw tries very hard to give an impression of honesty, of trustworthiness, of folksy credibility. And usually he's pretty good at it. But some things he reports are just too fantastic to believe. One of the most unbelievable things I have ever heard him say was a recent report he gave that our new Jewish secretary of state, Madeleine Albright, had just discovered that she is a Jewess, that she had no inkling of her Jewishness before becoming secretary of state. Brokaw gave us a little hocus pocus about Jewish tombstones in Prague and Jewish grandparents who had disappeared at Auschwitz, and how these things had been revealed very recently to Albright, surprising her greatly and leading her to the conclusion that she is not really the Gentile Episcopalian she formerly had thought she was, but a Jewess. Wow!

Now, I've been telling the world for the last four years that Madeleine Albright is Jewish. I knew, of course, about her pretense to Episcopalianism, but I also knew many other things about her -- including the fact that both her parents were Jews from the former Czechoslovakia. And now she is trying to persuade us peasants, with the help of the media bosses, that she didn't know. That is just not credible, no matter how hard Tom Brokaw tries to keep a straight face when he tells us.

Gee, all Madeleine had to do was look in a mirror at any time during the last 59 years to know what she was. Shades of Golda Meier! Are we supposed to believe that Madeleine's totally pro-Israel policy throughout her public life was based on a belief that she was a Gentile? Are we supposed to believe that her hawkish, bloodthirsty policy toward everyone else in the Middle East besides Israel has had nothing to do with her Jewishness? Are we supposed to believe that all of her Jewish political connections and the fact that she already had surrounded herself with Jewish advisors and assistants at the State Department are just coincidences? Are we supposed to believe the top politicians in Washington didn't know she is Jewish, and the Senate just rubber-stamped her appointment to be secretary of state because they like her looks? Are we supposed to believe that the media bosses have been in love with her for the same reason?

Come on, now! Everybody knew what Madeleine was, except the general public. At the time Clinton nominated her to be secretary of state the Jewish newspapers were ecstatic -- that is, the Jewish newspapers that only Jews are supposed to read, where you usually can get some hint of what they're really thinking, unlike the Jewish newspapers for Gentile consumption, like the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post.* These were happy with her too, of course, but they naturally cited reasons more likely to appeal to non-Jews to explain their happiness. The Arab newspapers were very unhappy about her appointment and referred to her Jewishness as a reason

for their unhappiness. Now Madeleine and the *New York Times* want us to believe that the Arabs knew she was a Jew, but she didn't know. And the *New York Times* also is telling us, "Don't worry. Her being a Jew won't change the way she does her job as secretary of state." In an editorial on February 6 the *New York Times* also told us that Madeleine has a "strong record of support for . . . human rights." They're talking about the same Madeleine Albright who last year on the interview program *60 Minutes* said that causing the deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children with an embargo which keeps food and medicine out of Iraq was a reasonable price to pay in order to keep Saddam Hussein from threatening Israel. Some humanitarian!

We've let Madeleine and her kinsmen in the media get away with so much for so long that they believe that they can get away with anything now. They believe that they can tell us any kind of whopper, and we'll believe it.

The thing that I'm wondering about is why did she choose *this* time to make her Jewishness public? Earlier, when she married one of the few Gentiles with some influence in the mass media, she found it advantageous to pretend to be Episcopalian. Now that she has become secretary of state in the most Jewish government this country has ever had, why did she choose to reveal her true identity? I have some ideas about this, but no proof yet. I hope that I'm wrong, but I'm afraid that within the next year or two we'll all find out why this thoroughly obnoxious, aggressive, and pushy Jewess has come out of the closet at this time.

* * *

Another interesting item in the news recently in addition to Madeleine Abright's "outing" is the case of the Army's highest-ranking Black enlisted man, Sergeant Major Gene C. McKinney. Actually, he's not just the highest-ranking Black enlisted man: with the help of a little Affirmative Action he's been boosted above all the White enlisted personnel in the Army too. At the time of his boosting, in June 1995, all of the media were gushing about the fact that he is Black and that he has been selected by the Army brass, with a little urging from the Clinton administration, to serve as a role model for all of the White enlisted personnel in the Army. Clinton was shown on television shaking hands with him, and the trendier Army spokesmen were beaming with pride and making statements about how McKinney's promotion showed that the Army is free of racism and is committed to "equal opportunity," blah, blah, blah.

That was in 1995. Now in 1997, with the details of Sergeant Major McKinney's sexual life in the Army finally leaking out, his name is in all of the media again, but, strangely, one really has to search to find any mention of the fact that he is Black, or that the female soldier he is accused of harassing sexually and threatening with rape is White. I have eight major, in-depth news articles on this matter in front of me now, from the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post,* and *USA Today,* and not one of them mentions that McKinney is Black, or that the woman he molested, former Sergeant Major Brenda Hoster, is White. There is no mention of race at all in the articles.

That's interesting, isn't it? At the time when Sergeant Major McKinney was made a role model for White soldiers, every newspaper and news magazine told us about his Blackness. They rubbed our noses in it. The media bosses really were gloating about it. And now, when he has

become just one more Black non-commissioned officer using his position of authority to demand sex from White female soldiers placed under him by an Army establishment desperate to prove its Political Correctness, there is no mention at all of his race.

In fact, except for one slip made in *Time* magazine last November, the controlled media have been very careful not to talk about the racial dimensions of the Army's sexual harassment problem. The November 25, 1996, issue of *Time* pointed out that the reason the Army brass hadn't done anything to stop the rapes of female recruits at Aberdeen Proving Ground and other Army bases is that most of the rapists are Black drill instructors and Black officers, and most of the rapees are White recruits, and the Army brass were afraid of being charged with racism if they acted quickly to deal with the problem. But since that one revelation in *Time* magazine, I haven't seen a single other mention by the controlled media that the Army's sexual harassment problem is actually a race problem. They don't want us to know that.

This seems to be true of the case with Sergeant Major McKinney too. His White victim, Brenda Hoster, complained to her superiors in the Army after McKinney attacked her, but they refused to take action. McKinney was being idolized as a Black role model for White soldiers, and Brenda Hoster's superiors knew that if they did anything to damage his image they would be suspected of racism. So they did nothing.

That, unfortunately, is all too typical of the U.S. Army today. For more than fifty years the Army has been politicized, step by step. Officers with the slightest hint of Politically Incorrect views or with any old-fashioned military values have been weeded out. Unprincipled careerists, willing to pay lip service to the party line, have been promoted. Today the officers' corps of the United States Army consists of politicians in uniform: trendy, rootless, without honor -- as ready to move against Politically Incorrect elements of their own people as against a foreign enemy.

This is the sort of development I foresaw more than 20 years ago, when I wrote *The Turner Diaries.* In my novel I predicted it, but I am truly sorry to see that it has come to pass.

* * *

Another matter much in the media of late has been O.J. Simpson. They can't seem to get enough of him -- and yet, they certainly have mixed feelings about him. On the one hand, he is their own creation: a Black sports star and media idol they created and then held up as a role model for young White Americans. And he's a race-mixer besides: he was married to a beautiful but empty-headed, trendy slut of a White woman. They love him for that. But then he had to go and embarrass them by letting his Black nature get the better of him, and, worse than that, get caught for it.

At that point the media bosses would have been well advised to drop O.J. and give him no more public exposure than they give to any of the thousands of other Black murderers who get caught in this country every year. But they were fascinated by their boy O.J., and so, with the eager collaboration of Judge Lance Ito, they gave us a media spectacle which has done more to wake

up White Americans and set back the media's program of racial destruction than anything else in years. That was a big mistake on their part.

When the civil trial finally brought in a guilty verdict recently, there was much foolish talk about how the new verdict shows that our system of justice works after all. What nonsense! Our justice system is broken, and it can't be fixed -- short of a revolution -- and everyone with half a brain understands that. To pretend otherwise is nothing but hypocrisy and unwillingness to face the more unpleasant realities of life in multiracial America. All of the talk about how the burden of proof is different in a civil trial than it is in a criminal trial and that's why he got through the first trial safely but lost the second one is just so much hot air. The only reason there was a different verdict in the civil trial than in the criminal trial is that the civil jury wasn't Black. If the civil jury had had the same racial makeup as the criminal jury, O.J. would have won the civil trial too. That's a fact, and it's utter foolishness to pretend it isn't.

The lesson for us in all of this is, don't get involved in any sort of dispute with a Black in an area where if you end up being tried for defending yourself you'll have a Black majority on the jury.

The corruption of our court system, of our legal system, is one of the most unfortunate things which has happened to America. Before the system was corrupted by "diversity" -- that is, by Blacks being on juries and being unwilling to rule against one of their own -- it was corrupted by money. The amount of justice a man got depended on how much justice he could afford to buy. Rich people were happy with the system because they could manipulate it to their advantage. Perhaps the two O.J. trials have been a good thing for us in more than one way. Perhaps they have awakened rich White people to the fact that their money is no longer enough to keep them safe, whenever there is a racial factor involved.

The whole O.J. saga reminded me of a novel I read more than ten years ago. It was Tom Wolfe's *Bonfire of the Vanities.* It's a story about what the court system in New York City does to a rich White man who has a racial encounter. Very illuminating. If you haven't read it yet you can order a copy from National Vanguard Books.

* * *

It's good to read informative books. It's good for you to listen to *American Dissident Voices.* In fact, these things are very necessary. But they are not enough. Listening and reading must be a preliminary to participation, or they are meaningless. While you do nothing, the people who are destroying America gloat and smirk. They will keep on gloating and smirking, and they will keep on with their destructive work until we stop them.

In America, unfortunately, we have developed a spectator mentality. We like to watch what's happening around us, but we don't like to participate. We don't like to get involved. That's why I hate spectator sports and have a great contempt for sports fans. Sitting on your couch and watching other people do things isn't healthy, either individually, for you, or collectively, for the country. America is in the mess it's in today because we just sat back and watched it happen. We

didn't do anything to stop it. We just let the wreckers have their way, without doing so much as giving them a bloody nose.

I don't like to say this, but I feel obliged to say it: If you just continue to do nothing, you are betraying your country and your people. You are a selfish coward. You are a traitor to your children and your grandchildren. You are shirking your responsibility to them. You know what the media bosses and the politicians have planned for them. You are a disgrace to your country and your ancestors.

Think about that. And if you are a real man or a real woman and not just a spectator, write and ask for information on the National Alliance. Together we can do something. Together we can make a difference. Together we can stop the people who are destroying our country and destroying our children's future.

The Nature of Patriotism

What Factors Control Whether People Are Loyal to Their Country?

I have been reading about Aldrich Ames, an employee in our Central Intelligence Agency who was caught spying against the United States. There have been several other Americans caught recently who were spying for foreign governments, including one who was an FBI agent, but Ames was the most important, in terms of the amount of damage he did. A book about Ames, who was arrested three years ago, has been published recently. Its author is Pete Earley, and it's titled *Confessions of a Spy.* The most interesting thing to me in the book was Ames's explanation of why he decided to sell American secrets to the KGB. He never really thought of himself as a traitor. He needed money, and he didn't think the CIA was paying him enough; he was essentially an alienated person who felt no sense of loyalty to anything.

There are a great many other people in this country who are just as alienated, just as self-oriented and rootless as Aldrich Ames. Most of them, of course, aren't in a position like Ames was where they can do a great deal of damage. They don't have the opportunity he had. And even among those who do have the opportunity, most aren't enterprising enough or bold enough to take the risks involved. And that is the main reason there aren't more spies being caught: there is a certain element of risk involved.

It used to be, 50 or 60 years ago, that people didn't spy against their country because of a sense of loyalty. They felt themselves a part of the United States, and they would no more betray their country than they would betray a family member. During and shortly after the Second World War, for example, most of the American citizens caught spying against this country were Jews who were selling information to the Soviet Union. Part of the reason was because there was much more sympathy for Communism among Jews than among non-Jews, but part of the reason also was that Jews, as a group apart, felt no sense of loyalty to America. Their loyalty was to other Jews and to Jewish interests, but not to the country in which they happened to be living at the moment. Nowadays, Gentile Americans are nearly as lacking in loyalty to America, nearly as lacking in patriotism, as Jews are. People still feel a sense of loyalty to their friends and their families, but not much else.

Why is this? What has changed in America during the past 50 years to erode the sense of patriotism so much?

If you think about it for a minute you'll know the answer. The average White person can no longer look on America as his family. He no longer feels a part of it. It's just the place where he happened to have been born and happens to be living. He no longer feels a sense of kinship with all other Americans. The reason he doesn't is primarily the result of the enormous increase in what liberals and the media fondly call "diversity": that is, the great increase in the number of people with whom we feel nothing in common -- people with different roots, people who look different, think differently, behave differently, and have different values -- people whom we cannot even imagine being part of our family. When we look at America and see a great many people like that, when we see all of this "diversity," then we no longer feel ourselves a part of

America. We no longer feel a sense of loyalty to America. We no longer feel like traitors if we do something to hurt America.

To be sure, not everyone is as alienated yet as Aldrich Ames -- but we're getting there. And "diversity" isn't the only thing which is eroding our sense of patriotism. The liberals and the media are working hard at it. The Vietnam war took us a giant step away from patriotism. Some of you may not remember, but 25 years ago there were giant demonstrations in Washington on behalf of the Viet Cong and the Communists, who were killing American soldiers at the rate of 100 a day. Left-wing groups with Jewish leaders organized these demonstrations, and they bused in college students from all over the country, hundreds of thousands of them, for these demonstrations. Most of the kids weren't Communists or even Communist sympathizers: they were just following the people on their campuses who were the loudest and pushiest and going along for the excitement and because it was the trendy thing to do. Some Jew would hand one of them a Viet Cong flag, and he would carry it, because everyone else was. It was very trendy, very fashionable to be anti-American.

And the worst thing about all this uproar during the Vietnam war is that the government did nothing to stop it. The government was sending young men over to Vietnam to be killed by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese and at the same time was permitting Viet Cong sympathizers to organize huge demonstrations in Washington and even providing police protection for them. The politicians were afraid to do anything, because the Jew-controlled media all sympathized with the demonstrators, and the politicians were afraid of the Jews. The net effect of this was a huge loss of respect for the government on the part of nearly everyone. The kids found that they could burn their draft cards and thumb their noses at the government and get away with it, and so they lost their respect for the government. The Vietnam vets came home and were treated like pariahs and felt unappreciated even by the government which had sent them to Vietnam, and so they lost their respect for the government. And I and many other patriots watched all of this in disgust, and we lost our respect for the government.

Back during the war I used to organize anti-Communist demonstrations to counter the big pro-Viet Cong demonstrations the Jews were organizing, and I used to give speeches against the politicians who were collaborating most openly with the Jews. I said in my speeches that these politicians were guilty of treason and ought to be dealt with summarily: they ought to be shot. And because of this the government sicced the FBI on me: not on **them,** but on **me.** I, and many others, developed a very negative feeling for the government during that time. That was 25 years ago, but everyone who went through that experience was changed by it. Much of the contempt for the government remains with them. And the kids who learned that it was fashionable to be anti-American kept some of that attitude even after they graduated from their colleges.

Of course, loss of respect for the government and loss of patriotism are two different things, but they both have been happening at the same time. It is interesting that today the media are trying to coax people into respecting the government again, while their assault on patriotism continues unabated. We have so many new laws and new governmental programs that are to the liking of the Jews in the media, and the politicians are so much more corrupt than they were 25 years ago, that the media now view the government more as an ally than as a rival. But the Jews in the media still hate and fear patriotism as much as ever. They have tried to make patriotism a dirty

word. And they have succeeded pretty well among the trendy yuppies and the urban rabble over whom they have the strongest influence. They hold up the militias as the epitome of patriotism, and they try to frighten the lemmings with the specter of the angry, rural, White male with a gun and an American flag who is threatening the government which provides their welfare checks.

It may be that the people in the militias are not very sophisticated and don't have very good public relations programs, but most of them still do have a little sense of patriotism: more patriotism, at least, than the folks who take their cue from the controlled media. The reason the media and the big Jewish pressure groups like Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center and the B'nai B'rith and the Simon Wiesenthal Center hate the militias and their old-fashioned patriotism so much is that they stand in the way of the New World Order. The Jews and their fellow travelers want the American people to transfer their loyalty from America as it used to be -- that is, from the White America built by our ancestors when they came here from Europe, the America we could think of as our extended family -- and give that loyalty instead to their New World Order.

Of course, they understand the idea of loyalty based on blood, on kinship, on common roots. That's the kind of loyalty they have to each other and to Israel, but they don't want us to have that. They know how powerful it is. They hate the idea of us being united by such a sense of patriotism. They hate it and fear it. And that's why they've been working so hard to undermine old-fashioned American patriotism and replace it by allegiance to a faceless, raceless, rootless, cosmopolitan New World Order -- under their control, of course.

And they're succeeding at least half way. They are destroying patriotism in a substantial portion of the American public -- which is why we're seeing more people like Aldrich Ames in the news these days. They are not really succeeding, however, in building much allegiance to the New World Order. Of course, they've made it a fashionable idea among the liberals and the mindless trendies, and all of the politicians are giving lip service to it. But ultimately they cannot succeed in establishing loyalty to the New World Order in the place of old-fashioned, race-based patriotism, because, no matter how fashionable they make their idea of a New World Order among the liberals and the politicians, it is an unnatural idea. Liberals may gush about equality and the "brotherhood of man" and the human race being the only race to which they feel loyalty, but that is empty sophistry. Fools may let themselves be convinced that they have become raceless, cosmopolitan patriots -- patriots of the New World Order -- but one will find very few of them who are willing to die or even make any major sacrifice for this new pseudo-patriotism.

Real patriotism is not some artificial idea dreamed up by Jews: It is something based in our genes, an instinct, an extension of the instinct for self-preservation to include our kin, our nation. One can undermine that patriotism by muddying and confusing the concept of nation, the image of nation, as has been done during the past half-century by promoting "diversity." When the enemies of our people, with the collaboration of the treasonous politicians in Washington -- politicians of the sort I publicly urged should be shot during the Vietnam war -- when these enemies infiltrate tens of millions of non-White immigrants into our country and stifle any effort to halt the flood, when they subsidize the breeding of a non-White underclass in our cities with our own tax money, when they force us to accept these growing non-White masses into our schools and neighborhoods and workplaces, when they saturate all of the news and entertainment

media with the alien faces, alien tones, and alien antics of these non-Whites and gloatingly tell us that we'd better get used to the idea of becoming a minority in our own land within the next 50 years, then, of course, the patriotism which came naturally to our people in the past becomes meaningless -- and we hear people like Aldrich Ames telling us that he sold national security information to the KGB because he needed money and he didn't think he was doing anything worse than the politicians in Washington do every day. And I guess it's hard to argue with him about that.

The process of social atomization, of deracination, of separating people from their roots and cutting the bonds to their natural communities so that they can become interchangeable units -- human atoms -- for building the New World Order is being promoted ruthlessly by the Jews and their collaborators, and the rising incidence of treason is only one of the smaller and less important consequences of this genocidal process.

I say that this process is genocidal, because it will certainly destroy us as a people, as a race, as well as destroying us as a nation. People with no sense of patriotism are people unable to defend themselves collectively. They are people who will be victimized by any group which still has a group feeling.

One of the factors which has made it possible for the Jews and their collaborators to undermine our patriotism is that we took it too much for granted in the past. Most of our people didn't really think about it, analyze it, and understand its true basis. We let our idea of patriotism gradually drift from a racial idea to a geographical idea, a political idea. When our ancestors in Europe were defending their people against Huns or Moors or Mongols or Turks, they understood patriotism. Even after the rise of all of Europe's national states, when patriotism began expressing itself as nationalism, it still had a racial -- or at least an ethnic -- basis. The words themselves tell us what their original meanings were. Patriotism, of course, comes from the Roman word for "father." Patriotism is love of the fatherland, love of the land inhabited by all of the people descended from a common father. Nationalism also comes to us from the Romans, from the Latin word for "birth." A nation is a group of people related by birth, by blood, and nationalism is love for that people, loyalty to that people. These feelings of patriotism or nationalism are very powerful feelings, because they are natural feelings. They contributed to our survival over a very long period of evolution.

But when we forget the racial meaning of patriotism and think of it only in geographical or political terms, as loyalty to every person, of whatever race, color, or creed, who happens to be living within a specified geographical area at the moment, then patriotism is no longer a natural feeling, but instead becomes artificial, and consequently much easier to subvert. And that is what has happened to people like Aldrich Ames -- and is happening to more and more White Americans all the time, as the growth of "diversity" proceeds.

The cure for this disease, for this erosion of patriotism, is not difficult to find. It is obvious. It is simply to understand and assimilate our patriotism as it originally was. The cure for what is happening to America begins by returning to the natural, race-based patriotism that our ancestors had when they halted the invading Moors at the Pyrenees nearly 1300 years ago and when, a

thousand years later, they defended their settlements in North America against marauding Indians.

The enemies of our people have anticipated this possibility, of course. Just as Morris Dees and his Southern Poverty Law Center rail against the patriotism of the militias today, so have the Jews of the media and their collaborators been stigmatizing natural patriotism for the last 50 years. They call it "racism," and they have intimidated most of our people into running for cover whenever they begin throwing out their accusations of "racism."

So while the cure for what has made White America sick is not difficult to find, it is a little harder to apply. It requires a little courage. It requires a little open-mindedness. It requires a little mental independence. It requires a little moral strength. It requires enough of us with these qualities to make patriotism a vital force in the life of our country again.

I believe that we can find enough such people to do the job. It will not be easy, of course. The media bosses and all of the other people who hate the real America will fight us all the way. The politicians will collaborate with them. Bill Clinton and everyone else who was demonstrating for the Viet Cong during the Vietnam war will try to stop us.

But I believe that ultimately we will prevail. I believe that natural patriotism will prevail over the phony loyalty to the New World Order that the Jews and the trendies are promoting. The only uncertainty I have is how long it will take us and how many must die in overcoming America's disease. Your help will make the victory come sooner and will make our casualties fewer.

The Jewish Problem

Jews Work for Their Own Interests: Often to the Detriment of Others

I recently discussed the ongoing Jewish extortion effort against Switzerland. Jewish organizations claimed that Swiss banks were holding onto assets deposited by wealthy Jews in the 1930s and 1940s who later perished during the Second World War and so were never able to retrieve their money. Jews demanded that this money be put into a special fund for so-called "Holocaust survivors."

More information has come to light about this Jewish extortion campaign, and I want to share it with you today, because it helps us to understand better the situation all of us are in. In the first place, let us be clear on the point that what we are talking about is not simply an effort by Jews to get back what rightfully belongs to them. It is not a matter of aging "Holocaust survivors" David and Sarah Goldblatt in Miami Beach trying to get their hands on an account their late uncle Abe set up in Switzerland before he was hauled off to Auschwitz in 1943 and never seen again. It is, in fact, a massive campaign of criminal extortion, complete with threats, deception, and fraud on a huge scale and criminal collusion by the Clinton government and the controlled news media.

The initial response of the Swiss to the Jewish demand for money was to state that Jewish depositors always had been treated just like all other depositors, and that Swiss bankers already had investigated their dormant accounts and looked for the rightful owners, and that there was at most a few million dollars in such accounts which might belong to relatives of Jews who had died during the war. All David and Sarah Goldblatt had to do to claim Uncle Abe's money was present evidence that it was rightfully theirs.

This, of course, wasn't what the Jews had in mind at all, and so they began applying pressure and making threats. Switzerland's president at the time, Jean-Pascal Delamuraz, angrily accused the Jews of "blackmail" and "extortion" in trying to pressure Switzerland to turn money over to them without any evidence that they had a legitimate claim. But, unfortunately, Mr. Delamuraz was leaving office at the end of 1996, and his successor was more willing to pay blackmail in order to avoid trouble. Just to make sure that the Swiss got the message the Jews persuaded some of their Christian collaborators to join their campaign. Willing church leaders in Switzerland organized a public demonstration in Zurich by 15,000 churchgoers who demanded that the Swiss government and the Swiss bankers give "God's Chosen People" whatever they wanted and stop accusing the poor, persecuted Jews of blackmail.

The Swiss bankers and the Swiss politicians are a bit more hardheaded than these pale, soft, hymn-singing churchgoers, however. Arguments that God's Chosen People deserve whatever they want because the Bible says so have little effect on them. The real pressure was being applied to them out of the public's eye. On January 10, 1997, billionaire Jewish liquor merchant Edgar Bronfman, head of the World Jewish Congress, met with the Swiss ambassador to the United States and threatened him that unless Switzerland coughed up $250 million immediately, the upcoming Congressional hearings by the House Banking Committee would be made as embarrassing as possible for Switzerland.

And other pressure was being applied behind the scenes. A group of New York Jews, claiming to be "Holocaust victims," brought a class-action suit against three of Switzerland's largest banks and petitioned the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to suspend the banking licenses of the defendant banks pending the outcome of the lawsuit. If such a petition were granted it would cause the banks to lose billions of dollars.

Israel got into the campaign when the Jewish Agency, headquartered in Jerusalem, hinted that it would call for a worldwide boycott of Swiss banks if the former Swiss president didn't apologize for characterizing the Jewish campaign as "extortion." The result of this threat was the apology which had been demanded. And Mr. Clinton's State Department has been cooperating with the campaign by releasing a series of World War II documents, one every week or so, purporting to show that the Swiss were cozy with the Germans during the war. The release of these documents at this time is clearly a ploy calculated to embarrass Switzerland and put pressure on that country to bow to Jewish demands for more and more money.

The Swiss already have coughed up the $250 million demanded by Bronfman, and now the Jews are indicating that that is just the first payment. They are suggesting that $7 billion may be a reasonable total amount for Switzerland to pay the Jews. And the Jews claim that they can't understand why so many people hate them!

It is clear in this case that the Jews will go for just as much money as they figure they can extort from the Swiss, and not a shekel less. And it is the shekels which count with them, not how many more people learn to hate them as a consequence of their behavior. That's the way it's always been with them. Of course, in this case it's hard to feel sorry for the Swiss, because they chose to capitulate to the extortion rather than to fight -- which is what the Jews calculated they would do. In this democratic era there just don't seem to be politicians or businessmen anywhere with principles or a sense of honor.

Another interesting example of the Jews' characteristic of pushing ahead arrogantly with whatever they believe is advantageous to them without any concern for the hatred which their behavior generates came to my attention recently. The great fad these days, the great media-promoted craze, is "diversity," and Jews are to be found in every nook and cranny of the "diversity" movement. Jews produce the "diversity" propaganda, they agitate for new "diversity" legislation, and they always are pushing to cram more "diversity" down our throats. If they see any group of White people -- the residents of an apartment building, students in a school classroom, a sports team, a Saturday-night poker club, any all-White group -- they will try to force the group to accept three Zulus, a Chinaman, and a disabled Hispanic lesbian.

The idea, of course, is to exterminate us, to wage genocide against us, to leave us no opportunity to be among our own kind, no opportunity to feel a sense of kinship and belonging among our own people, no opportunity to organize and defend ourselves. They want to be the one and only self-conscious group on this earth able to act intelligently in promoting their group interests, and then the world will belong to them. They've been pretty successful so far in their campaign against us. They've been successful because they've kept their motives moderately well concealed, and they've been able to persuade large segments of our own people to collaborate

with them in their "diversity" campaign by convincing them that it's the "moral" thing to do. The hymn-singers are an example.

But sometimes their arrogance just runs away with itself and blows their cover. They put out a newsletter called *Managing Diversity,* which goes to all of the government agencies in Washington. It tells the bureaucrats how they can increase the amount of "diversity" in their bailiwicks and still keep things under control. It tells them how they can displace more normal, White government workers with Hmong tribesmen, wetbacks, or AIDS-infected alternate life-stylers and still keep the remaining Whites from rebelling.

In addition to this sort of practical advice, *Managing Diversity* also has a lot of "sensitivity training" articles in its issues: articles which are supposed to be posted for the White workers to read in order to keep them feeling guilty and cowed. An example is a front-page article in a recent issue of *Managing Diversity* written by Harris Sussman, PhD. Doctor Sussman's article is titled "What Are the Values of White People?" And then this too-clever and too-arrogant Jewish "diversity" promoter turns and bites the very hymn-singers who have collaborated with him and his kind most eagerly. He writes:

It turns out that the white people we are talking about have been primarily Christians, often acting in the name of their Christian values. . . . In the name of Christian values they had the Inquisition. They called native peoples "savages" who did not qualify as human beings. They set up definitions of pagans, heathens, primitives, undeveloped people which left Christians superior and dominant. They killed Jews and Gypsies in the Holocaust.

In our post-modern vocabulary, "whites" or "the white man" is all we need to say to invoke this history and experience of injustice and cruelty. When we say "white people," we mean the people who value things over people, who value money over people. We know exactly what their values are and where they lead. We have all paid a terrible price for those values.

Remember, this is a *Jew* telling us that *we Gentiles* are too interested in money. In the same article Doctor Sussman goes on to gloat over what he and his kind already have done to White people with their brainwashing campaign. He gloats over the psychological and spiritual damage his "diversity" campaign already has caused. He crows:

Many white people are uneasy with their own history. They are having a profound identity crisis. . . . This means that many white people do not think of themselves as white people.

He then describes the many ways in which guilt-stricken Whites are trying to escape from their own identity and conform to what Sussman and his fellow Jews want them to be. He writes that many confused White people are trying to "adopt the values of native peoples. Look at ecofeminism, look at holistic health, Earth Day, the Rainbow Gathering."

Copies of *Managing Diversity* can be found in every government workplace in Washington. Sussman figures that the hymn-singers will let him kick them in the teeth and then will lick his toes and beg for another kick. And, unfortunately, that's exactly what many of them will do. There's a sort of masochistic tendency among many of them. But there are a lot of us White

people who aren't masochists, a lot of us unreconstructed White boys who don't react to Doctor Sussman and his kind the way they want us to, a lot of us who read what he has to say and then make a pledge to ourselves that one day we'll rid our society of his poison, no matter what it takes. And, you know, there are some old-fashioned Christians among us too, who will be more than happy to help!

These two examples of Jewish behavior -- the brazen extortion of hundreds of millions of dollars from the Swiss people and the arrogant gloating about the damage they have done to us with their "diversity" campaign -- these two examples lead us to a closely related subject discussed earlier -- the so-called "Holocaust." We've looked at various aspects of "Holocaust" propaganda in the past, and we've uncovered some of their little psychological tricks, such as calling anyone who doesn't swallow the whole myth lock, stock, and barrel a "Holocaust denier." If you question any of their numbers about how many Jews supposedly were put into gas chambers, if you question a single one of their overblown atrocity stories, then you're a "Holocaust denier," implying that you believe that the Germans took no defensive measures at all against the Jews during the Second World War, when, in fact, you know that the Germans did try to rid themselves of Jewish influence.

We've examined some of these tricks of theirs, and we've explored some of their specific lies about the "Holocaust," but the question remains: **Why** do they do it? Why do they push the "Holocaust" business so hard? Why, 55 years after the fact, do they keep playing the same tune? Why do they demand that the American taxpayers provide free land for "Holocaust" museums for them? Why do they demand that our children in the public schools be subjected to "Holocaust" propaganda courses? They are aware that many other peoples have gone through their own "holocausts": the Armenians, the Germans, the Ukrainians, the Russians. Why is it only the Jews who keep pushing it, only the Jews who make it the focus of their lives, the **essential core** of their identity?

We know the answer to this question now. We understand that they push the "Holocaust" for two reasons: first, because they make lots and lots of money from it; and second, because it protects them from criticism and enables them to get away with the most outrageous behavior, behavior that would not be tolerated in any other people. They have just collected $250 million in cold, hard cash from the Swiss in blackmail money: money which the Swiss gave to them not because there was the slightest evidence that the Jews were entitled to any of it, but simply to avoid a boycott. Now, the Jews are aiming for $7 billion more from the Swiss the same way. Anybody else who tried a stunt like that would end up in prison for extortion. The Swiss government wouldn't have caved in to anybody else. If, for example, the heirs of Russian aristocrats who were butchered by Jewish Communists in the 1920s had made a similar demand on the Swiss bankers for lost assets, the Swiss would have fought them all the way. But they didn't want to fight the Jews -- they even apologized for frankly telling the Jews what they thought about the whole racket -- because they knew the Jews would wrap themselves in the "Holocaust" and it would look like the Swiss were picking on the poor, innocent, defenseless, persecuted dears. They knew the Jews had them beat at the propaganda game, at the sympathy game.

That's just one example of the cash value of the "Holocaust." Another example is the $4 billion in American taxpayers' money which goes to Israel every year. Germany has also given Israel billions of dollars over the past 50 years, paid for by German taxpayers.

Or consider Doctor Sussman's boasting about the damage the Jews' "diversity" propaganda already has done to the self-image of many gullible White people. Who else but a Jew would have the brass for that? And where does that brass come from? It comes from a sure knowledge that he can retreat into his "victim" status if anyone calls him to account. He knows that he can invoke the "Holocaust," that he can wrap himself in the "Holocaust," and his accusers will retreat in embarrassment. At least, the hymn-singers will retreat in embarrassment. And any harder-headed critic of the Jews or their behavior or their influence knows that he will be regarded as a bully by everyone who has been taken in by the "Holocaust" propaganda.

The fact is that we do have a Jewish problem in America. It is by far the biggest and most dangerous problem we have. It is worse than our crime problem, worse than our drug problem, worse than our political corruption problem, worse than our immigration problem, worse even than our race problem. Our Jewish problem, in fact, lies at the root of nearly all of our other problems. If we are to have a future we must solve it. We cannot let ourselves be buffaloed by the "Holocaust." We must face the fact that, regardless of all the nice, inoffensive Jews you may know as individuals, all of the Jews who mind their own business, the Jews as a whole are destroying our society. Their policies are poison to us. And with their control of our news and entertainment media and their corollary control of our political system, they have a death grip on our country. We must have the courage to stand up to them and to do everything necessary to break that death grip. We must free our media and our government from their influence. We must make an example of the Sussmans and all of their collaborators. Otherwise they will destroy us as surely as they have destroyed every other society in which they were given free rein.

On Churchgoers

Does Admitting That Most Major Churches Are Anti-White Make One "Anti-Christian"?

After last week's broadcast, "The Jewish Problem," in which I made some unflattering comments about churchgoers -- I also referred to them as "hymn-singers" -- several listeners suggested that I am anti-Christian. Others said that even if I'm not anti-Christian I shouldn't criticize Christians, because we Whites need to stick together, and criticizing Christians is divisive.

I would now like to explain myself. First, let me assure you that I am not anti-Christian. I admire and respect many individuals from our people's past who were Christians. And there are some people alive today who call themselves Christians whom I respect. But I must confess that I am not very favorably disposed toward most churchgoers today, because I believe that virtually all of the major Christian churches, the major denominations, have allied themselves with the enemies of our people. In saying this I am not being at all partisan. Although I was raised as a Presbyterian when I was a child, I am talking about the Protestant denominations as well as the Catholic Church when I say that the churches have turned against our people and allied themselves with our enemies.

And remember, I was talking specifically about 15,000 churchgoers in Switzerland who obediently demonstrated in favor of the Jews and against their own people when ordered to do so by their priests and ministers. I am sure that there are many individual Christians, in Switzerland and elsewhere, who are just as disgusted by this behavior as I am. But the fact is that the churches themselves, virtually all of them, have become hostile to the interests of our people; for all practical purposes, they have been taken over by our enemies.

Think for a moment about what happened in South Africa a few years ago. In South Africa the percentage of churchgoers among the Whites is much higher than in the United States. Practically all of the Boers -- the Afrikaners, the Dutch-speaking Whites of South Africa -- are churchgoers. The Dutch Reformed Church is the most important institution in their communities. And as long as their church remained faithful to them they remained strong and were able to deal with all outside forces. The Jews in South Africa, of course, were pushing for them to turn their country over to the Blacks, but they were able to ignore this Jewish pressure as long as their church stood with them.

But when their church turned against them and betrayed them, then they lost everything. When their ministers began saying to them, "Oh, we have looked at our Bibles again and we now realize that we made a mistake earlier, when we told you that it was good to defend yourselves against those who would destroy you. Now we realize that it is a sin for you not to turn your country over to the Blacks" -- when their ministers began saying that, their will to preserve themselves collapsed.

And although the churches, fortunately, do not play as large a role in the lives of White Americans as they do in the lives of White South Africans, it is quite clear that the role they do play here in the United States is a destructive one. Think about almost any major issue involving the survival of our people, and the churches are on the wrong side of that issue: just as in

Switzerland, just as in South Africa. Forced racial mixing, including interracial marriage: the churches are for it; cutting off non-White immigration: the churches are against it; the destruction of White Rhodesia and White South Africa: all of the churches were for it; opposing the Jews in any way: the churches are against it.

You know, it didn't used to be that way. The churches in America used to be a bulwark of the community. It used to be that a man or a woman could be a Christian and a churchgoer and a patriot, and a person proud of his people and their heritage and concerned about their future. Why is that no longer true?

My Christian friends tell me that it's because the churches have been subverted, that what the churches teach today is no longer Christianity but instead is a Judaized doctrine which is opposed to real Christianity. And, of course, the ministers and priests today say just the opposite: they say just what the South African ministers said when they betrayed their people. They say, "No, we're preaching the real Christianity today. What used to be taught in our churches wasn't the real Christianity, but today we understand better what real Christianity is. Real Christianity requires us to follow Jewish policies and to mix the races, etc." And both sides will quote the Bible to prove the correctness of their position.

Now, I'm a scientist. I'm not a believer in miracles or in holy scriptures, and so I don't get involved in arguments based on the Bible -- although I do let myself be amused sometimes by the efforts of the new breed of preachers to make the Bible Politically Correct: to make it acceptable to the feminists, for example, by deleting all masculine pronouns, and to make the New Testament acceptable to the Jews by pretending that the account of the crucifixion, in which the Jews clearly are given the blame and in which they say, "His blood be on us and on our children," doesn't say what it seems to say.

As I said, I'm not very interested in what various verses in the Bible "really mean." To me what is significant is that the bulk of our people who called themselves Christians in the past had an essentially healthy outlook. They believed in defending themselves and their race and their way of life. They were self-sufficient, self-reliant. They believed that God looks out for those who look out for themselves. They may have been a little superstitious about some things, but they understood the important things. They understood that there is no such thing under the sun as "equality." They understood the concepts of personal honor and personal responsibility. They understood duty and discipline. They understood racial feeling and racial solidarity. And they understood that the Jews are profoundly different, profoundly alien.

Today the churches don't understand any of those things, nor do the churchgoers, the hymn-singers. So when I criticize the churches and the churchgoers, it doesn't mean that I'm anti-Christian. It just means that I am opposed to what the churches are teaching and opposed to what they are doing today.

And as far as my being divisive goes, well, I'm afraid that most of the hymn-singers are already on the other side, and pointing that fact out to people is probably more useful than divisive.

The question of what made the churches change is an interesting one, but I don't want to get too deeply involved in that now, except to say that at least in part it was a matter of deliberate subversion, as my Christian friends claim. Since the Second World War the Jews have made a concentrated effort to gain control of the churches, and in many cases they have been largely successful. They have been able to get the Lutherans to denounce Luther, for example, for telling what he knew about the Jews in various of his writings.

But it's also been a matter of simple human fallibility. Most churches are no longer led by zealots and martyrs and true believers, willing to die for the faith. They are led instead by people who are essentially businessmen, corporation executives: people more concerned with keeping their tax exemption than with doctrine, people more concerned about popularity and public relations than about theology. These people have been willing to yield to pressure, to go with the flow, to do whatever is expedient instead of what is right.

I'll give just one example of this change. The Jews in Hollywood have been turning out a number of films which are very hostile to the Christian churches, their traditions, and doctrines; and the churches, instead of raising hell about these films and counterattacking, have just been grinning and bearing it for the most part. A fairly recent film of this sort is one called *Priest*, which was produced by the Miramax division of the Disney Company, an entirely Jewish operation. The Miramax division is headed by the Weinstein brothers, and Disney itself is headed by Michael Eisner. The film features two priests, one of them with a mulatto mistress and the other of them an active homosexual, whose activities are depicted quite graphically in the film, and the implication of the film is that these two priests are real Christians, whereas the Church hierarchy, which doesn't approve of their behavior, consists of hypocrites. If the Jews had produced a film like *Priest* before the Second World War, the Pope would have preached a Crusade against them, and every theater which tried to show the film would have been burned by mobs of enraged Catholics. Today they just grin and bear it. They are much more concerned about pleasing the Jews and getting good press than they are about defending the faith.

But, you know, the real change, the significant change, that has taken place in the Western world, which makes it possible for me to respect many Christians of the past while having only contempt for most of today's churchgoers, is not so much a change in doctrine or in the way some little piece of Holy Writ is interpreted: it's a change in values. Basically what has happened is that the values of the Christian churches have become less aristocratic and more democratic, less masculine and more feminine. These changes actually have taken place in most of our society's institutions, not just in our churches. Back in the days when failure at a major undertaking could and often did mean starvation and death, or at least disgrace, personal values were bound to be different than they are in a time when failure simply means heading down to the welfare office and signing up for a handout. Institutions were bound to be imbued with different values in the days when the men governing those institutions were much more conscious of differences in human quality, and when the institutions themselves -- cultural and educational institutions as well as the churches -- were much more closely geared to the needs and concerns and sensibilities of the most capable and successful elements in society than to the interests of the masses. When failure lost its teeth and survival became less demanding, there was a general slackening in values. And when institutions began catering more to the masses, there was again a shift in values.

Nobody really planned this shift in values. It was a consequence of changing life-styles. Not planned, but understood. We understand these things because they have happened to us before. Even the ancient Romans understood them. They understood that ease breeds decadence, that luxury leads to softness and indiscipline, and that indiscipline leads to ruin.

We see these changes in our schools and universities, in our popular culture, and in our churches. Hard, strong men founded these churches. The Catholic Church was for more than 200 years led by men who risked being fed to the lions. Martin Luther was willing to risk being burned at the stake by defying the Pope and the emperor to do what he believed was right. Other Christian leaders actually **were** burned rather than recant their beliefs. Can you imagine any top church bureaucrat willing to do that today?

And so I say to my Christian friends: Don't try to shush me when I criticize today's churchgoers and hymn-singers. You should be even more concerned about their bad behavior than I. You should strive to regain control of your churches and to give them healthy values once again, to make them once again into bulwarks of the White community, to make them once again worthy of respect from all self-respecting White men. If you cannot do that, no one else will even try.

I say to all of my friends, to all self-respecting White men and women, Christian or not: Let's not concern ourselves with doctrinal quibbles now. Let's not concern ourselves with whether or not our neighbor believes in virgin birth and walking on water; let's concern ourselves with whether or not he cares about the survival of his people and is willing to do something for that survival. If he or she does care, and if he or she is willing, then he is our brother, then she is our sister.

And let us gather our brothers and our sisters to us; we need them all. We will judge our brothers and sisters, we will rank them, not by their belief or lack of belief in supernatural things, but by their character and their values and their ability. We will rank them according to their sense of duty and responsibility, according to their personal strength and self-discipline, according to their willingness to sacrifice for the common good of our people, and according to what they actually do accomplish for our people.

In fighting against the enemies whose aim is to destroy us all, we need to put religious differences and factional differences aside. We need to feel a sense of solidarity based on our common blood and our common purpose. But this solidarity, this common purpose, does not preclude us from speaking out about those things which need to be spoken about. And when 15,000 churchgoers in Switzerland demonstrate obediently against their own people and for the Jewish swindlers and extortionists who are stealing money from the pockets of the Swiss people, then we should speak out against them. We should separate ourselves from these renegades. We should let the world know that they are beyond the pale, that we disown them, not because of their religion, but regardless of their religion.

Speaking of the situation in Switzerland, I have been pleased to note during the past week that at least a few politicians and media people there have begun to show a little courage and a little honesty. While the church leaders and most of the top politicians and most of the mass media have either sided with the Jews, or at least have been afraid to oppose the Jews, a few have stood

up for their own people. Last week one member of the Swiss parliament, Christoph Blocher, demanded to know why Swiss taxpayers should pay blackmail money to the Jews.

And it only takes a few honest, courageous men to set the tone for others. Since Christoph Blocher spoke up, others also have expressed their outrage that the Swiss people's money should be given to the Jews in response to the Jewish extortion effort. Even a major Swiss newspaper, *Blick*, stood up to the Jews last week and reported that the Swiss people are becoming exasperated by the Jewish campaign against their country.

In this country we have no politicians with Christoph Blocher's courage and no major newspapers with *Blick's* honesty. In this country we still have politicians like New York Senator Alphonse D'Amato, who might as well be the senator from Israel, still beating the drum for the Jews and demanding that the Swiss yield to their blackmail effort. You can be sure that Senator D'Amato is a faithful churchgoer.

I really hope that D'Amato and his Jewish controllers succeed in imposing a boycott on Switzerland. That will do wonders to wake up the Swiss people and persuade them to take a stand. It might even help a few people over here wake up. People need to realize that the Jews are at war against the world, the whole world, and have been for thousands of years. It's about time to start fighting back.

In Switzerland, of course, they've been pushing their self-serving "Holocaust" propaganda for the past 50 years, just like they have over here and everywhere else, and I guess they figured they had the Swiss hypnotized to the point where they could just reach into the Swiss people's pockets and steal $7 billion from them without a protest. Well, we'll see about that. But if the Swiss do wake up and defend themselves, it will be without the help of their churchgoers, and we ought to think about the implications of that for our own fight over here.

How Liberals Think

Liberals Tend To Be Childish, Resentful, and Authoritarian

Every few days I get a telephone call from a newspaper or television reporter wanting an interview. The things they want to talk about change from time to time: a couple of years ago they were interested in some of the videos the sponsor of *American Dissident Voices*, National Vanguard Books, distributes; last summer it was the Montana Freemen; right now it's domestic unrest and terrorism. They want to know why terrorism is on the rise, what do I think about the Oklahoma City bombing, was there a conspiracy behind that bombing, do I believe there will be more such bombings, do I think people should worry that there may be biological or chemical terror attacks in the future, what do I believe is the motivation of most terrorists, etc.

I never have pretended to be an expert on terrorism, and I tell the reporters that -- but I also tell them, although no single act of terrorism is predictable, I am sure that, averaged over periods of two or three years, terrorism will continue to become more common. I tell them I am sure of this because the underlying causes of terrorism are on the rise.

Those underlying causes are growing hostility on the part of the government toward citizens, growing governmental intrusion into the lives of citizens, growing resentment against the government by the citizens, a growing sense of having been betrayed by the government. On top of all this is the growth of a more general sort of alienation, as reflected in the decline in citizen participation in elections, the growth in crime and the use of drugs, and the rise in the divorce and suicide rates.

I tell the reporters that there is no chance at all that the government will make the changes necessary to cure these problems. The government will respond to terrorism with counter-terrorism, which will provoke more terrorism. The government certainly will not take the measures necessary to decrease citizen alienation, because the greatest single cause of citizen alienation is government-promoted "diversity."

Can you imagine the Clinton administration -- or any administration, Republican or Democrat -- saying, "Well, we made a mistake in pushing 'diversity.' We shouldn't have forced racial mixing in the schools, the workplaces, and neighborhoods. We shouldn't have let a flood of non-White immigrants into the country. We'll straighten things out and restore the citizens' faith in the government by separating the races, by sending the non-White immigrants back where they came from, and by taking other steps to clean up the mess we've made of things. And the first thing we'll do is put on trial all of the corrupt politicians and bureaucrats, including those responsible for the massacre at Waco."

No, the government is locked into its present course of social and racial destruction. It does not have the will to change its fundamentally destructive policies. Nothing but a total revolution can bring about the changes necessary to minimize alienation, restore the faith of White citizens in the government, and eliminate terrorism. That's why I'm a revolutionary instead of a conservative or a reformer.

I tell the reporters all of these things, but it is clear to me in talking to them that they have no comprehension of what I'm saying. I might as well be talking to creatures from Mars as trying to explain to the average newspaper or television reporter the things that are wrong with American society today and why so many people are reacting badly to these things. To me, one of the more interesting aspects of these interviews is the opportunity to study the mentality of journalists. On the whole, they're not really stupid. In fact, they're probably a little brighter, on the average, than the population as a whole. But they really do have an almost identical mentality, as if they all had been cloned from a single ultra-liberal prototype.

They all understand, of course, that their Jewish bosses expect a certain slant on the reporting they do. They understand which side their bread is buttered on. They don't want to bite the hand that feeds them. But their liberal bias goes beyond just trying to please the Jewish media bosses who employ them.

I think it's clear that most journalists really don't understand why American society is coming unraveled. They really don't understand why alienation is growing, why divorce and suicide rates are up, why so many people hate and fear the government. They don't understand, and part of the reason may be a selection process in the journalism profession. It may be that students who major in journalism in college tend to be authoritarian types. It may be that they tend to be those who are only comfortable when they are marching in ideological lockstep with all the rest of their profession. And it may be that the journalism professors tend to weed out any students who show a streak of independence or who aren't trendy enough. That may be part of the explanation for why journalists are so uniformly liberal.

I think, though, that another part of the explanation may be found in the phenomenon of the 1960s. The great bulk of the reporters I talk with today went through their formative period, their period of social imprinting, during the 1960s or 1970s. The 1960s and 1970s were a period of deliberately induced chaos, a period during which American society deliberately was turned upside down, a period during which all of our traditional values and standards were ridiculed relentlessly by Jewish critics and arbiters of fashion. Young people on our college campuses were told that everything which had come before was old-fashioned and outdated and had to be scrapped to make way for a new order. The old way was racist and sexist and homophobic and had to go.

And these young people were the first TV generation, the first generation to be exposed more to artificial social situations and social interactions constructed by television scriptwriters than to natural social situations and interactions in the real world. They were the first generation to be socialized by Jewish television, before we had had any opportunity to develop defense mechanisms against this sort of brainwashing. They also were a generation raised according to Dr. Spock, a generation in which permissiveness ruled. They were kids raised without corrective punishment and with a minimum of discipline, kids raised without any reality checks. They've been called the "me" generation because of their narcissistic tendencies, but there's really more to it than just selfishness and egoism.

You know, when the question of Nature versus nurture is debated, I'm nearly always to be found on the side of Mother Nature. But in trying to understand what has made today's journalists what

they are, I believe that we must look very carefully into the way they were nurtured. Our ancestors spent thousands of generations learning how to raise children so that they had a reasonable chance to become valuable and effective adults. This process of learning wasn't done with books. It was a matter of trial and error, of failure and success, of life or death. Communities or tribes which had correct ways of raising their young survived and prospered, on the average. Tribes which had faulty methods stagnated or perished.

Within the past century some very foolish people let themselves be sold on the idea that the old ways of raising children to adulthood no longer have any relevance, because we have made so many changes in our environment. What worked back in tribal days a thousand years ago is no longer any good under modern conditions we were told. Discipline and hardness and self-reliance and courage may have been necessary qualities to instill in young people back in the days when survival was much more difficult. But in the days of the welfare state and day-care centers and working mothers and MTV, permissiveness isn't so bad, we were told. The consequences of that theory are to be seen all around us today. Journalists as a class show the consequences a little more strongly, a little more clearly, than the rest of the "me" generation, because, I believe, those most corrupted by the new nurturing have been attracted to journalism. The corruption, however, has permeated much of our society today. Many others besides journalists have been infected.

I don't want to overemphasize the effects of nurture. It is clear that many of our personality traits are inborn. Even many of the worst traits that we see in journalists and other members of the "me" generation are inborn traits which merely have been strengthened and brought to the fore by the disastrous nurturing environment of the 1960s and 1970s. In a healthier nurturing environment healthier traits are brought to the fore and unhealthy traits are at least partially suppressed.

In trying to understand liberals we also should keep in mind the fact that most people cannot properly be classified as real liberals or real conservatives. Most people have no real ideology of any sort: they simply parrot whatever ideas are fashionable at the moment. When the fashions change, their ideas will change instantly, like a weathercock. But there are, unfortunately, plenty of real liberals, and I believe that their unwholesome abundance these days can best be explained as I have just outlined. And if we understand what has caused the current plague of liberals, I believe that we can understand better how their minds work -- although that still is not an easy task.

In some ways it is unfortunate that I quit my university teaching when I did, in the mid 1960s. Liberalism was really starting to take hold on the campuses then, and if I had remained a physics professor for another ten years I might have been able to observe some of these psychological phenomena directly and figured things out much more quickly.

First, at the core of the liberal personality is an excessive degree of egoism, which in the worst cases amounts to narcissism. This excessive egoism is an infantile characteristic. Which is to say, it is a normal characteristic in infants, but in the case of healthy growth it recedes as the individual develops and matures. A permissive upbringing retards the normal process of maturing.

A second very important element in the liberal personality -- an element closely related to the egoism -- is resentment coupled with envy. That is why in the past liberalism has sometimes been called an ideology based on resentment. The liberal finds very distasteful the notion that some people are brighter than he is, better looking, more industrious, more righteous or moral, more cultured, more artistic, more capable, or more successful. And he regards these people who are better than he is -- and because of being better, more powerful -- as a threat, as an irksome constraint. This envy and resentment is in a way a carryover into adult life of the sort of resentment that a spoiled, self-indulgent child might feel toward a parent who won't let him do exactly what he wants to do, a parent who won't let him eat all the cookies in the cookie jar or torment an animal for his amusement or "play with himself," to use a familiar euphemism. It may express itself in infancy in the form of a tantrum. In adulthood it is expressed as a strong attraction to the ideology of egalitarianism: the idea that no one is better than anyone else.

If you believe that I'm on thin ice in tracing the adult liberal's egalitarianism back to an infantile resentment of parental restraint, let me remind you of a significant refrain in the Jews' indoctrination of young Gentiles during the 1960s and 1970s. The refrain was "kill your parents." In most cases this incitement to parenticide was symbolic. It meant get rid of every restraint, everything which keeps you from spending all of your time doing exactly what you feel like doing, whether that be smoking dope, having sex, or whatever. In one of the more popular books on the campuses in those days, a book published in 1970 and titled *Do It!* by Jerry Rubin, one of the Jewish leaders of the Youth International Party, or the "Yippies" for short, the incitement is quite literal. Rubin wrote, "When we start playing with our private parts, our parents say, 'Don't do that.' The mother commits a crime against her child when she says, 'Don't do that.'"

The remainder of Rubin's book is a non-stop effort to build resentment in his infantile collegiate readers with a long recitation of the "crimes" their parents, their schools, and the rest of society have committed against them by restraining them in one way or another and of the need to end this parental oppression. And, of course, Rubin manages to bring the racial angle and the Communist angle into this ideology of resentment. Blacks, he tells the kids, are your natural allies against your parents, because they have been oppressed too. They are Black niggers, and we are White niggers, Rubin says. Blacks will help you overthrow society, so that you can have everything you want. And Rubin idolizes Fidel Castro, as someone who succeeded in killing his parents. And he holds up the Communist guerrilla Che Guevara as another idol who was fighting to end parental oppression.

Rubin winds up his book with a description on the last page of how wonderful life will be for everyone after young people have gotten rid of their parents, burned their schools, and killed all of the police. He writes, and I quote: "There will be no more jails, courts, or police. The world will become one big commune with free food and housing, everything shared. There will be no such crime as 'stealing' because everything will be free. People will farm in the morning, make music in the afternoon, and have sex whenever and wherever they want to."

And there's more, but you get the picture. This is the image of the ideal life in an ideal world which the Jews were busy selling to young, White Americans during the 1960s and the 1970s. The ones who bought this image were the most infantile ones: that is the ones who had been

raised most permissively and were most narcissistic. And the worst of these went into journalism.

Unfortunately, however, some of this Jewish poison was absorbed by millions of other young people during that period of deliberate chaos and confusion, when the old America was being trashed. That's how the current crop of liberals was created. Most of them are in their 30s and 40s now; a few are in their 50s. Some of them went into business, some into education, some into the churches, some into government work. One couple, a man and wife, are in the White House now. Wherever they went, they continue the destruction, in a thousand ways.

It is in the journalists, though, where the poison has produced the most profound effects, that the phenomenon of liberalism is easiest to study and understand, I believe. When I explain to a reporter that terrorism is the consequence of a loss of a sense of belonging and identity -- when I explain that a person who feels that he is no longer a part of the society around him, that it is no longer his family and he has no responsibility to it, may strike out violently at that society -- when I explain this, the reporter may smile politely and take notes, but I can see the total lack of comprehension in his eyes. He lives in a different world, a different moral universe, where words like "responsibility" and "belonging" and "identity" have no meaning -- or at least, they have a totally different meaning to him than they have to me. He lives in a universe shaped by egoism and resentment, a world in which the individual, the self, is everything, and anyone who tries to impose any constraints at all on the individual is an enemy. He cannot comprehend a world in which the individual is just one part in a complex and interrelated natural order, and that for that order to be healthy the individual needs to be able to find his proper place, the place where he can be useful, and that he has a responsibility to be useful. That's an alien concept to the journalist.

I hope that I haven't bored you with these comments on the way a journalist's mind works. I believe that it's important to try to understand these things. If we're to effectively carry out our responsibilities and make a future for our people, we have to overcome all of those who are now infected by liberalism, and then we have to restructure our society in a way which will prevent the production of a new crop of liberals -- or at least, minimize the size and destructiveness of that crop. The more we know about them the more likely we are to succeed.

Time To Do What's Right

Why Does it Matter Who Controls the Media?

Well, well, well! Finally even someone in the Clinton gang said something about it: there are far too many Jews in Clinton's government. An unnamed bureaucrat in the State Department, trying to implement the Clinton government's policy of maximizing "diversity" in the bureaucracy, looked around and noticed that nearly all of the people in the key policy positions in the State Department are Jews, and he wrote a memorandum to other bureaucrats saying, "Hey, we have too many Jews. We need to hold off on appointing any more Jews to vacant positions around here and try to get some other ethnicities involved." He pointed out in particular that everyone in the section of the State Department dealing with the Middle East is a Jew.

Of course, the number of Jews in the State Department has become much more noticeable since Clinton's Jewish secretary of state Madeleine Albright was appointed and immediately surrounded herself with a swarm of Jewish assistants and advisors. But it is considered impolite to notice this, and when someone leaked the memo about there being too many Jews to a local newspaper, the *Washington Times*, things hit the fan. There were screams of outrage from all the usual quarters. Jewish Congressman Benjamin Gilman, a Republican from New York and chairman of the House Internal Affairs Committee, complained angrily about the memo to Mr. Clinton, wailing that any attempt to stop the State Department from becoming entirely Jewish is "religious discrimination." And in Mr. Clinton Congressman Gilman found a sympathetic listener. Mr. Clinton has appointed more Jews to government positions than any other President in history -- by far. In particular he has hardly appointed anyone except Jews to the positions of control over America's foreign policy. His entire national security team is Jewish: the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, the chief of the National Security Council and his deputy -- they're all Jews appointed by Clinton. And so the State Department bureaucrat who wrote that memo is now in very hot water. Predictions are that he will be crucified -- which, come to think of it, is a punishment which has a historical precedent for a similar offense against the Jewish establishment.

The bureaucrat's problem is that he just didn't get it: He just never understood that what the government's policy of "diversity" really means is, get rid of the straight, White males. **One** heterosexual White male in any department is one too many. But you do not ask whether or not there may be too many homosexuals or too many Blacks or too many Hispanic lesbians or too many Vietnamese immigrants in a particular government agency -- and especially you **never, never, never** comment about there being too many Jews. There **can't** be too many Jews in positions of power and influence. "Diversity" doesn't apply to Jews.

The government bureaucracy isn't the only place where it is Politically Incorrect to notice the huge overabundance of Jews; organized crime is another area. When the Los Angeles police announced that they had found out who had killed the son of Black television actor Bill Cosby, they told the world that their suspect is a "Russian" -- and might be a hit man for a "Russian" organized crime gang, suggesting that Cosby may have been involved in some sort of drug deal which went bad. When this announcement hit the news last week, there was much talk on television about how the "Russians" are taking over organized crime in the United States, about

how the most vicious and sophisticated organized crime gangs are made up of "Russian" immigrants, and so on. The word "Jew" was never mentioned in connection with any of this, and so the average television viewer would never realize that these crime gangs actually have no **Russians** in them at all. They consist entirely of Jews from Russia and other parts of the former Soviet Union. They are **Jewish** organized crime gangs, but that fact is never mentioned by the controlled news media.

The reason America is now plagued by the Jewish organized crime gangs is that our government in Washington has for years treated Jews differently from all other persons in Eastern Europe seeking entry to the United States. If you're a real Russian who wants to come to the United States to get away from the disastrous economic conditions in post-Communist Russia, our government won't let you in. But if you're a Jew who wants to come over here from Russia because your tribe already has picked that country's bones clean, you are welcomed with open arms and given every advantage. You are classified as a "refugee from persecution." Hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews have poured into the United States during the past 20 years, and many of them were hardened criminals. They ran the rackets in Russia, and now that they've bled Russia dry they've come over here to suck our blood. It is these Jewish so-called "refugees" who have set up the vicious organized crime gangs on the east and west coasts -- especially in the New York and Los Angeles areas -- and are doing far more damage than the Italian mafia ever did. But you would never know that from watching television. And don't expect the Clinton government to change its policy toward those poor, persecuted Soviet Jews still pouring into America.

After the Los Angeles police had investigated their suspect, Mikhail Markhasev, for a day or two, they announced that they believed he was not acting on behalf of any organized crime group when he shot Cosby. He is only 18 years old and came to the United States with his family eight years ago as a "Russian refugee," they said. Still no mention that he is a Jew, but the description of him as a "Russian refugee" is a dead giveaway, because, as I just mentioned, for all practical purposes it is only Jews who are given that status. And it turned out that this particular 18-year-old Jew has an extensive criminal record and is known as a hardened and vicious thug, and may have been undergoing initiation into a gang when he killed Cosby.

The two news items I've mentioned -- the fuss about a bureaucrat's memo on the growing Jewishness of our State Department and the murder of Bill Cosby's son by a Jewish criminal from Russia -- may sound like they're completely unrelated, but they're not. The common link they have is the Jewish control of America's news and entertainment media.

The State Department is supposed to look out for America's interests in our dealings with other countries. It's supposed to exercise diplomacy on our behalf in a way which will solve our problems with other countries without our having to go to war. One of the key problem spots in the world, of course, is the Middle East. Our State Department spends more time dealing with problems in the Middle East than anywhere else in the world. The root of all the problems in the Middle East is the seizure of Arab land by Jews in a series of wars over the past 50 years. And how does our State Department look out for our interests in the Middle East? It staffs the Middle Eastern section entirely with Jews. That's like trying to solve problems in the henhouse by putting a fox in charge.

No major politician in Washington, no sophisticated bureaucrat in Washington, believes that the State Department is looking out for American interests in the Middle East. Everyone understands that the real job of the State Department is to look out for Jewish interests. Everyone understands that except the general public. The general public hasn't been let in on the secret, because the news media, which are supposed to keep the public informed, are covering for the Jews. Can you imagine the screams of outrage you would hear if any President or Secretary of State tried to staff the Middle Eastern section of the State Department with Arabs? The media would be screaming that the State Department was biased against Israel, that it wasn't really looking out for America's interests, that it was siding with the Arabs. They would make sure that the public heard about it -- over and over and over. But when the State Department becomes essentially an arm of the government of Israel, the public doesn't hear a peep.

It may be foreign affairs that our Jew-heavy State Department deals with, but foreign affairs have domestic consequences. They can cost American lives. They take money out of the pockets of American taxpayers. The American public may not have found out yet that our State Department doesn't represent American interests, but the rest of the world has found out. That's why the Marine barracks in Lebanon was blown up, killing 237 of our Marines in 1983; that's why the World Trade Center in New York City was bombed a decade later; that's why our military people were bombed in Saudi Arabia last year; that's why there will be other terror bombings in the future which will take American lives. And it's why the Jews in our State Department very well may lead our country into another war in the Middle East in the near future. They will do it because they know that the Jews who control the media will cover for them.

Or take the Cosby killing. The Soviet Jewish thug who did it was in this country only because our government automatically classifies any Jew in eastern Europe who wants to come to the United States as a "refugee from persecution." It's a racket, and it wouldn't exist if our news media would expose it. But they don't. So the organized Jewish groups put pressure on the politicians, the politicians give them the special laws and handouts for Israel and other things they demand, and the news media just keep quiet about it, so Joe and Jill Sixpack never have a clue as to what's happening.

What we need are honest, responsible, and patriotic news media, which actually keep the public informed about what's going on. As long as the Jews have their death grip on the media, the public will remain ignorant, and every sort of corrupt and destructive activity will be able to proceed without the public's knowledge. Joe and Jill Sixpack will learn only what the Jews want them to learn.

But the public consists of more than Joe and Jill Sixpack. When I say Joe and Jill Sixpack, I'm talking about the great mass of Americans who never have an idea in their heads that they didn't get from television, who turn first to the sports section when they open their newspapers, and who never analyze anything, who never think carefully about anything. Unfortunately, Joe and Jill vote -- in fact, they make up the great mass of voters -- and so it suffices for the Jews' purpose to keep Joe and Jill in the dark. But there are people who do keep up with what's going on in the world. There are lots of people who concern themselves with what's really happening. They read the small print in their newspapers, and they read between the lines. They know how to add two and two and draw the correct conclusion. They have noted what our State Department

has been doing during the past 50 years, and they have noted many of the names and faces of the people involved. And so when they spot a small news article reporting Congressman Gilman's outrage over some minor personnel official in the State Department being concerned that there are too many Jews in the department, these people are not surprised or confused. They understand. And they have read and remembered the fine print about the immigration of Soviet Jews into this country, and so they understand what the newspapers really mean when they report about "Russian" gangs of organized criminals.

They understand, so why do they not speak out? Why do they remain silent while the Jews continue to deceive and plunder their fellow citizens? These people who understand more often than not are successful people, people who wield a certain amount of power, a certain amount of influence. They could make a difference. After all, the Jews constitute only 2-1/2 per cent of the population. The people who understand what the Jews are up to make up at least that large a portion of the population. So why do they remain silent?

I have spoken with many of these people, and I have asked them that very question. Some of them have answered me in a very reasonable way. They have told me that while they understand that many Jews are engaged in destructive activities, especially in connection with their control of the news and entertainment media and their influence on governmental policy and the political process, they don't know everything that's going on. They don't want to speak out in ignorance. They don't want to make fools of themselves and perhaps do an injustice to some Jews by making blanket statements when they don't yet have all of the facts.

Well, let's say we have a mutinous faction in a ship's crew which is drilling holes in the bottom of the boat, the ship has taken on a lot of water and already is listing at 45 degrees, but the ship's officers refuse to take any action because they don't yet have all of the facts. What would you say about those ship's officers? Are they just trying to be careful and fair? Or do they have some character flaw: perhaps a deficiency in courage or a defective sense of responsibility?

I understand as well as anyone that there is a cost involved in doing what is right instead of just going with the flow. I understand that the Jews always try to punish those who speak out against them. I understand there is some risk involved in being Politically Incorrect when one is living in a degenerate society under a corrupt government. But look at the cost of remaining silent: the loss of one's self-respect, the loss of one's sense of righteousness -- unless one has a very flexible conscience. Is it worth it?

You know, someone once said, "What does it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and yet lose his soul?" And I say, what degree of security, what amount of material wealth, is great enough to sacrifice one's honor for it? What can the Jews threaten a man with that is more terrible than living with the knowledge that he has shirked his responsibility, that he has failed to do what he knows he should do and could do?

I am attacked continually by the Jews in their newspapers and their television. They shriek that I am a "hater," and they try to frighten ordinary people into staying away from me. And they do more. They sic the government on me, and they try to bankrupt me with harassing lawsuits. I used to have a tax exemption because all of my work is educational, and I'm certainly not in it

for the profit. But the B'nai B'rith, one of the powerful Jewish organizations to whose tune the politicians dance, complained to the Internal Revenue Service, and they obediently took away my tax exemption. Morris Dees and his Southern Poverty Law Center tried to bankrupt me with a spurious law suit in an effort to silence me. Morris Dees boasted to the newspapers when he sued me that he would "shut Pierce down." And these things certainly are a nuisance. But the compensation is that I sleep well at night. I live and work constantly with the joy of knowing that I am doing the right thing, that I am doing what I should be doing, to the best of my ability. And despite all of the hatred and all of the attacks the Jews direct against me, the number of my friends and supporters continues to grow.

It is possible to stand up to the Jews. It is possible to do what you know is right without being destroyed. They have much power, but it is power which they are obliged to keep concealed. They understand that they are playing a very risky and tricky game. They know that there are more of us than of them. They know that they can only continue to suck the blood of our people if they can do it without provoking us sufficiently that we wake up and take action against them. And now they see more and more of us waking up. That must be a very unnerving experience for them.

You who are reading this are at least partially awake. You are a cut above Joe and Jill Sixpack. So I say to you: think about what you are doing with your life. Think about the responsibility you have to your children and grandchildren and great grandchildren. Think about the responsibility you have to all of those who came before you and whose sacrifices made your life possible. And think about your responsibility to yourself, your responsibility to be the best person, the most righteous person, that you can be. Think about all of these things, and then let me hear from you.

Focusing Our Anger

To Be Effective, Our Anger Must Be Properly Directed

Hillary Clinton went to South Africa a few days ago to show the Clinton government's support for Black rule in that country. She met with the new Black ruler of South Africa, Nelson Mandela, and she toured the prison where Mandela was an inmate for 27 years. And she said all of the Politically Correct things during her tour: about White injustice toward Blacks and the victims of apartheid and so on. The average American viewer watching her performance on television and listening to her comments was given the very definite impression that the jailing of Mandela was one of the "injustices" Mrs. Clinton was talking about, that Mandela was a "victim of apartheid," who had been locked up by the wicked South African racists merely because he was a Black man.

The fact of the matter is that Mandela was locked up for being a terrorist and nothing else. In 1963 the police in South Africa broke up a terrorist gang which had been meeting at Rivonia, near Johannesburg. The group consisted of both Blacks, of whom Mandela was one, and Jews -- plus one Indian. The Rivonia gang had detailed plans for a campaign of terror and murder. They already had carried out a number of terrorist killings before they were arrested. Terrorists acting under their direction had murdered a number of White South Africans, including women and children. Some of the Jews involved managed to escape from the country and continued their terrorist activities from abroad. One of these Jews who escaped was Joe Slovo, the Communist Party leader of South Africa. Mandela was not able to escape, however, because he already had been picked up by the police in connection with his illegal Communist Party activities before the raid on the terrorist headquarters at Rivonia. He was put on trial for his role in the terrorist conspiracy, convicted, and sentenced to life in prison. Now, of course, he is a hero of the leftists, including the Clintons and the American news media.

At home the Clintons are very much down on terrorists and always are calling for new laws to fight them and for more severe punishments when they are caught. It wasn't always that way. Back during the 1960s and 1970s Bill Clinton ran around with terrorists who burned ROTC buildings on university campuses and bombed Selective Service offices.

The lesson in all of this is that when the Clintons condemn terrorism, what they mean is that terrorism by White people on behalf of White people is bad and must be stamped out, but terrorism by Jews or Blacks against Whites is commendable.

It is unfortunate that the great mass of White Americans are not able to see this hypocrisy on the part of the Clintonistas. The reason they can't see it is that the controlled news media keep it covered up. How many of you listening today have ever even heard of Rivonia? You've certainly heard plenty about Nelson Mandela and the fact that he was sent to prison by the White South African government, but the implication always is that his only offense was that he was a Black leader, and that his imprisonment was an instance of White injustice against Blacks. You never hear that he was convicted of terrorism, of being an active terrorist in a gang which had murdered White South Africans and had the intent to murder many more of them and overthrow their government. The bosses of the news media know that, and the Clintons know that, but they

deliberately conceal that information from you. If you're really interested in the details, go to any large library and look for information about what was happening in South Africa in 1963, 1964, and 1965 in connection with the Rivonia terrorist gang. That's where Nelson Mandela got his start, but you'd never learn that from listening to Hillary Clinton or watching the television news today.

And there are many other things you'd never learn from Hillary or the television news. Mrs. Clinton has been holding a number of press conferences during her South African tour, and she never fails to say how pleased she is by all of the "progress" which has been made since the advent of Black rule there. She smiles and tells the television audience how wonderful everything is in South Africa now that the Whites no longer are running the country. And that is a bare-faced lie, but you won't hear any television newsman contradicting her. The truth is that South Africa has become a much more dangerous and unpleasant place to live, for both Blacks and Whites, since the country was turned over to Black rule three years ago, and Mrs. Clinton and the media bosses know it. The murder rate and the rate for crime of all types have skyrocketed. Johannesburg, which used to be a clean, decent, and safe city under White rule, now has the highest murder rate in the world. Gangs of armed Black criminals roam the streets of Johannesburg and prey on both Blacks and Whites with impunity. In the Black tribal areas of South Africa old superstitions have reasserted themselves, and thousands of Blacks have been burned, hacked, or stoned to death on suspicion of being witches during the past three years. If your neighbor's cow dies, he may accuse you of having caused the death by witchcraft, and then you may have your hands wired behind your back and a gasoline-soaked tire put around your neck and set afire, the same punishment Blacks used to administer to other Blacks suspected of collaborating with Whites. Under White rule, killing Blacks suspected of witchcraft was not tolerated, but now there's no one to stop the practice. White South Africans who live on farms or who drive in rural areas must worry constantly about Black gangs. One of the practices of these gangs is to descend suddenly upon a White farm or to force an automobile with White occupants off the road and then gang-rape any White females they find.

The infrastructure of South Africa is beginning to come apart from neglect and corruption, and Whites who can afford it and have the option are fleeing the country. Even Blacks often will whisper to visitors that they wish Whites were still running the country, because their lives were much better under White rule. South Africa, in other words, is coming unraveled under Black rule, is ceasing to function as a civilized country -- much like our nation's capital, Washington, DC, also is coming unraveled under Black rule. But don't expect to learn this from any television news program.

I talk with many people about things like this deliberate sanctification by the controlled news media of a Black terrorist thug and their lying about conditions in South Africa, and sometimes I become emotional when I talk about such things. It angers me, it makes me furious, that our news media, on which we depend for our knowledge about what's going on in the world, are under the control of a bunch of Jews who deliberately deceive us in order to advance their own interests.

What irritates me at least as much as this deception, however, is the moral paralysis of many of the people to whom I speak. They agree with me that it is bad that the news media deliberately

deceive us, but they don't become angry about it, they don't become outraged. They just take it for granted that the media are deceptive, but they don't feel any obligation to try to do something about that. It's as if they consider themselves merely spectators watching the world go by like some sort of drama on a television screen.

I'll give you another example, and that is what is happening to young White women in our armed forces. It is good, of course, that the Army brass finally have made a move against the Black drill instructors and Black officers who have been raping them. Finally. What has not changed, however, is the system which deliberately subjects White women to the authority of Black males and pretends that everything will be all right, a system which pretends that there is no difference between Blacks and Whites or between women and men. That filthy and destructive system is still in place. And it is only a fluke that the rapes and other abuse of our women under that system have been exposed. It's not that no one knew what was happening all along. All of the White enlisted men and the White officers knew what was happening, but they didn't do anything about it because they were afraid of being accused of racism. So now, finally, the dirty little secret about our Army is out because a few women raised hell about it, but the system is still in place. How the filthy creatures who designed that system and support that system must be smirking and gloating now.

More than 20 years ago, in 1975, when I began writing *The Turner Diaries*, I foresaw this sort of thing, and I predicted it in my book. I saw that, on the one hand, the feminists were generating hostility between men and women and were undermining the special, protected status that women always had had in our society, and on the other hand the race fanatics who demanded the forced social integration of the races were poisoning the minds of our young people with their propaganda and persuading them that it was evil to refuse to give Blacks whatever they wanted because their ancestors had been the slaves of our ancestors and so we owed them something. I saw this, and I predicted that it would lead to both large-scale miscegenation and to a much greater incidence of violence against our women and rape of our women. In fact there is an episode in *The Turner Diaries* where Black U.S. Army soldiers are gang-raping White girls, and White officers who are aware of what is happening refuse to interfere out of fear of being charged with racism.

And now, just a little over 20 years later, it has come to pass. But I did not make that prediction cold-bloodedly. I looked at the trends I could see in 1975, and I thought about where they would take our society in the next 20 years, but I wasn't cool and detached about it. I was mad as hell, and I'm still mad as hell. Even back in 1975 I wanted to take all of the feminist agitators and propagandists and all of the race-mixing fanatics and all of the media bosses and all of the bureaucrats and politicians who were collaborating with them, and I wanted to put them up against a wall, in batches of a thousand or so at a time, and machine-gun them. And I still want to do that. I am convinced that one day we will have to do that before we can get our civilization back on track, and I look forward to the day.

Of course, I didn't machine-gun any of these destroyers of our civilization, any of these poisoners of the souls of our people, but I didn't just sit on my hands either. I pledged that I would do everything that I could legally do to build the means for one day stamping out the filth that is poisoning our people. And that's what I have been doing, reaching out to our people through

every feasible medium -- through books and through the Internet and through these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts -- informing our people, awakening them, explaining things to them, and trying to inspire them.

And I know that I've been reaching many people, because I hear from them all the time. They tell me that I have helped them to understand what is happening, that I have helped them to make sense out of things, that I have given them a new sense of direction. I am glad for all of that. But what still is disconcerting to me is the relatively small number of these people who display any passion, any anger. For many of them it is as if they have been watching a confusing television drama, and I have helped them to understand the drama a little better, but it still isn't real to them; it still isn't their responsibility to do something about it. They still are just spectators. Not all of them. The number of people who are angry is growing. But too many are still just dispassionate spectators.

Maybe I shouldn't be irritated about this. Maybe this is just human nature. Maybe most people are inherently incapable of being anything but spectators -- although I'm inclined to believe that the television age has encouraged and exacerbated this passivity in some people who might otherwise be active and responsible citizens. Anyway, I should be thankful that at least understanding is growing among the spectators as well as among the more active people. Even passive support based on understanding is better than nothing.

But our real hope for the future lies with the people who still are capable of feeling moral outrage, still are capable of becoming angry: angry that our news media are being used to deceive us, angry that our entertainment media are being used to poison the minds of our people, angry that our government used our resources to pressure the people of South Africa into turning their country over to Black savages, angry that our Army has become what it is today. We need many more such angry people.

Our anger, of course, must be focused and directed. When someone sees his world being destroyed; when someone sees the future of his children being stolen from them; when someone sees everything around him that is fine and noble and beautiful being trampled into the mud; when someone sees his heritage, which has been created through the work and sacrifice of countless generations of his forebears, falling into the uncaring hands of savages -- it is easy for him to be angry at many things, at many people. It is easy to be angry at liberals, who manage to be on the wrong side of every issue and whose mindless egalitarianism lies at the root of most of the destructive policies which are wrecking our civilization. It is easy to be angry at lawyers -- along with big businessmen and corporation executives -- a privileged class whose members seem to be far more interested in fattening themselves on the various processes of decay in our society, even hastening those processes whenever it seems personally advantageous to them, than in using their positions of influence to oppose the destruction. It is easy to be angry at homosexuals and feminists, those sick creatures whose organized drive to remake the world to suit their own perverse needs has so poisoned our society in recent decades. And it is certainly easy to be angry at Blacks and other non-Whites, whose pestilential presence has done so much damage to our world.

And all of that anger would be justified. Certainly we must deal with each of these groups decisively before we can restore our world to health, but to focus on any of them now can only mislead us. There are just two proper targets for our attention and our anger now: they are, first and foremost, the controlled news and entertainment media, which have promoted and orchestrated every destructive and degenerative movement, policy, and tendency which afflicts our society; and second, the government, which for all practical purposes is today a creature of the media.

Without the backing of the mass media, liberalism would still be only a nutcase fringe tendency among a minority of academics and clerics. The whole campaign of racial integration and special rights for Blacks, which has pushed Blacks into every facet of White society since the Second World War, has been directed by the mass media: even the Black violence which has flared up so often in our cities is a direct and deliberate media product, a product designed to intimidate White opposition. None of the rioting, burning, and looting in Los Angeles a couple of years ago following the Rodney King incident, for example, would have occurred if the mass media had not incited it with their endless repetition on television of the arrest scene. Without the media incitement it would have been just one more arrest of a drug-crazed Black criminal by fed-up White policemen.

And just as the controlled news media today portray a Black terrorist and murderer of White women and children in South Africa as a saintly hero, just as they deliberately create the utterly false impression in White Americans that South Africa has become more peaceful and prosperous since the end of White rule, so it was the same sort of media lying and misrepresentation about South Africa in the past which led the U.S. government to boycott South Africa and apply other pressure leading to Black rule. The media, with their lies and propaganda, manipulate public opinion, and the politicians in the government just follow along.

So it is with virtually every other governmental policy. The media push public opinion in the direction the media bosses want it to go, and the politicians, willing to do anything to be elected, go along.

Let us keep in mind who the principal enemies of our people are, and let us keep our anger focused on these enemies. But let us also remember that our anger must not be dissipated in foolish and unproductive violence. Not now. Not yet. Now is the time for hard work, for intelligent work, not for violence.

What Terrifies America's Enemies

More and More People are Thinking Politically Incorrect Thoughts

I talked with you recently about the mentality of journalists, but I want to say a few more things on that subject today. I've been getting many calls from journalists recently because of the Oklahoma City bombing trial and the fact that the defendant is alleged to have read one of my books, *The Turner Diaries.* The journalists always ask me whether I think the bombing was inspired by my book, and I always reply that I have no way of knowing what was going on in the mind of the bomber, but that I am reasonably sure of one thing: if Janet Reno and Bill Clinton had not burned all of those women and children to death in Waco in 1993, there would have been no bombing of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City exactly two years later. Even if the perpetrators of the Waco massacre had been put on trial for murder and punished with appropriate severity, there would have been no bombing.

And I always find that the journalists have a hard time understanding that. To them the Waco massacre is not at all troubling, and it is hardly a reason to be angry at the government. They see all of those people who were killed in the Branch Davidian church at Waco as a bunch of weirdoes, a bunch of crazy religious fanatics, who really deserve no sympathy. I mean they weren't at all trendy and jaded and New Yorkish like the journalists themselves or like the sort of people the journalists meet at cocktail parties in New York or Washington; so they don't count. Besides, they were against the government and they liked guns, so they deserved what they got. The journalists don't come right out and say that, but it's pretty clear that's what they're thinking. They show it in a hundred ways. Typical is a front-page story about anti-government groups in the March 25, 1997, issue of *The Village Voice* which refers to the government's massacre of the Branch Davidians only as "the government's siege at Waco." Bill Clinton and Janet Reno didn't **massacre** all of those women and children at Waco; they didn't **murder** them; they didn't even **kill** them; they just **besieged** them.

The journalists always minimize Waco; they always use euphemisms and avoid words like "murder" and "massacre." And it's clear that they regard the Oklahoma City bombing as a far more heinous crime: not because there were more casualties at Oklahoma City than at Waco, but because the Oklahoma City bombing was a blow at their government, a blow at their beloved Clinton administration. In a sense the bombing at Oklahoma City was directed against the journalists too, whereas the Waco massacre wasn't. Which is to say, that any threat to the government these days is taken personally by most journalists.

I tell them that regardless of the beliefs or occupations of the people killed at Waco and the people killed in Oklahoma City, I regard the Waco massacre as a far more serious and worrisome crime than the Oklahoma City bombing, simply because the Federal government committed the Waco massacre, while presumably it was an individual terrorist, or at least a very small group of terrorists having no connection to the government who bombed the Federal building in Oklahoma City. I tell them that having a small number of terrorists running around bombing buildings is one thing, but having the Federal government committing massacres is quite another thing. A criminal government is much more a threat to its citizens than are a few individual

criminals not connected to the government. We know how to deal with individual terrorists, but how do you deal with a terrorist government?

But the journalists don't see it that way. They subconsciously identify with the government, especially with the Clinton government. The government's enemies are their enemies.

I remember the time I was writing *The Turner Diaries*, in 1975. That was a time when the journalists had much less sympathy for the government than now. That was a time when all of those big anti-American demonstrations were going on in Washington. The journalists all were on the side of the demonstrators. They were all on the side of the mobs marching in the streets carrying Viet Cong flags and shouting, "Ho-ho-ho Chi Minh, the Viet Cong's gonna win."

In 1975 I saw trends in American society, and I tried to understand where those trends would take us in the next 20 years. I saw, on the one hand, what the journalists' support of the anti-American demonstrators and, on the other hand, the government's vacillating and ambivalent attitude toward the Vietnam war were doing to American society. I saw everyone losing respect for the government, becoming angry at the government. I saw the kids on the university campuses being led into anti-Americanism by the Jewish-leftist groups. I saw the returning Vietnam vets being treated like dirt by the media and by the government. And I saw how disillusioned all of the traditionalists and patriots who witnessed all of this were becoming. And I predicted that this general and widespread loss of respect for the government would lead to dangerous social instability and pave the way for civil disorder and civil war. But because it was Politically Correct at that time to be against the government, the journalists just sneered at me and called me a "bigot."

I looked at what the feminists were doing, with all of their claims that men and women are basically the same and should be treated exactly alike. I saw the breakdown in the traditional relationship between men and women that feminism was causing, already in 1975. I saw the growing hostility between men and women, and I predicted that this would lead to an increased incidence of violence against women, an increased incidence of rape. I predicted this in *The Turner Diaries.* The journalists could see the same things I saw in 1975, but the Politically Correct attitude was to regard feminism as a good thing, which could only lead to good consequences. So the journalists sneered at what I predicted and called it "hate."

And I saw the effects that the government's forced mixing of the races in the schools and in residential areas and in the workplace were having. I saw people becoming alienated. I saw the breakdown of traditional community feeling. I saw young people growing up without any sense of rootedness, any sense of identity, any sense of belonging. And I predicted that this alienation would lead to social instability and to a thousand other social ills. And the journalists also could see this growing alienation back in the 1970s, but to all of them forced racial mixing was a wonderful thing. It was Politically Correct. It was one thing on which they agreed with the government. So they called me a "racist" and condemned my predictions.

And now, 22 years later, what the journalists find truly horrifying about *The Turner Diaries* is not just that the book predicts many unpleasant developments, and those developments are beginning to happen, they're beginning to become apparent to everyone, they no longer can be

denied and ignored -- what's really horrifying to the journalists is that I based my predictions of those developments on the trends of the 1960s and 1970s; I based them on things the journalists hold sacred. I predicted that the breakdown of respect for the government that they themselves were causing back in the 1960s and 1970s would lead to terrorism, whereas they would have us believe that terrorism is simply what happens when some people are permitted to have Politically Incorrect opinions. I predicted that feminism would lead to increased rape and other violence against women, whereas they would have us believe that feminism has nothing to do with it, that it's all the result of what they call "sexism." I predicted that forced racial mixing would lead to more hatred between the races, more violence between the races, and to growing alienation and social instability, whereas they would simply blame it all on "White racism."

The journalists are horrified because I spelled out all of these predictions in black and white more than 20 years ago, and now they're coming to pass, and as they come to pass they verify the assignment of causes I made back in 1975. They verify the assignment of blame I made more than 20 years ago, and that blame is against everything which is Politically Correct, everything which is Holy Writ to the journalists. I told the world where feminism and government enforced multiracialism and the government's no-win policy during the Vietnam war and the media's encouragement of anti-American demonstrations would lead. I condemned all of these things and predicted that they would have disastrous consequences for America, while the journalists praised and supported these same things and predicted that only good could come from them.

And now I am being proved right, and they are being proved wrong, and the proof is there for all the world to see, as *The Turner Diaries* becomes more and more widely read. That horrifies the journalists and fills them with hatred and anger.

Their reaction is not to examine their beliefs and admit that they were wrong. It is not to question their support for feminism and multiracialism and think about changing their ideas. No, their reaction instead is to condemn my book and look for ways to keep people from reading it. It is to blame the predictions I made 22 years ago for causing the developments I predicted. It is to blame the book rather than the destructive social policies I warned against in the book. And it is to try to make people frightened of the book, so they won't read it.

Last year, when a new printing of *The Turner Diaries* began appearing on the shelves of major bookstores, a left-wing mailing list huckster named Morris Dees, the head of the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center, who is a darling of the journalists and always is described by them as a "human-rights advocate," launched a letter-writing campaign to pressure bookstores into refusing to carry my book. Other Jewish organizations also tried to keep the book out of the mainstream. They don't want the book read, because it explains what is happening now and why it is happening. They are terrified of having people understand what's going on. They realize that if enough people understand why our society is coming apart, why our young women in the Army are being raped by Black drill instructors and officers, why the Federal building in Oklahoma City was bombed, why terrorism is on the rise everywhere, why drug usage is way up among our young people, why the suicide rate and the divorce rate are so high, why there is so much more corruption in the government -- if people understand these things, there will be a terrible and bloody reaction against the journalists and the Jews and everyone else responsible

for the policies which have been destroying our society. They are terrified that the people they have deceived and betrayed for so long will take a bloody vengeance on them.

This fear of the people finding out what's going on and then doing something about it is not just an American phenomenon. Jews, leftists, journalists, and politicians in Europe are terrified as well. I have an article from *Forbes* magazine in front of me, the April 7 issue. It is an article about the Jewish multibillionaire George Soros and his activities around the world. You may have heard of Soros before. He's a darling of the controlled media and is always being praised as a "philanthropist" and a "human-rights activist." He made his billions speculating in currency and commodities, but he spends his money propping up crypto-Communist regimes in Europe and sponsoring leftist causes. He buys newspapers and uses them to push leftist ideas and boost leftist candidates. He literally buys elections in places like Hungary and other eastern European countries. And the candidates he supports in those countries are the same Communist gangsters who plundered and ruined those countries and tyrannized them before the breakup of the Soviet Union. Now the Communists have changed hats and changed the names of their parties -- now they call themselves "socialists" or more often "democrats" -- but they're still the same gangsters, and they all should be put up against a wall and shot. And they're the people George Soros is spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year to keep in power.

And why is Soros doing that? *Forbes* tells us why. They quote a Jewish banker who is one of Soros' friends. He says, "Soros is terrified of right-wing nationalism." And Soros himself says essentially the same thing. He is willing to go to any expense to keep patriotic feeling from reasserting itself in eastern Europe. He knows that if patriots ever regain control of their destiny, not only will all of his kinsmen who fattened themselves on the blood of the people of these countries under Communist rule be out in the cold, but they may be called to account for their crimes. That thought terrifies Soros, just as it terrifies journalists over here.

And a similar process is at work in central and western Europe as well. The same fear is present among the ruling establishments that were installed by the victorious democratic-Communist Allies at the end of the Second World War. In most of these countries it has become illegal to question the mythology of anti-fascism which these regimes have used to justify their existence and to shield themselves from criticism. In particular, it has become absolutely taboo to question the Jews' claim to a unique and privileged status in Europe because of their "persecution" in the past.

In late March a magazine editor in Strasbourg, France, was fined more than $5000 and given a six-month suspended jail sentence merely for publishing an article in his magazine which mentioned that there were no gas chambers for killing Jews at a concentration camp in Struthof, near Strasbourg. Now there was a concentration camp, a prison camp, at Struthof in France during the war. And it is a fact, generally recognized by persons knowledgeable about the matter, that there were no gas chambers at Struthof for killing Jews. But in France it is illegal to mention this fact, because to mention it may raise doubts about other "Holocaust" claims. To mention this fact may weaken the fabric of the whole "Holocaust" mythology, a mythology upon which the present establishment in France depends for its moral justification. In Europe the "Holocaust" mythology has become a government-backed religion, and one may not question any part of it, any "Holocaust" claim, no matter how extravagant or absurd. To say, for example, "Well,

everybody knows that Jews were persecuted during the war, but let's face it, we all know that there were no Jews gassed at Struthof," is like someone in the 15th century announcing in public, "Well, I go along with most of the Bible, but I just can't swallow those parts about walking on water and the virgin birth." The reaction from the authorities would be pretty much the same in the two cases.

And what happened to that magazine editor in Strasbourg -- whose name, by the way, is Gabriel Andres -- has happened to many people recently in Germany and other European countries. The liberal-democrat regimes are feeling more and more insecure, more and more threatened by the specter of a resurgent patriotism which will hold them accountable for their treason. And they are responding with a more desperate effort to protect the official mythology, to prohibit dissent, to keep the people from understanding what is going on, and has been going on for more than 50 years.

Will they be successful? Will the media bosses and the Southern Poverty Law Center and the other powerful Jewish organizations be able to keep dissent suppressed in America by screaming, "Hate, hate, hate!" and waving *The Turner Diaries* around every time someone questions their policies? Will George Soros be able to keep his crypto-Communist pals in office in Hungary and the other plundered nations of eastern Europe and stifle all patriotic feeling? Will the frightened, crooked, little men who run France and Germany and Britain and the other European countries be able to keep the people of their countries intimidated with threats of imprisonment if they question the official religion of the "Holocaust" or ask other embarrassing questions?

Well, if it depended on the average voter in America or in Europe, they would be successful. The average voter doesn't care what's true and what isn't. He doesn't care about freedom. He's not interested in questioning the official religion. As long as he's well fed, he just doesn't care about anything except the sports page and the comic strips.

So why is George Soros terrified? Why are the bought politicians in France and Germany and Britain feeling so insecure? Why are the journalists and media bosses in America so shrill and so hateful?

It is because of you, my friends. It is because of the growing minority of Americans and Frenchmen and Germans and Hungarians who do care. They are afraid of you. They know that you are fed up. They know that your numbers are growing. They are afraid of what you will do.

Toward a Healthy Society

We Must Rediscover Our European Roots

The recent mass suicide of 39 members of a flaky, New Age religious cult in southern California has generated a great deal of media speculation and discussion of the cult phenomenon. There seems to be a general agreement that as we approach the end of this millennium cult membership and cult activity are on the rise. Perhaps so. One thing on which we have better statistics than cult membership is the suicide rate, and that very definitely is up, especially among young people. So is the rate of drug abuse. So is the divorce rate. So is the incidence of mental illness. So is the percentage of citizens in prison for crime.

Undoubtedly, some of the religious cults are growing now simply because the end of the millennium has a special significance for the less sophisticated elements of our society. But that has nothing to do with all of the other indicators of growing social pathology. The fact is that suicide rates and other indicators are up because more people are pessimistic about the future, unsure of the future, afraid of the future. There is a growing sense of instability and uncertainty and anxiety in our society. It drives some people to drugs or alcohol, some people to religious cults, and some people to suicide. It causes more marriages to break up, more people to have mental breakdowns. And none of this has anything to do with the calendar or with the Hale-Bopp comet. It has everything to do with the social and racial experiments which have been imposed on our society by liberal extremists and Jewish schemers during the past 50 years.

The deliberate destruction of America's schools and cities by people hell bent on equalizing the races is part of it. The flood of Third World immigrants pouring into this country is part of it. The pervasive influence of television in our lives is part of it. The deliberate effort to globalize America's economy, accompanied by downsizing and the conversion to a service economy is part of it. The destructive effects of government-sponsored feminism on the traditional relationship between men and women are part of it. All of these things, these social and racial experiments, have caused widespread social alienation, and from this alienation a thousand social pathologies have sprung.

Now, when the media become interested in one of the consequences of these destructive social experiments, such as the activities of religious cults, they talk about what the cults are doing and how they recruit members and the problems parents have in trying to get their children out of the clutches of cults and so on -- but they never talk about why so many people feel lost in American society today and so turn to a cult in order to be able to cope with life. They never talk about what has caused our society to fail so many people, to alienate so many people, to force so many people to desperate measures. They never talk about these things, because that would expose to public scrutiny the destructive social experiments which have caused the social pathologies I've mentioned: the drug use, the suicides, and so on. And, of course, the media bosses themselves have had a major role in these destructive experiments.

I've spoken before about the deliberately destructive role of the mass media in American society. I've also talked about the psychology of liberalism, about what makes liberals do the crazy and

destructive things they do. Today, though, instead of talking about the enemies of our society, the enemies of our people, let's just talk about our people and the sort of society we need.

You know, a society is a very complex thing: it is like a living organism. It responds to selective environmental forces, and it evolves. In past ages it was the struggle of our people to survive, the competition of our people against other peoples, other races, which determined the nature of our society. Societies which functioned well survived. Societies which didn't function well perished. Historically, if some crazy liberal came along and was able to change all of the rules and structures in a society to suit some egalitarian fantasy of his, the society would sink like a rock, and its people would perish. And that's what's happening to our society today, although it may not be apparent to us because of the time scale. After the experimenters finish their deadly work, it may take a society 200 years to disintegrate completely and sink out of sight. That's not long from a historical viewpoint, but it's long enough so that most of the people involved never realize what's happening to them.

The society we had in Europe up until the end of the 18th century -- or one may say, the various societies there, which really were very much alike when compared with any non-European society -- this European society had evolved over a period of many, many generations of our people, and it had fine-tuned itself to our special nature; it had developed its institutions and its ways of doing things which suited us as a people and allowed us to form viable, efficient communities. And when we colonized North America and other parts of the world, we took the essential elements of our society with us.

And what were those essential elements?

The first essential element was order. Everyone had a place in our society, whether he was the village blacksmith or the king, and he knew what that place was. He knew how he fitted in, what his responsibilities were, to whom he owed loyalty and respect, and to whom he in turn was obliged to provide guidance. It was a hierarchical society. There was no pretense that everyone was just as capable or just as creative or just as brave or just as suited for leadership as anyone else. People had social rank and social status and social authority commensurate with their social responsibilities and with their contributions to society. The master craftsman had a higher social rank than a journeyman, who in turn had a higher rank than an apprentice. The landowner with a thousand acres who employed 100 workers on his land had a higher social rank than the man who owned only an acre and worked his land himself, but he also had more social responsibilities. He had a responsibility for the welfare and the discipline of his workers, for example. And the master craftsman had a responsibility to provide proper guidance for his apprentices and to uphold the standards of his craft.

The fact that our society was orderly and people knew their place didn't mean that it was inflexible. The apprentice, through diligence and talent, could become a journeyman; and a journeyman might eventually become a master. And the man with only one acre might buy more land and hire workers, if he used the land he already had in a productive way and accumulated savings. But the shirker or the wastrel or the incompetent could never expect that the government would tax his more successful neighbors in order to reward him for his failure and bring him up to their level.

The second essential feature that our society had was homogeneity. Everyone had the same roots, the same history, the same genes, the same sensibilities. Or at least, there was enough genetic similarity, there was a close enough family relationship among the people, so that people understood each other. A village, a province, a nation was like a large, extended family. People felt a sense of kinship, a sense of belonging, a sense of loyalty and responsibility that extended to the whole society. This feeling of belonging, this sense of a common history and a common destiny, this sense of identity, was the glue that held the society together and gave it its strength. And it gave men and women their individual strength too. Just knowing who they were, where they had been, and where they were going made an enormous difference in their sense of personal security, in their ability to plan ahead and be reasonably confident of what the future held for them.

This homogeneity and the consequent sense of family, of identity, was thousands of years in developing, just like the hierarchical order in our society. And we developed, we evolved, along with our society. The type of society we had became imprinted on our genes. Of course, it wasn't a perfect society. It was full of problems and imperfections. We always were developing new technologies, for example, and our society didn't always have time to adjust itself to these innovations before even more innovations came along. But it was a society in which we were strong and confident and more or less spiritually healthy.

The opponents of social order and racial homogeneity will try to confuse the issue by pointing out that we have a longer life span today, that our infant mortality rate is much lower, that we don't have to work as hard to support ourselves, that we can buy all sorts of shiny gadgets that our ancestors couldn't, and so on. They want you to believe that these changes came about as benefits of the breakdown of order and the destruction of homogeneity. But they didn't. They are all the results of technological innovation. Our medical scientists learned how to control the diseases which shortened our lives. Our scientists and engineers learned how we could work more efficiently. And they learned how to make new tools and new toys for us.

Now, to be sure, not all of the degenerative changes in our society which have occurred in the past couple of centuries have been the consequence of the destructive efforts of the Jews and the liberals. The Industrial Revolution really was a huge shock to our traditional form of society. The Industrial Revolution took people off the farms and out of the villages and packed them into factory towns like sardines in a can. This was a great strain on the old order. The new relationship between factory owner and factory workers was not as healthy a one as had existed between landowner and workers on the land, nor was the new, urban life-style as spiritually healthy as the village life-style.

We were learning gradually to cope with some of the changes in our society which accompanied the Industrial Revolution, our social order gradually was beginning to adjust itself, when the liberals and the Jews launched their assault. Unrest and revolution were fomented from the latter part of the 18th century and throughout the 19th and 20th centuries: egalitarianism, Communism, democracy, equal rights, no responsibilities, welfare programs, feminism. The old order was drowned in blood. In France the aristocrats and the landowners were butchered in response to the resentments which the liberals had stirred up among the rabble. Later in Russia the same process took place, when the Jewish Bolsheviks finally gained the upper hand and butchered not just the

aristocrats, but everyone who had worked a little harder and been a little more successful than the rabble. The *kulaks*, the small farmers and landowners, were murdered en masse, by the millions, in order to "equalize" Russian society and destroy the last traces of the old, hierarchical order.

And into the social chaos of the 20th century the enemies of our people were able to introduce their idea of racial equality alongside their idea of social equality. We were told that the descendants of our slaves are just as good as we are -- maybe better -- and so they should become our social equals. We should bring them into our schools and neighborhoods, and we should intermarry with them, and we should buy Food Stamps for them with our taxes, and we should give them preference in hiring and promotions. And we should open our borders to all of the non-White wretched refuse of the Third World's teeming shores. They also are our equals, we are told. The more diversity the better. Diversity is our strength. Et cetera. Et cetera. Blah, blah, blah.

We were too disoriented and confused by the destruction of our social order to resist this poisonous propaganda. And so here we are at the end of the 20th century. There are some people who will try to convince you that things never have been better. We certainly have more equality and less order, more diversity and less homogeneity than ever before. And that obviously suits some people, in addition to the liberals and the Jews who have been pushing for these changes.

Are these changes better for us?

The suicide statistics, the drug statistics, the crime statistics, the divorce statistics, and the mental illness statistics give us part of the answer. The statistics should help us keep our grip on reality when the Jewish media try to persuade us that we need more of the same poison they have been dishing out for so long: more equality, more chaos, more diversity.

And we should be able to look into our own souls for the rest of the answer. We should know that we need again to have an ordered, structured society, in which we all have a place and will be appreciated according to how effectively we fill that place. We should know that we need again to have a homogeneous society, in which we can feel a sense of belonging. We should know that we need a society in which we have a sense of permanence and stability, not chaos and uncertainty. We should know that we need a society in which everyone strives for quality, not for an imaginary equality. We should know that in order to be spiritually healthy again we need a society in which we can feel a sense of rootedness and responsibility, rather than the aimless, wandering, rootless, cosmopolitan, egoism which characterizes American society today.

If we are honest with ourselves we know that we all crave a healthy society again, we need it. But too many of us have let ourselves be persuaded by the enemies of our people that the type of society we need is no longer attainable. Our enemies tell us, "We have destroyed the order in your society. We have made everyone equal, and you dare not try to take that equality away. That would be like trying to take candy away from a child. We have opened the candy store and told all the children that they can have as much as they want, and it's all free. They all will fight you if you try to change that, if you try to tell them that they must earn their candy." And our enemies grin in triumph when they see how that demoralizes and discourages so many of us.

And they tell us, "We have destroyed the homogeneity in your society. We have replaced your homogeneity with diversity. We have brought every non-White type on the face of the earth into your midst, we have brought them in by the millions, and we have forced you to mix with them. Now there's nothing you can do to restore your homogeneity." And again they grin and say, "What will you do? Will you try to root out every non-White and every mongrel and send them all away or get rid of them? You don't have the stomach for that. So you'd better just learn to live with all of these non-Whites and mongrels. Pretty soon you'll be a minority in your own land." And they gloat.

And it is true that many of u8s do not yet have the stomach to do what must be done. And so the suicide rate and the divorce rate and the abortion rate will keep rising. The government will continue building more prisons. The cults will continue thriving. And the Jews and the liberals will keep telling us how wonderful everything is, how things have never been better, how we should appreciate all of the equality and diversity.

But all the while the number of us who do have the stomach to do what must be done will be growing. Our numbers are growing, because more and more of our people are coming to understand that the only alternative is death: death for our society, death for our children, death for our kind. What the Jews and liberals have done to our society is lethal. It cannot be sustained.

Order and homogeneity, a sense of identity and belonging, are not just luxuries for us. They are essential. Without them our society sickens and dies. The liberals may not be able to understands that, and the Jews, with their media propaganda, try to keep the rest of us from understanding it, but we can see the proof of it all around us. And we are determined to do whatever we must do to have once again a society for our own kind, a society to which we can really belong and feel a sense of responsibility to, a society in which we have a place and are appreciated if we fill that place well, a society based on order and quality and structure and commonality. We will have it. We will do what is necessary.

Allen Ginsberg

Media Model for America's Youth

Three weeks ago a man named Allen Ginsberg died, at the age of 70. If you were a university student in the 1960s or 1970s, his name will be very familiar to you. He was the person chosen by the media to be the number-one guru for America's youth during that period. He's been a sort of secondary guru ever since, and if you studied literature even in the 1980s or 1990s you got a dose of him. He always was treated in a worshipful sort of way by the media, in order to make the more gullible young people believe that he was some sort of genius who was to be taken very seriously. We could see this same worshipful attitude again when the media people reported his death earlier this month. I listened to NBC's Tom Brokaw talk about Ginsberg on the evening television news. Brokaw behaved as if he were reporting the death of George Washington or Thomas Jefferson. He spoke of Ginsberg as if he had been a talented and sensitive poet, a great soul who had passed away, leaving us all sadder and poorer for the loss. He even read the first line of one of Ginsberg's so-called "poems," *Howl.* And he did it all with a straight face. There was no hint in his facial expression or tone of voice that he wasn't completely serious. I didn't see the way the other TV-news anchor-people dealt with Ginsberg's death, but I presume it was similar to the way Brokaw did it. Certainly, the tone of all of the print media that I saw also was worshipful.

Let me tell you about Allen Ginsberg, this great and sensitive soul who contributed so much to America and whose passing we all should mourn. Ginsberg was a drug-crazed, homosexual, Communist Jew. I do not use any of those terms lightly. He was very homosexual, very Communist, and very Jewish, and he was a big promoter of drug use by young people back during the 1950s and 1960s. He was not a guru, if we intend the normal meaning for that word, which is "spiritual teacher." Judging from what he said and wrote during his life, he never had a spiritual impulse. Nor was he a poet, if we have any reasonable definition of what constitutes poetry. Of course, he pretended to be both a guru and a poet, and the media vigorously supported his pretensions. He was simply a degenerate piece of filth. His mind was a sewer. He was a con man, who made a good living from his pretensions.

To realize the full truth of this you need to read -- actually read for yourself -- what Ginsberg wrote, which his media promoters call "poetry" -- in fact, "great poetry." I intended to quote a few samples myself, but I couldn't find anything that I'm willing to repeat. His writing is almost indescribably filthy and perverted. I am not a prude, I am not sexually repressed, and I'm sure that I often say or write things which are offensive to many people. So when I tell you that there's nothing Ginsberg wrote that I'm willing to quote, believe me, it's pretty sick stuff.

The best I can do is to paraphrase a couple of his poems to give you an idea of their content. His best-known poem is *Howl.* That's the one that attracted the attention of the big media Jews back in 1956 and resulted in their decision to promote him as a "guru" and a cultural icon for young Americans. I repeat, Tom Brokaw read the first line of *Howl* with a sober expression on the *NBC Evening News* -- and without mentioning that Ginsberg was a homosexual or a Communist. The poem begins like this: "I saw the best minds of my generation destroyed . . . ." That's as far as Brokaw went, giving the average listener a very limited impression of what Ginsberg had in

mind when he wrote *Howl.* A few lines later the poem describes homosexual couplings with motorcyclists and sailors in the most graphic possible language.

Another of Ginsberg's better-known writings is *Kaddish,* which he wrote in 1961 about his mother, who had died five years earlier. He describes in revolting anatomical detail his fat, aging mother lying naked on a bed while he contemplates having sex with her, thinking maybe that's what she wants. He also describes, in the same revolting detail, his mother vomiting into a toilet and having a bowel movement on the bathroom floor.

In 1995 Ginsberg had a collection of his poems published under the title *Cosmopolitan Greetings: Poems 1986-1992.* One of the poems in this collection is titled *Sphincter.* It's a poem about his anus -- that's right, his *anus* -- and the various uses it's been put to in his homosexual activities. Very graphic. This collection was in the finals for the Pulitzer Prize in 1995.

I won't cite any more of Ginsberg's so-called "poetry." But I want you to understand what it's really like. The examples I've mentioned are by no means exceptional. They are **typical** of the sort of filthy scribbling that Ginsberg called "poetry." They are representative. They display the infantile, narcissistic attitude that underlies liberalism. They are the barely coherent expressions of a child playing with his own feces and his own genitalia, looking for new ways to gratify himself. And that's **all** that Ginsberg wrote: nothing serious, nothing except drugs, homosexual activity, degeneracy. If there is any idea that characterizes Ginsberg's writing, it is the liberal idea that everything is relative, nothing is evil, no attitude or life-style or sexual orientation is better than any other, and the purpose of life is self-gratification.

Ginsberg is said to have launched the hippie movement of the 1960s, not to mention the "beat" movement of the preceding decade. I don't know about that, although certainly the hippies shared a similarly infantile outlook. Ginsberg has, however, had a substantial influence on many people who grew up during the 1960s and 1970s -- not as a consequence of his own efforts, but because the Jewish media establishment made the conscious decision to make him influential, to hold him up as a cultural icon. Because of this conscious effort of the Jewish media bosses, books of Ginsberg's scatological, homosexual, drug-induced ravings are found in nearly every public and school library in the country. Ginsberg received all sorts of academic and literary awards. One book of his scribblings was given the National Book Award in 1974. He was nominated to the American Academy and the Institute of Arts and Letters. He was given a faculty position at Brooklyn College, which he still held at the time of his death. He was a favored speaker at hundreds of colleges around the country. And the media were always praising him, always taking him seriously, always holding him up as a model for young, impressionable students. Reviewers in Jewish papers like the *New York Times* referred to him as "America's greatest living poet" and called his poetry "brilliant." They used the same sort of meaningless double-talk to make fools take him seriously that the art critics use to make other fools take the hideous daubings of modern "artists" seriously. One reviewer wrote of Ginsberg's poetry: "The Judeo-Christian dualism of good versus evil is obliterated by an oriental relativism that neatly does away with the consequences of the spiritual pride that has bloodied the pages of Western ecclesiastical history." Another wrote that Ginsberg's poetry is "in one of the oldest traditions, that of Hosea or the other angry minor prophets of the Bible." Some of the literary critics claimed to see parallels between

Ginsberg's literary efforts and the mission of Jesus to redeem the world. This sort of nonsense impresses many people, unfortunately.

Even when Ginsberg bragged in public about his pederasty or his illegal drug use, he continued to be held up as a great, creative genius, and he continued to be given awards. In 1995, just two years ago, he bragged to a newspaper interviewer, "I sleep with young boys," but that didn't discourage Stanford University from setting up a Ginsberg Center and buying all of Ginsberg's personal papers, manuscripts, and so on to preserve them for posterity.

You know, Ginsberg was just a filthy, little, perverted, drug-crazed, Communist Jew. The world would be a lot cleaner place if all of his kind were swept up and buried in a deep hole somewhere. But Ginsberg, by himself, was not especially dangerous. The things he wrote were not likely to influence any healthy person. They were attractive only to sick creatures like himself.

Ginsberg, for all of his depravity, must take second place to the truly evil and destructive creatures who promoted him, who decided to make an icon of him, and who still praise him. Ginsberg became dangerous only after the big Jews, the media bosses, decided to use him as a weapon against White society and began promoting him. But even the Jewish media bosses are what they are. Everything they do is destructive to us. It is in their nature.

The ones we ought to save our anger for are the traitors among our own people who collaborated with the media bosses in promoting Ginsberg. I would sooner shoot the president of Stanford University for going along with the idea of a Ginsberg Center, or shoot Tom Brokaw for collaborating in the postmortem elevation of Ginsberg to sainthood, than I would shoot Ginsberg himself. Every newspaper writer who praised Ginsberg's trash, every newspaper editor who allowed the praise to be published in his paper, every university librarian who eagerly recommended Ginsberg's filth, every literary reviewer who treated Ginsberg seriously -- every one of them has done inestimable damage to our people.

For 40 years university students have been told by Jewish literature professors -- and by trendy, collaborating professors from our own people -- that Ginsberg was a genius, that his poetry was "brilliant" and showed great "sensitivity," that Ginsberg had great literary creativity. The students not only heard this from their professors, they read the same thing from the literary reviewers, and they heard various Hollywood figures refer adoringly to Ginsberg. And you know, a lot of our university students may have high IQs, but they really aren't very smart, if you understand what I mean. They haven't learned to look beneath the surface for truth. They believed their Jewish professors. They believed the reviewers.

So we've had two generations of literature students graduating from our universities who believe that *Kaddish* and *Sphincter* and *Howl* are great poetry, that Ginsberg had a great, creative soul, and that his filth is something to be imitated. And that's what our people have been trying to do: not only to imitate Ginsberg's scribblings, believing them to be art, but also trying to imitate his life-style, believing it to belong to a nobler and more saintly way of life than that of our own people. How many thousands of our young men and women have had their lives destroyed by these false beliefs! This is the way the Jews destroy a culture, destroy a society, destroy a people.

I've talked about these things before, and I guess that too often they sounded theoretical, and I'm sure that many of you didn't really take it to heart when I told you that it is in the nature of the Jew to try to destroy any non-Jewish people with whom he is in contact.

Allen Ginsberg is a splendid illustration of the truth of what I have been telling you. Go to any large library and do two things. Sit down and read for yourself what Ginsberg wrote. Read his so-called poetry for yourself, since I do not want to quote it. Then, read what the reviewers have had to say about Ginsberg. There's a lot of that in the periodicals in connection with his death. And every large library has not only books by Ginsberg but also books about him. Read how he has been praised and is still being praised. And think about the fact that this is the image of Ginsberg presented to American university students today.

Ginsberg's filth is what is presented to our young people as a sublime example of literary creativity. Ginsberg is presented as a sensitive genius. Think about it. Perhaps then you will share my view about what ought to be done to Tom Brokaw and the president of Stanford University. Perhaps then you will understand the urgency of our task to take the mass media away from the Jews.

I've also talked before about the nature of liberalism and about the roots of this spiritual disease. I've told you that liberalism is narcissistic and infantile, that it is an arrested state of emotional and spiritual development. And perhaps my words seemed too theoretical, not concrete enough. Allen Ginsberg is a wonderfully concrete example. Read Ginsberg and you will understand the meaning of narcissism. And contemplate the way in which liberals have responded to Ginsberg. A liberal is a person who when he or she was very young was oriented toward making mud-pies with his own feces and playing with his genitalia and never developed emotionally beyond this stage when he grew up. Now, that is a very crude and simplistic statement, and in the case of many individual liberals it may not even be literally true. But there is a sense in which it is generally true for all liberals, a sense in which it expresses the essence of liberalism. Allen Ginsberg and his relationship with the liberal establishment are the proof of that.

Occasionally I've talked about homosexuality on these broadcasts, but I haven't gotten into the subject in depth because it's such an unpleasant one. And more than that, it's difficult to convey my full meaning when I say that homosexuality is something which should be abhorrent to every spiritually healthy person. There is a tendency on the part of many well-meaning persons -- not liberals, but persons who are a bit naive and a bit too trusting -- to be taken in by the campaign of the Jewish media and our current government and the liberal establishment to portray homosexuals as essentially normal people who just happen to have a different sexual orientation. The fact is that homosexuality is a disease of the soul. There is no such thing as a "normal" homosexual. Homosexuality colors a person's entire outlook, his entire attitude toward life, toward himself and the world around him. Many homosexuals are pretty skillful at covering this up, at pretending to be just like everyone else except in the privacy of their bedrooms. But they aren't like healthy people at all, either in the bedroom or out of the bedroom. They are sick and tortured souls. They are truly depraved. If you want to understand what I mean by that, read Ginsberg.

Read Ginsberg and you will understand why homosexuals should not be in our armed forces. You will understand why they always have been regarded as security risks -- and, believe me, it's not just because they can be blackmailed. Ginsberg's poetry will help you to understand why homosexuals should not be tolerated in our society, why they should not be permitted to teach or to have any position of influence over others.

I feel a bit sheepish in telling you to read Ginsberg. I don't want to be seen as a promoter of his filth. And I don't tell you to read him because I want to titillate you, as if I were telling you, "Hey, look at this really raunchy inscription I found on the men's room wall." The reason you need to know about Ginsberg and about his promoters is so that you will understand that there **is** evil in our midst. Too many of us, in our sheltered, middle-class lives, don't understand that. But indeed, there **are** evil men among us, men who intend to destroy us and everything that we have created. We must not try to hide from these men and hope that they will go away if we don't provoke them. When we send our sons and daughters off to college, we send them into the arms of these evil men. When we let our children watch television, we hand them over to these evil men.

We must not try to hide from them. We must stand up and oppose them. We must understand that if we do not destroy them, they will destroy everything that is noble and decent and beautiful and good on this earth, because that is their nature.

Remember What Happened to Anwar?

Discontent With America's Rulers Is Growing

I've been asked to appear as a guest on a number of radio talk shows recently because of the public interest in the Denver trial of Oklahoma City bombing suspect Timothy McVeigh and the news report that when McVeigh was arrested he had with him an envelope containing a copy of the Declaration of Independence, a quotation from the writings of the 17th-century English philosopher John Locke, and a photocopy of a page from my book *The Turner Diaries.*

Callers on these talk shows will ask me, "How dare you write a book that advocates killing innocent women and children?" Most of these people haven't read the book, of course. But they have read what the controlled media have said about it, including perhaps one or two carefully selected little excerpts. I will explain patiently that my book **doesn't** advocate killing innocent women and children, that it is not a book of advocacy at all, but a novel. It does, however, predict that innocent women and children will die as a consequence of the government's policies. I explain that I observed the very troubling trends that were visible in the early 1970s and then wrote a fictional scenario of what life might be like in the 1990s if those trends continued. In my fictional scenario I saw the continued breakdown of American society growing into increasing civil violence, or terrorism if you prefer, and eventual civil war. I explain all of this on these radio talk shows, but I still encounter talk-show callers who tell me, "If you hadn't written about these things they wouldn't have happened."

I guess the old idea about blaming the bearer of bad news is still valid. Back in the 1970s the hostility I encountered was a little different. Then the hostility was based on the fact that I was predicting a bad outcome for policies that were Politically Correct: I was thinking bad thoughts about what the media said were good policies. Today it's based on the fact that some of those bad thoughts are coming true. The fact is that when a society is coming apart, everybody looks for someone to blame. The folks who generally approve of the government's policies will blame the government's enemies. The folks who don't approve of the government's policies will blame the government.

So today I must expect to be called a baby-killer by the people who support the government and the *status quo,* not because I approve of the Oklahoma City bombing -- I don't approve of it -- but because I predicted it in a general sort of way: because I said back in 1975 that we're headed toward civil war in America.

The really revealing thing about the mentality of the government's supporters is that the ones who yell the loudest about the government's enemies being baby-killers aren't at all indignant about the babies that Bill Clinton and Janet Reno burned to death in Waco four years ago. They don't call Bill Clinton and Janet Reno "baby-killers." Which leads me to believe that it's not really the killing of innocent women and children they're outraged about; it's opposition to the government which upsets them. And I suppose it's always been that way in war: the only atrocities you really get worked up about are those committed by the other side.

One thing that's certain is that there will be many more atrocities committed before this war is over: not because I said there will be, but because that's the nature of war.

The government's supporters -- and in fact, everyone who believes what the media bosses say in their newspapers and on their television -- act outraged every time a bomb goes off outside an abortion clinic or a homosexual club. They call it "terrorism," and they blame it on religious fanatics or on patriots, and they demand that the government punish someone for it. They don't blame the media and the government for telling sexually confused youngsters that homosexuality is an acceptable lifestyle. They don't blame the media and the government for encouraging abortion as a convenience. It never occurs to them that more and more decent, patriotic Americans are sick and tired of seeing homosexuals arrogantly forcing their way into the mainstream and demanding to be accepted. It never occurs to them that more and more normal, law-abiding citizens are horrified by the enormous number of healthy, White babies being aborted every year. It never occurs to them that more and more good, decent Americans are reaching the point where they simply aren't willing to tolerate these things any longer. Because the government's supporters are people who will accept any immorality, any atrocity on the part of the government, they can't imagine that there are people who won't. So there will be more bombings of abortion clinics and of homosexual clubs and of government offices, and sometimes innocent bystanders will be killed. It is a terrible thing when these innocent people are killed. It's terrible regardless of who kills them. But it **will** happen, not because I predict it, but because the government and the media will persist with their destructive policies, and because the government's supporters will continue supporting the government -- at least for a while.

Let me tell you about another atrocity in this war, which happened in early April. In Detroit there's a music company, a record company, called Resistance Records. They produce and sell mostly CDs -- compact discs -- of music by skinhead rock bands. Now, I personally can't stand any kind of rock music. I just don't like it. But many young people do, and Resistance Records sells a lot of CDs to them. But Resistance Records specializes in a type of music called "White power rock." In fact, they're the world's biggest producer and distributor of White power rock. It's the music of White, urban youth who have been abandoned by the Clinton government, who have found their racial roots, and who have banded together to protect themselves. The lyrics of their music, the lyrics of this White power rock, are racially conscious lyrics and they're anti-government. It's really revolutionary music. The names of some of the bands whose music is produced by Resistance Records are Bound for Glory, Max Resist, Berserkr, Blue Eyed Devils, and No Remorse. It's militant music. And it's becoming increasingly popular among young people. And it has the Clintonistas worried.

So on the morning of April 9, 1997, a gang of heavily armed, jackbooted thugs ostensibly representing the state of Michigan kicked in the door of Resistance Records' Detroit office and charged in with guns drawn. They put a pistol to the head of the office caretaker, made him lie on the floor, then backed up a truck to the front door and carted off all of the company's stock of CDs, their business records, and their computers and other office equipment.

What had Resistance Records done to warrant this sort of treatment? Were they planning to bomb the White House? Were they involved in a conspiracy to poison Detroit's water supply?

No. The thugs said they were investigating whether or not Resistance Records had been turning over all of the sales taxes collected on CDs sold to Michigan residents.

Let me assure you that this is not the way in which sales-tax investigations normally are carried out in the state of Michigan. So when my office received the first telephone call from Resistance Records April 9 telling us what was happening, I was skeptical. I thought that surely Resistance Records had done something worse than keeping sloppy sales-tax records. I began checking into it. I got a copy of the search warrant. I talked to other people at Resistance Records. And the more I checked, the madder I got. Apparently this raid really was based on nothing more than the pretense of a sales-tax investigation. Now, whether Resistance Records owes sales taxes to the state of Michigan or not, I don't know, but this raid quite obviously was conducted in the manner it was simply because the music these people produce and sell is Politically Incorrect. You know and I know that if this record company produced gangsta'-rap CDs or rhythm-and-blues CDs or any other kind of Politically Correct, Clinton administration-approved music, this wouldn't have happened to them. They would have received a notice in the mail from the state tax department that their sales records were going to be audited, and everything would have been done in a polite and civilized manner.

The way this raid was conducted, it almost seems that the government was hoping it would develop into another Waco or Ruby Ridge massacre, that the government was hoping someone at Resistance Records would resist the raid so the government would have an excuse to start shooting. Another chance for the government to flex its muscles and intimidate its opponents. Another chance to prove to that part of the population which still supports it that it still has everything under control. Another chance to get a pat on the head from its masters.

Yes, the government's masters were involved too. *The Detroit Free Press* story reporting the raid had a comment from the Michigan chapter of B'nai B'rith, the powerful Jewish pressure group. Don Cohen, Michigan commissar of B'nai B'rith's Anti-Defamation League, approved of the raid and told the *Detroit Free Press* sneeringly, "There will always be these hard-core hate groups. Our job is to expose them for what they are." He might have added, his job also is to show everyone that in the New World Order Political Incorrectness will not be tolerated.

I don't know whether it was Don Cohen who ordered this raid on Resistance Records or someone back in New York or Washington, but I'll tell you what I believe. I believe that the raid was carried out not only to silence Resistance Records, to put them out of business, but also to find out who their customers in Canada are. You see, at exactly the same time the Michigan State Police were kicking in the front door of Resistance Records' Detroit office -- **at exactly the same time** -- Canadian secret police were raiding the homes of some of the people who work for Resistance Records but who live across the border in Canada. The Canadian secret police don't care about Michigan sales taxes. That's none of their business. They want to charge the Canadians who work for Resistance Records and perhaps the ordinary Canadian citizens who buy CDs from Resistance Records with "hate crimes." You see, in Canada the Jews have succeeded in obtaining the sort of legislation that the Clintonistas want in the United States, legislation outlawing Politically Incorrect speech and Politically Incorrect music.

Think about it for a minute. What Resistance Records is doing is constitutionally protected. Whether the Clintonistas and the Jews like their music or not isn't important. Whether I like it or not isn't important. They have a First Amendment right to publish it, and Americans have a First Amendment right to buy it and to listen to it and have their friends listen to it. Unfortunately, Canadians don't have the same rights in their country. The Jews and their collaborators have taken those rights away from them. I believe that the purpose of this raid was to obtain the customer list of Resistance Records and turn it over to the Canadian thought police so that they can prosecute Canadian citizens who have ordered music from Resistance Records. I believe that's the reason the raids in Detroit and in Canada on April 9 were coordinated.

The reason I believe this is that I've seen this sort of thing before. For example, Mr. Clinton's FBI shares information on the international travels of American citizens with the secret police in foreign countries, so that American citizens who have done nothing illegal under the laws of the United States, who have in fact done nothing except exercise their right to free speech in this country, can be arrested in countries where Politically Incorrect speech has been outlawed. I told you in a couple of broadcasts last year about the arrest by the German secret police of American citizens Hans Schmidt and Gerhard Lauck. Mr. Schmidt publishes a newsletter in the United States which often is critical of the current German government and its policies. When he traveled to Germany last year to visit his elderly mother he was seized at the airport by the German secret police. Mr. Lauck was arrested while in Denmark, extradited to Germany, put on trial for publishing Politically Incorrect materials in the United States, and is now serving a four-year sentence in a German prison. In both of these cases not only did the Clinton government assist the German police in arresting these two U.S. citizens, but it made no protest when they were prosecuted for perfectly legal activities which they had carried out entirely in the United States. Now, I believe that what happened to Resistance Records on April 9 is an instance of governmental authorities in the United States helping the Canadian government prosecute its citizens for doing things in Canada which would be constitutionally protected if done in the United States -- and incidentally violating the civil rights of the folks at Resistance Records in the process. That is an atrocity. That is the New World Order in action.

The government and its supporters believe that the only atrocities they have to worry about are the atrocities committed by the other side. They believe that they can commit all the atrocities they want, because they have more muscle, more guns, on their side. And at the moment that's true. If anybody doesn't like it, if anybody gets out of line, why, if the secret police can't handle it, then Mr. Clinton's Jewish secretary of defense William Cohen will sic the Army on him. Mr. Cohen's Army will smash anybody who gets out of line, they believe. They've got their Army and their Air Force and their Navy trained to obey orders, to shoot anybody Mr. Cohen tells them to shoot. They think they can count on their Army and their Air Force to defend their New World Order and kill anybody who gets in their way.

And for the most part they're right. Most military officers these days are just politicians in uniform, lawyers with guns, who don't care about what's right and what's wrong. They do what the people who pay them tell them to do. Most of them, that is. But not all of them. Mr. Cohen's psychologists have a pretty effective program of brainwashing for the troops and a pretty effective program for weeding out any people who still insist on thinking for themselves after the brainwashing, any people who still have any old-fashioned patriotism or morality left.

But Mr. Cohen doesn't get all of them. And some of these people who still do have a sense of right and wrong left in them have had about all they're going to take from the Clintonistas. They've had about all they're going to take of having to accept homosexuals into their ranks, of changing their way of fighting so that women can go into combat with them, of seeing the Constitution they've sworn to defend being subverted and trampled on by the politicians who give them their orders, of carrying out the policies of a government which murders its own citizens wholesale.

Hey, Bill! Remember what happened to Anwar? You got away with a lot of treason back during the Vietnam war, supporting America's enemies while those enemies were killing our young men over in Vietnam. You've gotten away with a lot more treason during the last four years. You think your buddy Cohen has the military people under control, don't you, and that you can get away with whatever you want?

Well, believe me, you can't do it. You will find out that not all of the military people you order to back up your atrocious policies are as rotten as you are. One by one they will rebel, and then two by two, and then there will be hell to pay. Not because I predicted it, but because your policies, your treason, your unpunished atrocities made it happen. When it happens, you remember that!

Marriage and White Survival

More Men and Women Must Form Successful Families

Another friend of mine recently went through a very traumatic marital breakup. The breakup was worse than most because my friend and his wife have three small children. When I took an inventory of all of the people I know, well over half of them had had at least one failed marriage. Most of the ones I know who have never had a divorce are those who are over 70. I guess that about 60 per cent of my younger friends have been divorced one or more times. And I guess that the rising national statistics on divorce agree with this personal inventory: as time goes on, it's getting harder and harder to keep marriages together.

So, what are the reasons for this? Why are men and women having a harder time getting along? I've thought about this problem for quite a while, and I believe that I understand the reasons. Some of the reasons for the decline of marital stability are economic, some are social, and some are psychological. Historically, marriage has been based on the bedrock economic fact that a well-defined division of labor results in greater survivability. If a man and a woman worked together as a team, with the woman keeping the home front under control while the man brought home the bacon and chased the wolves away from the door, both gained a competitive advantage over unattached singles and were more likely to survive and prosper -- not to mention the fact that their children were far more likely to survive than those engendered by unattached individuals.

This economic basis for marriage survived even the enormous social changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution, but economic developments in this century began undermining it. There was the large-scale recruitment of married women into the non-domestic work force during the past 60 years, at the same time many men found that their income alone could no longer support a family. Another development was the advent of the welfare state.

When employers came to regard their employees simply as interchangeable economic units, they no longer could see any reason why they shouldn't hire married women, even married women with children, for any sort of work women could handle -- especially since doing so increased the size of the labor pool and lowered the price of labor. The transition of America from an industrial economy to a service economy during the past 30 years or so has greatly accelerated this tendency by decreasing the percentage of jobs which require a man's strength.

At the same time that the percentage of married women employed outside the home was rising from nearly zero 60 years ago to its present level of around 70 per cent, technology was greatly reducing the burden of maintaining a home. Sixty years ago clothes were washed by hand with a washing board and a washtub. Modern fabrics hadn't been invented, and so everything that was washed then had to be ironed. Homes didn't have electric or gas refrigerators, and only those in urban areas where there was an icehouse even had iceboxes. Kitchen work took substantially more time and effort, and so did shopping; there was no such thing as popping a frozen dinner into the microwave.

In other words, at the same time new employment opportunities for women meant that they weren't as economically dependent on their husbands as in the past, men were finding that a woman's work in the home was less essential than it had been: with all of the modern appliances and shortcuts, a man could get by in reasonable comfort alone. The introduction of the welfare state after the Second World War meant that a woman dissatisfied with married life didn't even have to worry about finding employment if she left her husband.

A century ago couples had fights just like they do today, but they had strong economic motives for making peace and keeping the union together. Today the tendency is just to announce, "I don't have to put up with this crap," and walk out the door.

Paralleling these economic changes were social changes which also worked to the detriment of marriage. A century ago, when most of us lived in a rural environment or small towns, there was strong social pressure on a couple to stay together. A divorce was almost scandalous. In today's urban environment this social pressure and the accompanying stigma of divorce are entirely absent.

After the Second World War the rise of feminism and so-called "women's liberation" also took their toll on marital stability. The feminists asserted that women were essentially the same as men, except for a few minor anatomical details, and that women didn't need men in order to live a complete and fulfilling life. They insisted on being treated just like men. And of course, their cause was taken up by the government and by the Jewish media, which resulted in their doctrines influencing many otherwise sensible women.

Women consequently lost their special status. When they asserted that they no longer needed the protection or the support of men, many men took them at face value. Men responded by deciding that they no longer had a special obligation or responsibility to support or protect a woman. Deciding to shed a wife became much like deciding to change roommates. Feminism has eroded the traditional complementary relationship between men and women, which was a relationship based on their natural differences, and tried to replace it with equality, which is not in accord with reality. The result of this failed effort has been very traumatic for both men and women. In many cases it has turned natural affection to hostility on both sides. Just as many women have responded by becoming less feminine, many men have become less masculine. It has played havoc with the institution of marriage.

So what's to be done?

Unfortunately, about all we can do in the short run is try to minimize the trauma for ourselves as individuals. If you're a man, when you're looking for a mate steer clear of women who have been tainted by feminism; and if you're a woman, be on your guard against men who have been "sensitized" by the feminists.

In the long run, we can make the institution of marriage healthy again only after we have cured the social and economic problems in our society. One of the easiest things we can do is simply stop promoting the false and destructive doctrine of feminism. When our government, our

schools, and our media recognize that men and women are different and complementary members of our society and have fundamentally different roles to fill, we'll be a long way ahead.

Fixing the economic problems which beset marriage will be more difficult. It is hard to take women out of factories and offices and put them back in the home when most families have become accustomed to a life-style which requires two incomes to maintain. One of the reasons our grandmothers were able to stay at home and raise their children instead of dropping them off at a day-care center on the way to work was that our grandparents managed to do without many things that have come to be thought of as necessities today, so that one income was sufficient for them. Outlawing credit cards and other forms of borrowing certainly would cut consumption and help more people get by on one income, but that probably would cause a revolution all by itself, because our people have forgotten the old way of paying for things first and then having them.

We don't need to go back to using washing boards and washtubs, but we can look forward to building a new society in which economic policy and employment policy are made subordinate to the primary goal of promoting the racial and spiritual health of our people. One thing we can do is get rid of government welfare programs -- no food stamps, no subsidized rents, no welfare checks, nothing. If churches want to set up soup kitchens or flop houses for the homeless, that's their business, but no one should be forced to pay for the support of those who won't work, male or female -- nor should the dole be an attractive alternative to working or to keeping a marriage together.

And a career should not be quite as attractive or available an alternative to marriage for young women as it is now. Simply doing away with the government-imposed requirements for hiring and promoting women and leaving employers free to hire whom they choose will help a lot in this direction. And women could just forget about careers as soldiers.

We don't need governmental coercion to make marriage healthy again. We just need an end to the governmental programs which have made it unhealthy. Without feminist propaganda and without government interference, the instincts of men and women will do most of what needs to be done to get things back on a healthy track again. Their inherently different natures will reassert themselves again. Perhaps we can't make things quite as sound as they were a century ago when most of us lived in much smaller communities, but we can make them a lot better than they are now.

Whenever I talk about the things we need to do to make a better future for our people, I hear many people telling me, "Oh, you can't do that. You can't just take the welfare class off the dole. They'll riot. They'll burn the cities. And you can't expect women to give up their careers and become housewives. You can't just take away all of the privileges the government has given them. You'll lose their support if you try to do that."

Well, let me assure you, with a healthy government in place, the welfare class will not riot -- at least, not more than once. We know how to deal with rioters. All it takes is will power. It will be a good training exercise for our military people. That's not a hard problem at all.

As for losing the support of women, I'm sure that will be true in some cases, because the enemies of our people have convinced many of them that being a housewife or a mother is a fate worse than death. Many of them believe that they absolutely have to be fighter pilots or corporate executives. And I'm not proposing making a law that they **can't** be corporate executives if they want to. I'm just saying that we shouldn't pump them full of propaganda to convince them that that's what they **should** be. And we shouldn't have laws which give them an artificial advantage in becoming corporate executives. I believe that the institution of marriage can tolerate a few female executives: just not quite so many as we have today.

One thing I must admit: it would be easier not to do anything, just to leave things as they are. If we just keep feeding the welfare class, then we don't have to machine-gun them when they start demanding what they think they're entitled to. And if we leave the government quotas alone, many feminists won't hate us as much for trying to take something away from them.

But, you know, leaving things as they are really isn't an option. If we do nothing, then our people will die. Our race will become extinct, and the earth will be inherited by the savages and degenerates of the non-White world. The birthrate for White women in America is far below the replacement level. There are fewer White Americans with every passing year. The White birthrate has fallen below the level necessary for replacement for pretty much the same reasons that the divorce rate has gone up. As more women have left the home and joined the work force, they have decided to have fewer children. Children are a hardship on mothers who are obliged to hold down a full-time job outside the home. Children can lower a father's standard of living. Worse, the women most susceptible to feminist propaganda, the ones most likely to choose a career instead of motherhood, tend to be the brightest and most capable, the ones who most need to have children and pass on their genes to the next generation.

So we really have no choice in the matter. We either start having and raising more healthy White babies, or we die. Our race dies. Our country dies.

We will do what we have to do. We don't want to be unpopular, we don't want to make anyone hate us, but we will if we must. Those who hate us will be those who hate our people and want our people to die, or who have become so self-centered, so individualistic, so alienated and rootless that they don't care what happens to our people, so long as it doesn't inconvenience them personally. Let them hate us. It is a mark of honor, a mark of distinction.

The truly unfortunate fact now is that those who hate our people and want us to die are in control of most of the organs of influence, the media of influence. On our side we have *American Dissident Voices* and we have a growing presence on the Internet, but those who hate us have nearly everything else. They have the television networks, and they have Hollywood and Madison Avenue, and they have the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Washington Post,* and *Time* and *Newsweek,* and they have all of the slick, trendy, shallow, feminist-oriented magazines available at every magazine rack. Because they control the media, they also control the government. No politician, from Bill Clinton down to the least significant Congressman, dares to contradict them.

If we are ever to have any hope of making the institution of marriage healthy again, any hope of getting the White birthrate up to the replacement level again, any hope of keeping our people from becoming extinct, then we must gain for ourselves a much greater influence: eventually more influence than the enemies of our people have. The only way to do this is to build our own media for communicating with our people: to reach more of our people with *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts, *Free Speech,* and our other media.

Our enemies would like for everyone to believe that the only people who are concerned about the things I have talked about today -- the decay of our marriage institution and the declining White birthrate -- are what they like to call "right wing extremists" or "White supremacists." Ordinary people, they will tell you, don't share my concerns, my feeling that we must do something about what is happening to our people.

But our enemies are wrong. I know that a great many thoughtful people share my concerns. I know that a great many decent people are just as distressed as I am about what has happened to our marriage institution. I know that a great many of our most intelligent and perceptive people are as alarmed as I am over the catastrophic decline in the White birthrate. Not all of them have been quite so rude as I have in placing the blame for these things where it belongs. Not all of them are willing to be shrieked at by the controlled media as "anti-Semites" and "racists," so they keep quiet. But they are concerned; they are distressed.

My task -- our task -- is to persuade them to speak up, to persuade them to give voice to their concerns, to stop letting themselves be intimidated by those who want to destroy our people. And it also is to make many more of our people think about these things. So many of our people today are so busy, so wrapped up in their own affairs, that they haven't taken time to look at what is happening to our society and to think about it, to try to understand its long-range implications: its implications for their children and their grandchildren. I believe that when they do understand these implications, they too will share my concerns.

We need to continue talking with them, to talk with more and more of them. We need to get our radio program on more and more stations and our publications read by more and more people. Everything counts on it. You can help. I hope that you will.

Slime at the Top

The United States and the United Kingdom have Similar Problems

I've been looking at the results of the May 1st parliamentary elections in Britain. They are gratifying in an odd way: they prove that British voters are just as stupid as American voters. I had thought that choosing Bill Clinton twice in a row gave Americans some sort of world record for stupidity, but now I can see that the Britons are no brighter than we are. They've chosen as their new prime minister, Tony Blair, a man who bears so many resemblances to Bill Clinton that it is uncanny. Blair, like Clinton, is a crooked lawyer with a sly smile who looks like he would be more at home hawking his wares on a used-car lot than making policy for what used to be a truly great White nation. Like Clinton, he's the sort who can look you right in the eye and, with an expression of the utmost sincerity, tell you any kind of whopper that suits his purpose. And like Clinton he is married to a hard-as-nails female lawyer.

Like Clinton, Blair heads the leftist, internationalist, pro-spending, pro-big government faction in his country. Like Clinton, he is the choice of the non-White minorities and the really sappy element among the women. And like Clinton, he was elected with substantially less than a majority of the vote. But the really scary part of the similarity between Blair and Clinton is in the ties which both men have to organized Jewish power. It is fair to say that both men, more than any other U.S. President or British prime minister in recent history, are surrounded by Jews, have had their careers guided by Jews, and have appointed Jews to high governmental posts in unprecedented numbers. They are both creatures of the Jews. They are both utterly -- I mean **utterly** -- unprincipled men who serve at the pleasure of the Jewish minority in their country and also serve as instruments of that Jewish minority.

Blair, like Clinton, is the darling of the controlled media, but despite this there are a few elements of the media in Britain which are not Blair boosters. One of these, the London *Sunday Times*, ran an expose of Blair's secret financial backers in November 1996. More than that, the *Times* identified each of the wealthy men involved as a leading member of Britain's small but very powerful Jewish community. Between them they had donated more than 500,000 pounds to Blair -- not to his election campaign, but to support his private wheeling and dealing: what the British call Blair's "private office."

Blair's response to this expose has been to propose legislation which would make it illegal for a newspaper to provide such ethnic identifications. It would be considered "group libel" to identify as Jewish any malefactor or person involved in shady or illegal activities. Blair also has proposed legislation to make it illegal to express publicly any doubt about the so-called "Holocaust." In addition, he is a great advocate of more laws against what the Jews call "hate crimes" and of stiffer penalties for "hate criminals."

How can men like Blair and Clinton be elected to high public office in countries like Britain and the United States? What has happened to us that we tolerate this?

Please don't think that I'm calling for a return to the Conservative Party in Britain or for a Republican President in the United States. The Conservative Party in Britain is riddled with

corruption and treason, as is the Republican Party in the United States. The Jews may be a little less numerous and a little less obvious among the Conservatives and the Republicans than they are in the Labor Party and among the Democrats, but they're still there. The reason that the Jews prefer a man like Blair or Clinton, as opposed to a Conservative or a Republican, is that men like Blair and Clinton are wholly dependent on them, whereas there's more of an old-boy network among the Conservatives and the Republicans. There is more Gentile money for the Conservatives or the Republicans to fall back on. Men like Blair and Clinton, on the other hand, whose votes come much more from the urban rabble, from the welfare class, are much more heavily dependent on Jewish money for their campaigns. They cannot declare their independence from the Jews. Not that there's a very big chance of the Conservatives or the Republicans trying that.

Corruption and treason have riddled the whole system of mass democracy in the television age. It's not just the individual slimeballs like Blair and Clinton who are the problem. It is the system itself. It is the system of television-mediated electoral politics. Even if television and the other mass media were in the hands of decent people, even if they were in the hands of racially conscious Whites, democracy still would be a sham, because the people who control the media would still control the electoral process.

We've just come too far from the days of ancient Athens, where candidates for public office spoke directly and in person to the thousand or so men who were entitled to vote: men of maturity, substance, and responsibility, who could choose a candidate based on their personal knowledge of him. Nowadays what we vote for is the image of the candidate shaped and projected by the media. It is an image designed to appeal to a majority of voters. So we might get good men in office if the media were controlled by good men, but it still would be dishonest to pretend that the masses of voters were the ones making the choices. As it is, with Jews and those beholden to Jews controlling the mass media in both Britain and the United States, we get men like Tony Blair and Bill Clinton. That's the level to which we have sunk.

In the past we could count on the old two-party shell game. When the voters couldn't stand the Democrats -- or in the case of Britain, the Labor Party -- any longer, they could switch to the Republicans -- or the Conservatives -- for a few years, until in desperation they were ready to try the Democrats or the Laborites again. And the Jews always stayed moderately well hidden behind the scenes. They kept a moderately low profile. I have a suspicion that they've gotten tired of having to keep their heads down. I think that they're itching to rule openly. That may account for the sudden huge increase in the number of Jews visibly involved in running the government, both in the United States and in Britain. I believe that it also accounts for the greatly accelerated drive to silence dissenters, to make any expression of Politically Incorrect ideas or any revelation of Politically Incorrect facts illegal. That's why there's a big push on by the forces of Political Correctness to censor the Internet, for example. That's why Blair has proposed making any questioning of the "Holocaust" or any unfavorable mention of Jews a crime. Believe me, the rabble will go for it. The people who voted for Clinton and those who voted for Blair will gladly sign away all their rights in return for the promise of a little more security.

The problem with that is that they will sign away **our** rights too. What can we do about this terribly depressing and dangerous state of affairs?

The first thing we can do is understand it: really pound into our consciousness the fact that mass democracy, with millions of voters, is a fraud. It is not rule by the majority. It is rule by the minority able to control the images of the candidates presented to the public. Let's remember that. As soon as you have more than a few thousand voters, each of whom knows the candidates personally, the concept of democracy becomes meaningless. Let's not let ourselves be fooled by all of the pretense associated with campaigns and elections. What we have today is just a variation on the old, old theme that wealth rules: except that the wealth that really counts today is that which controls the mass media. A penniless candidate can defeat a Rockefeller, if the masters of the media favor the penniless candidate, if they build his image up and make it attractive to the largest faction of voters.

Let's also understand who the masters of the mass media are. Let's understand that they are Jews. In many cases they are Jews who are right out in the open in the top positions of the giant media corporations, Jews like Michael Eisner at the head of the Disney Corporation, which also owns the ABC television network; or Gerald Levin at the head of Time Warner; or Sumner Redstone, who owns MTV and other media as well. And, of course, there are the Jews who own the *New York Times,* the *Wall Street Journal,* and the *Washington Post.* But even in those cases when the men at the top are not Jews -- Rupert Murdoch, for example -- the Jews are still there, just not in such conspicuous positions. Over the last 60 years or so they have burrowed into the mass media at every level. The few Gentiles in the media business would be shut down immediately if they tried to buck the Jews. They could not run their businesses without the cooperation of the Jews. It may seem amazing that a tiny minority, which makes up only 2.5 per cent of the population, could have weaseled its way into virtually total control of such a vital industry as the mass media, but the Jews knew exactly what they were doing. They understood from the beginning that control of the mass media is the key to the control of everything else in a modern society.

The reason the Jews are able to blackmail countries like Switzerland, Sweden, and Argentina into paying them billions of dollars today for supposed wrongs done 60 years ago is not just because the United States has a Jewish secretary of state. It's primarily because the mass media in the United States are controlled by Jews. The Jews can go to some country and say, "Give us $500 million for the property we claim to have lost during the Second World War, or we'll sic the U.S. media on you, and it'll end up costing you a lot more than $500 million." And it works. Every week they dream up something else that the world owes them a billion or two billion dollars for. And they get it, because the politicians understand the power of the media.

Now the Jews are even claiming that American taxpayers owe them millions of dollars in restitution for not doing quite enough for them during the Second World War. And they'll get that too, you can be sure.

So that's why we have people like Bill Clinton and Tony Blair winning elections. Let's understand that as long as the mass media are under Jewish control we'll continue to have election results like that. We can't solve the problem by putting a different candidate forward or by organizing another party so long as we have the bulk of the voters being told what to think by Jews in New York and Hollywood.

What we must do now is talk with our people, help our people to understand the situation, help our people to find their roots again -- and to find their lost manhood. We must continue speaking out -- not just me -- you too. We must use every medium we can: *American Dissident Voices* radio broadcasts, *Free Speech,* the Internet, books, leaflets -- and person-to-person communication. That's what you can do. You don't have to have your own radio program to make a difference. All you have to do is have the courage to say what you think, the courage to share with other people what you know.

I know that it used to be tough to speak out. As soon as you'd open your mouth the haters and the bigots would be screaming at you because you were saying something Politically Incorrect. And there are still a lot of haters and bigots out there. But we are gaining ground on them. More and more ordinary people are just becoming fed up with Political Correctness. It's not just unemployed rednecks with tattoos living in mobile homes who are unhappy enough with the government to speak out these days. The unhappiness has percolated up through the socioeconomic strata all the way to the top. Today there is a growing number of engineers and doctors, teachers and business executives -- even lawyers -- who have reached such a point of disgust and frustration that they're no longer willing to pretend that everything is going along just fine. They look at a piece of filth like Clinton running the country to which they pledged their allegiance when they were in school, and it makes them sick to their stomachs. They watch the controlled media playing up to him and praising him, and it makes them even sicker. They think about the sort of world their kids will have to live in when they grow up, and they're ready to fight.

So don't worry about the Politically Correct bigots. Don't let the haters intimidate you. Stand up and speak out. Talk to your friends and neighbors. Invite a couple of them over to listen to an *American Dissident Voices* program. You'll be surprised at how many people will agree with you. They're all around you. Speak to them, and you will give some of them the courage also to speak out.

Just because you see more evil men in positions of power these days, just because you see men like Clinton and Blair in high office and you see Jews swarming around them, just because there's more filth and decay and hatred in our society, just because the bigots of Political Correctness are trying harder than ever to force everyone into ideological conformity, just because you see more hatred of our people and our traditions being expressed on television, just because you see more people doing disgusting things and hear them expressing disgusting ideas -- all of this does not mean that there are fewer decent people, fewer people who will agree with you if you speak up. It just means that our society is becoming more and more sharply divided. When there are more evil men in high places, when there are more foolish people who express agreement with these evil men, then there also are more normal, decent men who will notice this evil and who will turn against it inwardly. The more the Jews come out into the open and flaunt their power and make demands and are obeyed by the politicians, the more people there will be who will notice these things and disapprove of them and be silently opposed to them.

The Jews make their own opposition. Evil makes its own opposition. I do not make opposition to the Jews when I speak out. But I do encourage other people to speak out. I do not make evil men

become good men, but I do make at least some good men speak who otherwise would have remained silent.

You know, our enemies like to say that I am divisive. They tell me that I should be silent, because by speaking out I divide Americans against each other. But that is not true. It is they who have divided America by their actions and their policies. I point out their evil. I encourage others to speak. But it is the evil itself, not my words, which turns good men against it.

They have divided America by destroying its homogeneity, by bringing a flood of aliens into our midst, and by forcing their evil and destructive policies on us. Now they would like for us to be silent. Now they would like to censor us. Now they would like to have new laws making it illegal for us to say what we think. Now we have evil men like Morris Dees and his Jewish friends in the Southern Poverty Law Center running around claiming that they will shut Pierce up. They claim that by speaking out I make men hate the government. They claim that by speaking out I cause people to commit terrorist acts against the government. But that is not true. It is the government itself which makes men hate it. And when good men hate someone like Morris Dees, it is not because I tell them that he is an evil man. They can see that for themselves. He himself proves that he is evil by what he does.

The obligation that I have and that you have is not to make good men hate the government or hate Bill Clinton or hate Morris Dees. Our obligation is simply to speak out. Our obligation is not to permit them to silence us. Our obligation is to help our neighbors find the courage to speak out also. If enough good men speak out, we can shed the light of truth on the evil which is taking over our country. We can help other men and women see it for what it is. And by exercising our freedom to speak out now, we can make it much more difficult for those who want to take that freedom away from us.

And someday -- **someday** -- we can build a united America again.

Day of Infamy

June 8, 1967, is a day which will live in infamy. On this day an American Navy vessel, the U.S.S. *Liberty*, was deliberately attacked in international waters by the armed forces of Israel in a treacherous attempt to sink the ship and kill everyone aboard it. The *Liberty* was an electronic intelligence gathering vessel, and it had been sent to the eastern Mediterranean to monitor radio communications. Israel had launched its latest land-grabbing war against its neighbors just four days earlier, and the U.S. government was curious as to what its Jewish "ally" was up to.

The Jews, on the other hand, were quite determined that the United States not learn what they were doing. The Jewish plan was to grab as much Arab land as possible before the United States could figure out what was going on and begin insisting that Israel halt its latest aggression. The Jews did not want the United States, their principal source of military, economic, and diplomatic support to tell them to "cool it" until they had achieved all of their objectives, and so it was important to the Jewish warlords to keep the American military in the dark for a few more days.

Early on the morning of June 8, 1967, the *Liberty* was just over 12 miles off the Egyptian coast in international waters and in sight of the Egyptian town of El Arish, monitoring radio signals and flying a large American flag. Jewish forces had occupied El Arish two days earlier, and the Israeli Army was involved in killing a large number of Egyptian prisoners of war that very morning. Groups of Egyptian prisoners were marched into the desert, made to dig their graves, and then were shot by their Jewish captors. American personnel on the *Liberty* would not have been able to see these atrocities from more than 12 miles away, but they were intercepting Israeli radio communications discussing local operations.

Of much more serious concern to the Jews was the interception by the *Liberty* of radio communications concerning their strategic military intentions: specifically their planned invasion of Syria.

Just after dawn, a twin-engine, propeller-driven Israeli reconnaissance plane flew out from the coast and slowly circled the *Liberty* three times. A little before 9:00 AM an Israeli jet fighter flew out and circled the *Liberty.* Throughout the morning and early afternoon, the Jews sent one aircraft after another out to circle the *Liberty.* Some of these aircraft flew so low that the crew members aboard the *Liberty* could see the faces of the pilots. The Jews were keeping the *Liberty* under very close observation and seemed to be concerned about the presence of the eavesdropper.

The Israelis finally decided to get rid of this threat to the secrecy of their military operations. At 2:00 PM several Israeli jet fighters streaked out from the coast and without warning began raking the *Liberty* from stem to stern with rockets, 30-mm cannon fire, and napalm. A number of Americans on the bridge and deck of the *Liberty* were killed immediately. The Jewish aircraft made pass after pass over the ship, pouring their fire into the helpless, slow-moving American target, riddling it from stem to stern with explosive ordnance and leaving it looking like a floating piece of Swiss cheese. The hull and superstructure of the *Liberty* had 821 holes larger

than a man's fist from the rocket and cannon fire. Among other things the Jewish air attacks had shot away the *Liberty's* radio antennas and wrecked the radio room.

As soon as the Israeli jets had exhausted their munitions and flown off, the crew immediately ran up another American flag to replace the one the Jews had shot away. The new flag was an oversize one, seven feet high and 13 feet long. Then, while the crew was fighting fires started by the aerial napalm attacks and attempting to tend to the wounded and dying men on the deck, three Israeli torpedo boats appeared and began raking the decks of the *Liberty* with 20-mm and 40-mm automatic cannon fire. The *Liberty's* life rafts in the water were machine-gunned by the Israelis. Then a torpedo from one of the torpedo boats struck the ship, tearing a large hole in its side below the waterline and killing 22 more crew members.

Just before the torpedo struck, the *Liberty's* radiomen had managed to rig an emergency antenna and get an auxiliary transmitter working. Throughout the attack the Jews were using radio jamming equipment in an attempt to drown out any radio message from the *Liberty.* Nevertheless, the *Liberty* managed to get off one radio message to the U.S. Sixth Fleet reporting the attack and calling for help. The Sixth Fleet, to the west in the Mediterranean, responded with a message that help was being sent. The U.S. aircraft carriers *America* and *Saratoga* launched jets which sped toward the *Liberty.*

As soon as the Jews realized that the Sixth Fleet had received the *Liberty's* signal, the attacks were halted. The clear intention of the Jews had been to disable the ship's radio communications and then sink it before a radio message could be sent. Any survivors in the water then would have been killed by the Jews. No one would be able to prove the Jews had done it, and it could be blamed on the Egyptians.

As soon as the Jews understood that their scheme had failed, they shifted from the military to the diplomatic mode. The murderous assault on the U.S.S. *Liberty* had been a "mistake," the Jews claimed. They had thought the ship was Egyptian, they told their media friends and their bought politicians in Washington.

President Lyndon Johnson didn't even wait for this excuse from the Jews. As soon as he was given word that an American Navy vessel had been attacked by the Israelis and that the U.S. Sixth Fleet was sending help, he ordered that the help be recalled. He was terrified that the U.S. aircraft would inflict casualties on the Jews attacking the *Liberty,* and the Jews would blame him. If the Jewish attack on the *Liberty* became a public "incident" involving conflict between the United States and Israel, Johnson would be forced to take the American side and might be regarded as "anti-Israel," which would turn America's Jews against him. So he sent an emergency message to the Sixth Fleet, ordering that the American jets flying to the relief of the *Liberty* be recalled and that no further assistance be given. Perhaps the stricken ship would sink, and the whole matter could be hushed up.

But the U.S.S. *Liberty* did not sink, much to the embarrassment of the Jews and their collaborators. The survivors among the crew even managed to get the ship's engines running again, and the *Liberty* limped out to sea, eventually rendezvousing the next day with an American destroyer, the U.S.S. Davis. The wounded crewmen -- 171 of them -- were airlifted off

the ship. Many of the dead -- 34 of them --- could not be recovered from the interior of the ship until it had reached port in Malta.

Even while the wounded crewmen were in a Naval hospital, they were given strict orders not to tell anyone, not even members of their families, about the Jewish attack on their ship. The U.S. Navy went through the formalities of holding a court of inquiry, but it was a complete sham. No Israelis were even questioned during the inquiry, and the U.S. government meekly accepted the Jews' explanation that the attack on the *Liberty* had been a "mistake." The news media were indecently silent about the whole affair. The obvious concern of the Jews and their sympathizers in the United States was not that an American ship had been attacked treacherously and 34 Americans killed; their concern was only to keep Israel from being blamed for the attack. And the politicians were all too eager to go along with the Jews.

The members of the *Liberty's* crew who had been wounded during the Israeli attack asked for damages from the Israeli government. The Israelis refused to pay, and it was necessary for the wounded crewmen to hire attorneys and file suit. When the Israelis did eventually pay, nearly two years later, attorneys' fees ate up most of the payment.

The commanding officer of the *Liberty* during the Israeli attack was Captain William McGonagle. Though severely wounded during the attack he remained at his post throughout and behaved in a heroic manner. A year after the attack Captain McGonagle was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroism, but so desperate was President Lyndon Johnson to avoid offending the Jews that he refused to present the medal himself, as always has been customary. Instead of receiving his Medal of Honor from the President in the customary White House ceremony, McGonagle was quietly given the medal by the secretary of the Navy at the Washington Navy Yard, so as to attract the least possible public attention. The citation accompanying the medal, which customarily describes in detail the action for which the medal is being awarded, carefully omitted any mention of Israel. The *Washington Post* did not even report the award.

One of the *Liberty's* officers, Lieutenant James Ennes, wrote a detailed account of the Jewish attack on his ship and its aftermath, and his account was published in 1979 as a book under the title *Assault on the Liberty.* The Jews immediately began a campaign to keep the book out of bookstores and to keep reviews of the book out of newspapers. This campaign was much like the one the Jews have been conducting against one of my books, *The Turner Diaries.* Ennes reports that whenever a bookstore would stock his book, the local Jews would begin complaining to the store owner that the book is "anti-Israel" and is "offensive to Jewish people everywhere." The Jews have been fairly successful in keeping the book out of the hands of the public, and it is now out of print and generally unavailable.

I have been able to obtain a number of copies of the original hardback edition of *Assault on the Liberty* directly from Lieutenant Ennes, so this book is available from National Vanguard Books, the publisher of *Free Speech.* If you would like a copy see the National Vanguard Books Catalog section of this web page. The button for the catalog is on our home page.

To his credit Lieutenant Ennes has kept the truth about the Jewish attempt to sink the *Liberty* alive for 30 years, in the face of a concerted effort by the controlled media, the Jewish establishment, and the U.S. government, including the U.S. Navy, to kill this truth. In return for his efforts, the Jews and their collaborators have been calling Ennes an "anti-Semite," a "neo-Nazi," a "professional Jew-hater," and lots of things that are too crude for me to write. Among these collaborators of the Jews attacking Ennes are individuals claiming to be veterans and patriots, but it is clear where their allegiance really lies.

Ennes always has declined to respond in kind to these attacks and has been unfailingly polite. We might fault him for failing to draw some general conclusions about the Jews and for continuing to maintain that he is **not** anti-Jewish, but let us instead credit him for standing up for the truth in his own way against the almost unbelievably intense barrage of hatred that has been directed against him.

What should be shocking and disgusting to every American, what should outrage us all, is not the lies of the Jews or their attacks on Lieutenant Ennes -- we expect that sort of behavior from the Jews -- but rather we should be outraged by the collaboration of the U.S. government with the Jews. During the attack on the *Liberty*, when it was calling for help and was in danger of being sunk, President Lyndon Johnson recalled the U.S. aircraft that were rushing to assist the *Liberty.* He was more concerned about not offending the Jews in the United States than he was about his responsibility as commander-in-chief of America's armed forces.

And Johnson's recall of these American jets cannot be explained away as a mix-up or a misunderstanding in the heat of the moment. This action of Johnson's was deliberate. It was consistent with his behavior in every instance involving the *Liberty.* Johnson even checked with the Israeli ambassador a year after the attack to see if the government of Israel had any objection to Captain McGonagle's receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor, and then he refused to present the medal himself. That sort of behavior goes beyond outrageous, even for a Democratic politician. It is nothing but the basest treason.

Now do you understand why we have a piece of filth like Bill Clinton in the White House? We had a piece of filth in the White House 30 years ago. It is the system itself which is filthy, and so it should be no surprise when filthy individuals rise to the top of it.

One of these days we have to change the system itself radically, but that will take a full-scale revolution. What we must do until then is make ourselves heard. What we must do is raise our voices. The reason that Israel is able to lead America around by the nose is that the Jews, through their control of the news and entertainment media in America, have the only effective voice, the only voice that the damnable politicians respond to. Lyndon Johnson didn't betray the men of the *Liberty* because he loved Jews. Nobody loves Jews. They are the most unlovable race on this earth. Johnson behaved as he did because he feared the Jews. And he feared them because he knew that they control the political process in this country through their control of the media.

That is the key fact, the salient fact, the most important fact in the life of our people today: Jewish control of the media.

Why do you think the Jews did such a rash thing as attack the *Liberty* in the first place? That, after all, was a very rash thing to do. If the United States were a nation led by honorable men, a nation in control of its own destiny, such an attack would have meant the end of Israel's existence right then and there. Why did the Jews do it? Are they stupid?

I think not. They did it because they knew they could get away with it. They did it because it might have worked, and they had nothing to lose if it didn't work. They knew they could get away with it. And they knew they could get away with it because they control our news and entertainment media.

And so here we are, 30 years into this shameful episode, 30 years after the treacherous and arrogant attack by Israel on the U.S.S. *Liberty* which killed 34 Americans and wounded 171 of them -- an attack which was intended to kill everyone aboard our ship. And for 30 years the media have maintained their blanket of silence, and the politicians have maintained their sickening pretense about our "gallant, little Jewish ally" in the Middle East. This is the Jewish ally which continues to moan to the world about how it is "persecuted" by everyone else and continues to make demands on the world for money which it claims the world owes it.

Our politicians make pious speeches about China's abuse of human rights -- and I have no doubt that the charges against China are true -- but then these same politicians vote for more of our money to be given to Israel, a country which murders prisoners of war wholesale and which routinely tortures Palestinians suspected of wanting freedom for their people. These are the same politicians who vote for laws requiring that our children be brainwashed with Jewish propaganda about the so-called "Holocaust" in their schools and who express their abhorrence of "anti - Semitism" whenever any American, such as Lieutenant Ennes, tells the nasty truth about our "gallant, little Jewish ally."

Surely, the citizens of Sodom and Gomorra were paragons of virtue and rectitude compared to the current inhabitants of Congress, the White House, and the Federal courts. And surely, what happened to the citizens of Sodom and Gomorra will happen to them.

But until that cleansing fire comes, let us raise our voices. Let us speak out ever more boldly and ever more loudly. Let us remind all of our fellow citizens about the U.S.S. *Liberty.* And let us resolve now that we will put an end to the shame that has been brought on us by our government and by the controlled media!

The Clinton White House

Even Former Supporters of the Government Are Disgusted

I've just finished reading a book called *Unlimited Access*. It's by an FBI agent, Gary Aldrich, who worked in the Clinton White House. His job was to do background investigations on White House staff members. He had done the same job earlier during the Bush administration and found the work congenial, but he discovered that working in the Clinton White House was an altogether different matter. He was shocked by the character and behavior of the people he was obliged to work with, and finally, in June 1995, he quit in disgust, taking early retirement from the FBI. Now he has written a book about his observations during the first Clinton administration.

There's nothing really startling in Aldrich's book: it's primarily a confirmation of what we've learned from other sources. The Clintonistas are substantially a product of the 1960s. They tend to be slovenly, self-indulgent, egoistic, smart-alecky, ill-mannered, pushy, disrespectful, and very Politically Correct. The women tend to be hard-case feminists, there are many homosexuals among the men, the incidence of illegal drug usage is phenomenal, and all of them are inclined to believe that they have the world by the balls and can get away with anything they want. They are very contemptuous of conservative, conventional people like Aldrich, and this fact irritated him enormously.

I must admit that I myself don't have a lot of rapport with the average FBI agent. They are a bit too authoritarian and a bit too unimaginative for my taste. And when I am talking with one of them, no matter how polite he is, I never can get out of my mind the knowledge that he is one of the enemy's soldiers. Regardless of his personal beliefs and tastes, he is taking orders and his paychecks from the most evil and destructive organization which has ever existed on this earth: namely, the present U.S. government. Nevertheless, if I had to choose between FBI agents like Aldrich and the White House staffers he was assigned to investigate, I'd choose Aldrich in a second. He is not really a bad person: he just happened to be working for the wrong people.

Some of Aldrich's observations in the Clinton White House are more interesting than others. For example, the FBI agents there learned not to be surprised or shocked when they occasionally encountered homosexual staff members going at it in White House offices or showers. And Aldrich's observations of Hillary's autocratic behavior, her loud and vulgar language, and her screaming fits directed at those who displeased her, including her husband, are consistent with the reports of other observers.

Aldrich tells of being asked to help decorate some of the Christmas trees in the various rooms of the White House in December 1994 and being horrified when he discovered that the Christmas-tree decorations supplied by Hillary consisted of condoms, various miniature items of drug paraphernalia, and little sex toys.

The White House staffers described in *Unlimited Access* are former student radicals. They are the people who back in the 1970s used to organize loud and rowdy campus demonstrations demanding that some professor be fired whom they considered to be a "racist" or a "fascist."

They used to occupy the dean's office and trash the place in order to get their way, defecating on the dean's desk and urinating in his files. Now they've graduated, gone on to law school and gotten law degrees, and joined the system they used to demonstrate against. But their manners, their morals, and their ideas haven't changed a bit. This fact hit Aldrich with a jolt when a fellow FBI agent said to him: "Don't you recognize these people, Gary? They're the people we used to arrest."

And now the FBI is working for them! Isn't democracy wonderful?

One section of Aldrich's book really struck me. He recalls his early days in the FBI, and in particular the time in the fall of 1969 when he was assigned to dress like a student radical and mingle with a crowd of nearly 500,000 pro-Viet Cong demonstrators at a march in Washington. He was supposed to keep his eyes and ears open, and if he learned anything about the plans of the demonstrators to do anything especially dangerous he was to report back to FBI headquarters.

The interesting thing to me is that I also was present as an observer in that 1969 demonstration in Washington. I had mingled with a mob of about 5,000 demonstrators who had split off from the main demonstration and converged on the building housing the Department of Justice. I watched as the demonstrators smashed out nearly every window in the ground floor of the building and then began using long poles to poke out the second-floor windows. There were soldiers with machine guns on the roof and in the halls behind the doors, which had been chained shut, but they made no attempt to interfere with the demonstrators who were smashing the windows.

Several hundred policemen had barricaded Constitution Avenue in an attempt to keep the mob contained, and the demonstrators began throwing Coke bottles with lighted firecrackers in them -- primitive fragmentation grenades -- into the ranks of the police. Eventually the police responded with a moving barrage of tear-gas grenades, and the mob stampeded. I was in the middle of that mob, surrounded on every side by tightly packed demonstrators, and as my lungs filled with the burning, choking tear gas, I thought I would die. Within a few seconds the mob began running west along Constitution Avenue, and I ran with them, moving my legs as fast as I could and worrying that if I stumbled I would be trampled to death. Eventually I reached the 12th Street underpass and ran into the tunnel, where I gradually recovered from the tear gas. A few months after that experience I organized the National Youth Alliance, which evolved into the National Alliance.

Aldrich doesn't say whether or not he also got a dose of tear gas that day, but he concludes his comments on the episode with the following, and I quote: "Earlier that day, in another time zone, five hundred protesters from Oxford led by William Jefferson Blythe Clinton marched on the American Embassy. Many carried little red books (by Chairman Mao) and Viet Cong flags, shouting, ‘Down with the United States,’ and, ‘Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh!’ It was a coordinated effort, set up by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, or VMC, an organization run by Sam Brown, a good friend of Bill Clinton. On this side of the Atlantic, I stood at a police barricade and hoped the officers would be able to return safely to their wives and children that night. On the other side of the Atlantic, the future President of the United States was leading a march against his own country's embassy."

The really interesting thing about Aldrich's book is its illustration of the great divide between the Clinton crowd -- the Clintonistas -- and traditional White America. Aldrich is a reasonably typical specimen of traditional White America: basically a decent fellow, who believes in politeness, honesty, obeying the law, saluting the flag, opening doors for women, and going to church on Sunday, but who never quite figured out what has happened to America during the past 50 years and who made it happen. A great many other people besides Gary Aldrich are in a similar situation, and it's not just retired FBI agents. In some cases it's people who end up in gunfights with folks like Gary Aldrich: people like those in some of the many little outfits that have declared themselves out of the system during the past four or five years, outfits like the Montana Freemen or the Republic of Texas. There has been an explosion in the number of such outfits recently. Five years ago you never heard about them. Now there's one in the headlines every few weeks. And these people you read about in the newspapers really are only the tip of the iceberg. Most of the people on Gary Aldrich's side of the divide are law-abiding people. They don't want to be involved in a shootout or get in the newspapers like the Montana Freemen. But make no mistake about it, they are not happy about things. Many of them are quite angry. Some of them are almost angry enough to start shooting. The rest are getting there. The Clintonistas don't really understand that. But they will.

You know, I said that the Clintonistas are creatures of the 1960s. But there's more than just a difference in life-style between them and us. The difference is more than just that they like to smoke marijuana and don't see anything wrong with two men having a sexual relationship, while we don't approve of those things. The divide that I mentioned a minute ago is a very profound divide. It splits White America -- it splits all of America -- into two camps that are moving further and further apart. These two camps aren't homogeneous by any means. I -- and I think nearly all of you who are listening -- are in one camp, along with Gary Aldrich. I know that we're a pretty diverse bunch. There are a lot of things that Gary Aldrich and I would disagree about. But we do agree on some things, some pretty fundamental things: things like discipline and individual responsibility.

On the other side are the urban rabble and the yuppies. They're not homogeneous either, but they do have some things in common. They all look to the government to guarantee them the things they believe they're entitled to -- which are many. And they all have trouble with the concept of individual responsibility. Entitlements they understand, but not responsibility. We have a President who gave aid and comfort to the enemies of his country during the Vietnam war and who runs around with cocaine dealers. Their attitude is, who cares? Just keep those special government programs going.

And there's more. The people in the Clinton constituency are missing something really important. Their orientation is basically materialistic, hedonistic, egoistic. They have no spiritual dimension. They have no roots, no sense of purpose, no feeling of being a part of something more important than themselves.

I don't mean to imply that there's no materialism or egoism or hedonism on our side of the divide. There is. There's just a lot more of it on their side. They don't realize that. And if they did they wouldn't consider it important, because none of the people they meet at cocktail parties in Washington or New York or Hollywood consider it important. They live in a self-contained

world of their own, and there's not much communication between their world and ours. These people believe that they are the wave of the future. Everything they see in the media controlled by their Jewish friends convinces them of that. They believe that they are a lot smarter than all of us folks out beyond the beltway who don't like them. They figure that with the media bosses on their side, with their government programs to keep the rabble voting for them, and with their pollsters to keep them informed about what people are thinking, they've got everything under control. They figure that we can dislike them as much as we want, because there's nothing we can do about the situation.

What does it matter to them if a few stodgy, conservative FBI agents disapprove of them? They have one of their types in as FBI director now in the person of Louis Freeh, and most of the newer agents being hired look at things the way they do and will be loyal Clintonistas. They even believe that most of us slow learners out here in the suburbs eventually will wake up and understand that there's nothing to be gained by being against progress.

They just don't get it. They don't understand why we dislike them and why we will never acquiesce in their takeover of the government. They think it's because we're stupid or backward. And let's face it, a lot of the people on our side of the divide are a little stupid or backward. That's why some of us do dumb things like declaring ourselves an independent republic or deciding that the Constitution allows us to print our own money. That's why many of us, like Gary Aldrich, haven't figured out yet that there's much more to America's current sickness than the gang now in the White House.

But, you know, more and more of us are figuring that out. We are understanding that Bill Clinton is not just an isolated phenomenon, but that he is a symptom of a rot which has permeated our government, our schools, our churches, our media -- indeed, our whole society. The Jews could never have gotten away with their "counter-culture" organizing on our university campuses back in the 1960s if they had not already rotted out the soul of our university system with their liberal poison first. They could never have gotten 500,000 students and other young people to Washington for a pro-Viet Cong demonstration in 1969, at the height of the Vietnam war, if they had not already sapped the integrity of our government.

Gary Aldrich and I both saw what happened in Washington during that demonstration. We both saw the government's failure to deal with the situation properly, but we drew quite different conclusions from our observations. Perhaps Gary Aldrich drew no conclusion at all, because he stayed with the FBI and was surprised when things turned out the way they did 23 years later. I did draw some conclusions, and I founded the National Alliance, and I was not surprised that the White House eventually ended up in the hands of the Clinton gang. Back in 1969 I saw us headed this way.

Today more and more people also are beginning to draw conclusions. They are realizing that having a White House full of coke-heads and dykes and former Viet Cong supporters is not just a fluke. They are realizing that it is the culmination of a long process of decay and subversion. They are realizing that it is something which they cannot continue to ignore, that it puts them and their children and their grandchildren in great jeopardy, and that they must take a stand against it.

Although Gary Aldrich doesn't say so in his book, I wouldn't be surprised if he is beginning to realize this too. I hope he is. And I hope that a lot of the other people still in the FBI are realizing it too.

One thing that they may not realize, that they may not understand, is the spiritual aspect of what has happened to America. I've already mentioned this briefly, but I'll say it again, because it's important: before the Jews could turn America's university campuses upside down back in the 1960s, they had to prepare the universities spiritually. That meant replacing **our** spirit at the universities with **their** spirit. It meant decades of undermining our traditions and of changing our way of looking at the world and at ourselves to **their** way. It meant replacing our feeling for quality with the worship of equality and democracy. It meant subverting our pride of race and changing it into a sense of guilt. It meant replacing our sense of order, discipline, and responsibility with hedonism. It meant making us forget the spiritual meaning of our existence: it meant making us forget our roots and become their brand of get-it-while-you-can materialists.

I suspect that Gary Aldrich still doesn't understand these things; otherwise he couldn't have stayed with the FBI all those years. Nevertheless, his book is quite interesting, and if you haven't read it yet you will find it worthwhile to do so. National Vanguard Books carries this book. To order it see the National Vanguard Books Catalog section of this web site. The button for the catalog is on our home page.

The Jews are very smart and very powerful. They have all of the politicians dancing to their tune. They control the news and entertainment media. They have their creature in the White House. But they are **losing.** They are on the way out. Even their trained attack dogs in the FBI are beginning to turn against them. Not much -- not yet -- but it's a beginning. There are tens of thousands of us out here who have gone much further than Gary Aldrich has. And there are hundreds of thousands more who are on their way. The Jews and the Clintonistas don't understand that. They can't understand it. But the opposition to them will continue to grow, simply because more and more of us, on our side of the divide, are sensing that their spirit is profoundly alien to ours.

The Women of Monte Cassino

Many War Atrocities Are Utterly Ignored

It seems that every time I pick up a newspaper I read about a new claim the Jews are making on someone else's money. It began a few months ago when they claimed that the Swiss hadn't been diligent enough in trying to track down the heirs of Jews who had deposited money in Swiss banks back during the 1930s, before the Second World War, and then never reclaimed it. Seven billion dollars the Jews wanted from the Swiss people -- plus interest, of course. And when the Swiss politicians, instead of telling them to go to hell, started negotiating with them and offering them hundreds of millions of dollars, the Jews realized they had a good thing going, and they decided to push it. Next they accused the Swedes of having some gold left over from the Second World War which should be given to Jews to compensate them for their persecution. Then they went after Argentina and Portugal and France and eventually the United States as well. In France they announced that many buildings in Paris and other French cities had belonged to Jews sixty years ago, back before the Second World War, and now they want the French to pay them for these buildings -- plus interest, of course. Every week there are new demands for more money to be given to the Jews, more gold. Anyone who scoffs at these Jewish claims is likely to be attacked by the media as an "anti-Semite," a "neo-Nazi," or, worst of all, a "Holocaust denier."

The whole racket, you see, is based on the "Holocaust," on the theory that the Jews have suffered uniquely at the hands of all the rest of us, and so now we owe them, and it is terribly wicked of us -- or at least, very "insensitive" -- to refuse their demands.

Now, I have no doubt that the Jews lost some money during the Second World War. Who didn't? It was a terribly destructive and murderous war. Everyone who was involved in it lost a lot. The Jews, however, are the only ones who seem to believe that the world owes them a living because of it. Perhaps they feel that they're entitled to more because they have made such a big investment in reminding everyone. They have used their control of Hollywood and of the television industry to produce hundreds of films and TV episodes to remind us of how they were mistreated by the terrible Germans and the Germans' French, Italian, Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian helpers -- all through no fault of their own, of course. They are the only ones who have persuaded the U.S. government to let them set up a "Holocaust" museum on public property in Washington. They are the only ones who have pressured corrupt politicians and education officials in a dozen states to require special classes on the "Holocaust" for all high school students. What these special classes amount to is brainwashing intended to give the Jews a special, privileged status in the minds of the students: the status of the world's premier victims, the status of the world's premier blameless sufferers, the status of people to whom the world owes something. Just Jews. No one else.

This is crooked. This is dishonest. We understand why they do it, of course. They tell us that they do it so that we won't forget what terrible things we did to them, how we failed to rescue them from the Germans, and so on. But they also do it because the "Holocaust" is an immensely profitable racket for them. They suck billions of dollars in guilt money out of the rest of the world every year. But it is dishonest for two reasons. First, it greatly exaggerates the suffering of the Jews. It takes a few basic and indisputable facts -- primarily the fact that the Germans did not

like having Jews in control of their society and were determined to break their grip on Germany, and did in fact break that grip, sometimes by drastic measures -- and it embroiders those basic facts with many, many lies: lies about soap made from Jewish corpses, lies about lampshades made from the skin of Jews, lies about gas chambers in many places where there were no gas chambers, and lies about German soldiers swinging Jewish babies by their legs and bashing out their brains. We should not let the Jews compel the teaching of these lies to our children just so that they can continue sending us on a guilt trip and bleeding the world for as much money as they can get.

I was reading a story in the *New York Times* just a few days ago about a study being conducted at Cambridge University on the fate of part-Jews in Germany, and the story quoted a woman who was living in Germany in the 1930s. Her mother was German and her father was a Jew, and she went to the headquarters of the Gestapo in Berlin in 1938 to complain that the government had ordered her father to leave Germany. She said that the Gestapo officers took her into a back office of the headquarters and raped her.

Now, I **know** that **didn't** happen. A White woman might get raped in a police station in New York or Washington or Chicago today, but the Berlin Gestapo did not rape anybody. Berlin in 1938 was not like New York or Washington, DC, today. It was an orderly place. It was a place with rules. It was a place where women did not have to worry about being raped by the police. Such behavior was unthinkable. But it makes a nice lie to embroider the "Holocaust" with.

There's another reason why this claim by the Jews that the world owes them a living because they are the world's premier victims is crooked. It is crooked because it is associated with the deliberate suppression of the truth about what has happened to other people: in particular about what the Jews and their allies have done to other people. If you want to learn about atrocities, take a look at what the Bolsheviks did in Russia and Ukraine. You've probably heard very vague stories about the mass murder of 30 million *kulaks*, 30 million Ukrainian and Russian and German farmers, by the Communists in the 1920s and 1930s, but very few details, I'm sure. This is not taught in the schools, and Hollywood does not make films about this, because the majority of the Bolshevik commissars who supervised this program of mass murder were Communist Jews, and their victims were Gentiles. What's the point in reminding the world about that? For the same reason you do not hear about what the Communist secret police did in their torture and execution cells in Poland, Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere after the Second World War, when they were making eastern Europe safe for Communism. You don't hear about it because not only were the victims not Jews, but the torturers and murderers in many cases were Jews.

Suppose the relatives, the heirs, of all of these non-Jewish victims organized themselves and began demanding that they be paid compensation for what had been done to them and for what had been stolen from them 55 or 60 or 70 years ago? Even if they did you still wouldn't hear about it, because the people who control the media would make sure that their story didn't get told.

Let me tell you about one group of victims -- **real** victims -- from the Second World War that you've never heard about for this very reason. In May 1944 the Allies -- the forces of democracy

and equality, the anti-Nazi and pro-Jewish forces -- finally succeeded in taking Monte Cassino in the Apennines of central Italy away from the German Army, after bombing Monte Cassino's sixth-century abbey into ruins. The Allies had some Moroccan soldiers with them. They wanted "diversity" in their armed forces even then. They wanted to demonstrate their belief in racial equality. The Moroccans were only mediocre as fighters, but they really excelled at cutting the throats of prisoners after the fighting was over. They were pretty good at raping civilians too. The night after the battle for Monte Cassino was over and the Germans had withdrawn in good order, a division of Moroccan soldiers -- 12,000 of them -- left their camp and swarmed over a group of mountain villages around Monte Cassino. They raped every village woman and girl they could get their hands on, an estimated 3,000 women, ranging in age from 11 years to 86. They murdered 800 village men who tried to protect their women. They abused some of the women so badly that more than 100 of them died.

The people of these mountain villages are descended from the ancient Volsci, one of the tribes in pre-Roman Italy, and their women are reputed to be taller and more graceful than other women in that part of Italy. The Moroccan soldiers selected the prettiest girls for gang-raping, with long lines of dark-skinned Moroccans waiting their turn in front of each one, while other Moroccans held the victims down. Two sisters, 15 and 18 years old, were raped by more than 200 Moroccans each. One of them died from the abuse. The other has spent the last 53 years in a mental hospital. The Moroccans even raped some of the young men in the villages. The Moroccans also destroyed most of the buildings in the villages and stole everything of value.

Interestingly enough, there is no mention of this action by our gallant Colored allies from North Africa in most of the histories of the battle for Monte Cassino which have been published since the war. Not even the official history published by the U.S. War Department mentions what the Moroccans did to these Italian mountain villagers. Jewish policy during and since the war has been to ignore any atrocity committed by the people on their side -- unless they could blame it on their enemies. For example, the murder by Jewish execution squads belonging to the Soviet secret police of 15,000 Polish officers and intellectuals in 1940 was blamed on the Germans after the advancing German Army uncovered the bodies of more than 4,000 of the victims in the Katyn forest. Even years after the end of the war many elements of the controlled media continued to parrot this lie about German guilt for the Katyn murders. Jewish control of the news media made this easy.

And of course, reports of the atrocities committed against the Germans by Soviet forces during and after the war also were suppressed. The horrible mass rapes of German women and young girls and the mass murder of German civilians and prisoners of war were deliberately incited by the Jewish-Soviet propaganda commissar Ilya Ehrenburg. This hate-crazed Jewish commissar explicitly urged the Red Army to rape German women and murder German civilians, including children. And they did. But of course, Hollywood has never made a film about these horrible atrocities. And so far as I am aware, none of the heirs of these Polish, German, or Italian victims of the pro-Jewish Allies have made any demands on the various Allied governments for restitution.

Of all the people who suffered losses during the Second World War, it's only the Jews who are demanding to be paid, only the Jews who are trying to capitalize on their losses -- and

exaggerating and lying about those losses so that they can inflate their claims for restitution. Of course, it really wouldn't do any of these Poles, Germans, or Italians any good to make claims for restitution, because they don't control the media, and without the media to back them up the politicians would just laugh in their faces.

Imagine a delegation of elderly Italian village women from the Monte Cassino area showing up in Washington and claiming restitution from the U.S. government for their horrible experience of being gang-raped by Moroccans 53 years ago. After all, it was an American, General Dwight Eisenhower, who was in charge of the Allied war effort and who therefore had responsibility for the conduct of the Allied soldiers, including the Moroccans. The Moroccans already had a reputation as a bunch of raping, cutthroat savages, so that even bringing Moroccan soldiers into Europe constituted a war crime and a crime against humanity.

But can you imagine any of our politicians even giving these women the time of day? New York Senator Alphonse D'Amato has been beating the drums for the Jews who are demanding gold from the Swiss, the Swedes, and everyone else. I am sure that he would not be so helpful to his fellow Italians. After all, Italians don't own the *New York Times.* No, these Italian women would be ignored. To claim victim status like the Jews, thereby stealing part of the spotlight from the Jews, would be considered tantamount to anti-Semitism. And to complain about being raped by Colored soldiers certainly would smack of racism. When the politicians saw these women coming they would run in the other direction, and Senator D'Amato would be running faster than all the rest.

You know, it may be that this business of Jews extorting a few billion dollars from various governments and banks and insurance companies they claim shortchanged them 60 years ago isn't a big deal. After all, it's only money. But it is nevertheless a good illustration, I believe, both of the way the Jews work and of the absolute necessity that we regain control of our mass media. In my view, what was done to those women in the villages around Monte Cassino in May 1944 is a far worse crime than anything the Jews claim happened to them -- even if every one of their claims were true. It is also a crime that the news of this terrible atrocity was suppressed. Our children today are being taught a false version of history and are being led to wrong conclusions as a result. Because of this they are unable effectively to defend their society, their civilization, and their race. They have been given false notions of who their friends are and who their enemies are. And they have been given these false ideas, they have been led to these wrong conclusions, for one reason only, and that is because it benefits the Jews.

This is a terrible crime. It would justify a hundred Nuremberg trials and the hanging of every general, every politician, and every media boss who participated in it.

If our people are to survive we must know what's happening in the world around us. We must know the truth about what has happened to us in the past, not lies designed to benefit the Jews. You know, I harp on this point a lot, but that is because it is of supreme importance. Some people deliberately avoid understanding that. They pretend that it should be of no concern to us who controls our communications media. Someone has to control them, and so it may as well be Jews, they think. How does that hurt us, they ask. We can still get the latest basketball scores. We can still find out what the weather forecast is. We can still watch our favorite game show or

situation comedy. Why should we be concerned that it's the Jews providing these things for us instead of someone else?

Let me tell you again why we should be concerned, and I'll say it slowly this time. We were not told by the media about what the Communists were doing in the Soviet Union in the 1920s and the 1930s, because the Jews didn't want us to know. It might turn us against Communism, and in the Communist Soviet Union Jews were riding high. The Jews didn't want us to be against Communism. So there were no Hollywood films showing Russian and Ukrainian farmers dying of starvation while Jewish commissars ate caviar. Instead, what we got from the mid-1930s on was anti-German films and anti-German propaganda in the newspapers and on the radio. The Jews wanted us to be anti-German, because the Germans were kicking the Jews out of Germany. We were lied to so much and for so long that we ended up allying ourselves with the Communists in order to destroy the Germans. And in 1943, when the German Army discovered the bodies of those 15,000 Polish officers and intellectuals who had been murdered by the Communists, the Jewish media over here lied to us again and told us that the Germans had done it. And it was all of these lies which led directly to all of those women in the mountain villages around Monte Cassino being gang-raped by Moroccan soldiers in May 1944. And the same lies led to the gang-rape and the mass murder of millions of Germans in the years after that.

But for these lies we never would have been involved in a war in Europe, even with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. But for these lies, Communism would have been crushed in Europe 50 years sooner. But for these lies, the most horrible crimes in history would have been avoided.

So it does matter who controls the media. It mattered then, and it matters now, because we're still being lied to. It is the worst sort of irresponsibility to imagine that you will be nice by not noticing what the Jews are doing with the media and by politely accepting all of their "Holocaust" claims. That is not nice. That is criminal. People who thought like that are partly responsible for all of the crimes of the Second World War. Until we take the media away from the liars, we will blunder into one crime after another and one catastrophe after another. We can't afford many more.

Right and Wrong

"Diversity" Destroys Morality

When I was a little boy I was taught that it is bad to lie. I was taught that it is always better to tell the truth, even if that sometimes puts one at a disadvantage. For example, if my mother asked me, "Bill, did you eat all of the cookies in the cookie jar?" and I had done it, I knew that I was supposed to say, "Yes, mother, I did," even though it might mean a whipping for me.

I believe that I was taught this pretty well, because I always felt guilty, I felt very bad, when I lied to avoid some unpleasantness or to gain some advantage. Actually, I usually told the truth, and as I grew up I admired and respected people who had the courage to be truthful when it was disadvantageous to them.

But as I grew up I also learned that life is a complicated business, and that sometimes it isn't easy to decide what is right and what is wrong. For example, suppose one is in a war: is it right to lie to the enemy? In a war there will be situations in which the disadvantage in telling the truth is not just to oneself, but also to one's people. Should one put the obligation to tell the truth above the obligation to protect one's people?

I thought about that one for a while. I decided that while there may have been, in the past, wars between gentlemen, where being truthful even to the enemy was the right thing, being truthful to the sort of enemies one was likely to encounter today could not be justified.

That decision moved me onto the rather slippery terrain of situational ethics. After the Second World War a lot of people skated pretty far out onto the thin ice of that terrain: they decided that what is right and what is wrong has no absolute meaning at all, that it all depends upon the situation one finds oneself in at the moment. They went much further in that direction than I was willing to go. As a practical matter, they abandoned ethics altogether, although they probably wouldn't agree with that assessment. From my point of view, for right and wrong to have any meaning in the moral sense, they must have the same meaning at least most of the time. One might be justified in making occasional rare exceptions -- in time of war, for example -- but most of the time one must have ethical rules which don't change to suit the situation or the crowd one happens to be with at the moment. If one has one set of rules when one is with Christians, a different set when one is with Jews, a third set when one is in the company of homosexuals, different sets of rules for Democrats and Republicans, and so on -- then from my point of view one should be looked on as an unprincipled or unethical person.

This drift away from a generally agreed upon definition of right and wrong to the sort of extreme situational ethics one sees in public and private life today has been a natural consequence of the increasing degree of "diversity," of inhomogeneity and chaos, in American society since the Second World War. That is one more reason why we must return to a homogeneous society if we ever want to have a moral society and a moral government again. People who tell you that we can have both morality and at the same time diversity of the sort the government and the media are pushing just don't know what they're talking about.

I don't know whether or not you've been around homosexuals enough to get a feeling for the generally different attitude toward life which prevails among them. It's not just that they have different sexual practices: they are a group which has abandoned completely the absolute ethics that I grew up with, and they have adopted instead the view that whatever **feels** good at the moment **is** good. It's a totally hedonistic view of life. Personally I wouldn't care what homosexuals thought or how they behaved, if they lived in a separate society of their own. Unfortunately, they don't, and I see homosexual ethics rubbing off on a lot of otherwise normal people. This has become an especially severe problem since the government and the media have declared homosexuality to be socially acceptable. In cities like Washington, New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, the heterosexual yuppies invite homosexual yuppies to their cocktail parties and vice versa. This explains, I think, why the yuppies around Bill and Hillary Clinton -- and I'm talking now about the heterosexual yuppies -- don't see anything wrong with the fact that the President of the United States exposes himself to female employees and asks for sex, runs around with cocaine dealers, invites Chinese gangsters to sleep in the White House in return for large envelopes full of cash, and lies continuously. That's the sort of world these yuppies live in. It's a pretty degenerate, depraved sort of world, where anything goes.

Most of the time we ordinary people out beyond the beltway don't hear about the degeneracy and the depravity in which these people are immersed. The media cover for them. The Jews in the media understand that many of us still operate by the old rules and that we would be shocked if we learned the details about what goes on in the world of the Clintonistas. So ordinarily they don't tell us about the details.

It used to work this way back during the Vietnam war too. The Jews would organize a big demonstration in Washington, and I'd go downtown to observe, because I was interested in the types of people who were participating, how the demonstrations were organized, and so on. And I'd see the demonstration led by a bunch of New York Jews carrying a big, red banner which stretched clear across the street and had big pictures of Marx and Lenin and the words "Revolutionary Communist Party" on it. And there would be hundreds of people scattered among the demonstrators carrying Communist Viet Cong flags. And then I would watch the television coverage of the demonstration on the evening news, and I would be amazed. I would ask myself, "Is this the same demonstration I saw this afternoon?" The news cameramen would manage to miss completely the big Revolutionary Communist Party banner and the Viet Cong flags. Instead they would focus on some woman pushing a baby carriage with a baby in it. What was clearly a pro-Viet Cong demonstration they called a "peace" demonstration, and the coverage of it was sanitized, so that the folks out in Kansas or Iowa watching on television would get the impression that the demonstrators were mostly just ordinary people like themselves.

And the controlled media do a similar job of sanitizing their coverage of the lives of the rich and powerful -- so long as those being covered are Politically Correct, of course. But sometimes there's a slipup. That's what happened at a big party for the rich and powerful in San Francisco a while back. On May 3 a man named Jack Davis had a birthday party for himself and invited all of the political bigshots. Davis is a well-known political fixer and campaign consultant in San Francisco, and so the mayor came, the sheriff came, and so did all of the other top politicians and media bosses.

Davis is a homosexual, and his party reflected this. There was a male striptease show, semi-nude men in leather paraphernalia and tattoos wandered about, and various sex acts took place in full view of the guests. Then a pair of performers put on a sado-masochist act. It would take me far beyond the bounds of decency to describe in detail what they did to each other, but it ended with one of the performers taking off his pants and bending over while the other used the neck of a whisky bottle to perform an indecent act on him.

To homosexuals this sort of thing is all great fun, and the Politically Correct heterosexual yuppies of San Francisco have learned to regard it as "normal" and take it in stride. But someone new to this sort of thing had been invited to the party by mistake and found it so shocking that he risked being considered "homophobic" -- in San Francisco that's as bad as being a "racist" or an "anti-Semite" -- he risked being considered "homophobic" by describing to some media people he knew who weren't at the party what it had been like. So, the story started coming out, and the media people who had been at the party had to say something about it and pretend to be shocked in order to protect their image in the eyes of the not-so-rich and not-so-powerful citizens of San Francisco. Then the sheriff, the mayor, and the other politicians who had been at the party had to pretend to be shocked too, in order to cover their asses, if you'll pardon my expression. Eventually the *Sunday Times* of London carried a full account of the party in its May 11, 1997, issue.

The whole thing was like the story by Hans Christian Anderson about the emperor's new clothes. If the newcomer hadn't popped the balloon by saying, "This is disgusting and depraved," everyone else would have kept on pretending that everything was fine. As it is, although the *San Francisco Chronicle* felt obliged to say something -- after the whistle had been blown -- most Americans outside the San Francisco area still haven't heard about this party. The media bosses decided that it wasn't newsworthy. No point in getting the folks in Kansas and Iowa riled up.

Of course, most of the private parties thrown by the rich and degenerate in Hollywood, New York, or Washington don't have a homosexual theme. San Francisco is a special place. But the degeneracy nevertheless has permeated the whole stratum of Politically Correct yuppie society. In particular, the Clintons and the people around them are of the same sort as those at Jack Davis's San Francisco birthday party: the same sort of politicians, the same sort of media people. They are people with hedonist ethics, the ethics of homosexuals.

So what should we old-fashioned people, who still believe in right and wrong, do about this situation? Even though there are more of us than there are of them, we can't afford to do what many of us really are itching to do. The people on our side still are too divided, too disorganized, and too confused for that to be successful. We must not depart from a policy of legality and non-violence at this time.

We know that a society without a soul, a society without a strong moral basis, cannot long survive. Indeed, we can see this society unraveling almost month by month. But we must not just sit and wait for the cleansing fire. There must be something left after the fire in order to build a new society. We have a responsibility to do whatever is necessary to guarantee this. Our morality must not be just a passive morality, which keeps us from doing what is wrong. It also must be an

active morality, which leads us to do what is right. It must be a morality which leads us to plan, to prepare, to build, to preserve -- and eventually to fight.

In planning, in preparing, in building, we must understand why we have this problem of moral decay, of moral breakdown, in our society now. Our ancestors in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, in Germany, and in the other parts of Europe from which they came brought to America a common morality which was many centuries old. Why this sudden collapse during the past 50 years or so?

I've already pointed out that as we moved from a homogeneous, essentially European or White society in America before the Second World War to a multiracial, multicultural chaos today we were bound to experience a certain degree of moral confusion, of moral disorientation. But we also must note that during the past 50 years or so the mass media have had an unprecedented degree of influence on manners and morals in America, and during that same period the mass media in America have been almost entirely under the control of people whose ancestors did not share the morality of **our** ancestors.

The mass influx of Jews into America began toward the end of the last century. By the early part of this century they were buying up American newspapers and magazines as fast as they could. Then they began moving into radio broadcasting. In the 1930s they virtually took over Hollywood. After the Second World War, when television first began having an impact on the thinking of Americans, Jews were in total control of this new medium. The children of the 1960s were raised on television. The television receiver was their baby-sitter, their foster parent, their teacher. And what television taught them was that their ancestors were exploiters, imperialists, and bigots: an obnoxious, pushy, self-righteous, and hateful bunch of people who stole America from the peace-loving, inoffensive Indians. Television taught them to despise their own traditions and folkways. Television began to instill in them a sense of guilt for being White: a sense of guilt for being better off than non-Whites, for being more successful, more creative, and more civilized than the inhabitants of the non-White world. Then gradually, subtly, slyly at first and more and more boldly and arrogantly later, television began teaching them the new morality, the morality of hedonism, the Clinton morality.

We are fortunate in being able to see some of the consequences of this new morality now, to see some of its effects on our society. In a sense we are even fortunate in having this new morality in the highest levels of our government, where it is especially conspicuous. Most of all, we are fortunate that it has infected only a minority of our people, an especially susceptible minority, and that the healthier majority are beginning to react strongly against it.

Very little of this reaction can be credited to those who traditionally have been the guardians of morality in our society: namely the leaders of our churches. They have, almost to a man, sold out to the enemy, sold out to the corrupters of our people. They have eagerly participated in promoting multiculturalism and multiracialism and the acceptance of homosexuality and of moral relativism generally, in the hope of getting a pat on the head from the masters of the media. No, when the healthy elements of our people have rejected this new morality, it has been an instinctive reaction, rather than anything taught them by today's churches.

The media really are the key to this problem. It is they which have undermined the old morality, promoted the new morality, and also taken the primary role in destroying the homogeneity in which the old morality was at home and brought about the social and racial chaos which is congenial to the new morality.

If we are to have more than an instinctive and uninformed reaction to what the media have done, if we are to have a rejection of the new morality which is not only instinctive but also is informed and organized, then we must have media of our own.

American Dissident Voices broadcasts and *Free Speech* are just a small start toward what we must build. We must build our media to the point where we are able to talk with all of our people. We must do much more than just inform them about what is going on in the world today. We also must help them to understand that their instincts in rejecting the Clinton morality are healthy. We must teach them to have faith in their instincts. And then we must begin restoring the knowledge of our traditions, the knowledge of our roots, which they were robbed of by the controlled media. We must build again in our people self-confidence and a sense of purpose. Eventually we must be able to bring our people to the point that when they hear what goes on at one of these Politically Correct yuppie parties in Washington or San Francisco or anywhere else, they won't just be shocked and disgusted but also will be determined to put a final end to it: to root these people out of our government and out of our media and to make it impossible for them to exert their evil influence on our children or on our society.

That's a big job, a really big job. But it's a job that must be done. I believe that together we can do it. I believe that more and more people will join our effort to get the job done, because the disgust with the Clinton morality is growing and spreading. More and more people, even though they don't understand all of the things we've talked about today, know that they're fed up with what's going on. What we have to do now is help all of these people understand. I'll do part of that work, but you must do part too. I'm counting on your support.

The Morality of the Immigration Problem

If you live in any large city on the East Coast or the West Coast or in Texas, you know that immigration is a problem which is destroying America. Actually, there are many other parts of the country where the destructive effects of the government's current immigration policies are obvious.

I am fortunate to be able to live and work in a rural, mountainous part of the country where the population has not been affected much by non-White immigration. Perhaps for that reason whenever business takes me to a large city I am struck forcefully by what the immigration of the last couple of decades has done to our country. When I visited Los Angeles recently, I was impressed by my observation that the entire infrastructure of the city is in the hands of non-Whites, nearly all of them recent immigrants. Walk into any hotel or restaurant in Los Angeles, get on any bus, buy something in any store, and you are dealing almost exclusively with non-White clerks, waiters, cooks, and drivers. Observe the sanitation workers, the public utilities crews, the road-repair laborers. They are non-White immigrants, nearly all of them. If the non-Whites wanted to, they could immobilize the city, and the Whites would be helpless.

Los Angeles, with its *Blade Runner* ambience, is perhaps an extreme example, but the same process is taking place in other cities all across America. One sees a few White people in suits carrying briefcases, and everyone else on the streets is non-White. The people in the suits and carrying the briefcases don't seem to be alarmed by this situation. They regard all of the Brown, Yellow, and Black people around them as very useful, because they are doing jobs that White people don't want to do and thereby are making it possible for the people with the suits and briefcases to live a more comfortable and prosperous life.

What a selfish and short-sighted view of the situation that is!

I lived in Los Angeles more than 40 years ago. How different it was then! There were still far too many non-Whites in the area even then, but you could walk into a restaurant and expect to have a White waiter or waitress. You could expect to ride a bus with a White driver. And in the 1950s people who had been living in the Los Angeles area since before the Second World War told me how much the city had gone downhill since the 1930s. In the 1930s it had really been a White city: clean, uncrowded, almost no crime, a very pleasant place to live. Today, of course, between the Blacks and the non-White immigrants, it's become a hell hole. There are large sections of the city where a White man dare not go, even in the daytime. Mark Fuhrman didn't develop his views in a vacuum. He learned about non-Whites on the streets of Los Angeles.

We can see the same thing happening all over America. What used to be a White country 60 years ago is very rapidly becoming a non-White country. Mark Fuhrman and I are not the only White Americans who have noticed that, but there are far too many White Americans who pretend **not** to notice, because **pretending** is what is Politically Correct these days.

I go on many radio and television interview programs, and when I point out the damage that immigration is doing to America, I nearly always am countered by a host who pretends that our

government's immigration policy is a wonderful thing. I run into all of the standard cliches: Don't you know that we are a nation of immigrants? We all are descended from immigrants. Immigration is what built this country. Our diversity is what makes us strong, and so on.

When I point out that the immigrants who built America were immigrants from Europe, and that the immigrants who are destroying America now are from everywhere **but** Europe, the host asks me incredulously whether or not I really believe that it makes any difference where the immigrants come from. He pretends to believe that immigrants from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, or Mexico have the same effect on American life that immigrants from Sweden, Poland, England, Ireland, or Germany have had. He **pretends** to believe this, because otherwise he would be charged with being a racist, and then he would no longer have a job as a radio or TV host. And I am afraid that there are idiots out there who really do believe that, because that's what they're being taught in their schools and their churches, as well as by their TV.

Back in the 1930s Americans had a little more sense about things like race and immigration. Immigration was from Europe, and there were laws to keep it that way. After the Second World War the propagandists in Hollywood and New York started beating the drums for racial integration and for opening America's borders to the Third World. A huge Jewish propaganda campaign was aimed at changing America's immigration laws. The Jews and their allies wanted to switch immigration from Europe to the Third World. Of course, they didn't **say** that. They just said that they wanted America's immigration laws to be more "fair." It was "racist" to keep Asian Indians and Haitians out and let Norwegians and Frenchmen in. They didn't want too many, just a few to make it clear that Americans weren't bigots.

New York Jewish Congressman Emanuel Celler led the campaign in the Congress, and he recruited renegade Whites, such as Ted Kennedy, to help him. In 1965 this campaign finally succeeded in making America's immigration laws "fairer," and so now we have the situation we can see in Los Angeles and in many other American cities today.

If I were an observer from Mars, I might wonder at what sort of collective death wish had infected the minds of White Americans, what sort of suicidal insanity had gripped them to make them put up with this situation. As a Martian observer I might study the matter with detachment.

But I'm not from Mars. This is **my** country which is being destroyed. These are **my** people who are letting themselves be led with little protest into the slaughterhouse. And that is exactly where we are headed: into the slaughterhouse. All for the sake of Political Correctness; all for the sake of racial equality; all for the sake of "diversity." It is truly insane.

America becomes darker -- racially darker -- every year, and that is the direct result of our government's immigration policy. Sometime around the middle of the next century, about 50 years from now, America will become a majority non-White country. We White people, we descendants of the European immigrants who built America, will be a minority in our own country. And if we don't like it, why then we can be dealt with the way they deal with ethnic conflicts in places like Rwanda. Or the way they dealt with the racial problem in Haiti, when the Black majority simply butchered the entire White minority 200 years ago. In large parts of the

American Southwest, including California, the Mexicans already talk among themselves about what they will do to the gringos as soon as they have the power to do it. It is, of course, a fact that our ancestors took the American Southwest away from their ancestors. We were stronger than they, and we wanted their land. As soon as they become stronger, they intend to take it back again -- and in the process do a bit of "ethnic cleansing" to get rid of any remaining gringos. That is the way the world works. That is the way the world always has worked. That is the way it always **will** work.

Why do we have so many idiots among us today who believe that the lion can be taught to lie down with the lamb? Why do we have so many idiots who believe that the laws of Nature have been suspended simply because these laws are not Politically Correct? Why do we have so many men among us who have lost their manly instincts and believe that we should no longer fight to protect what is ours, that we no longer should defend our borders, our part of the earth, and that we should bare our throats to our enemies?

I've answered these questions before, and I'll answer them again now. Many of our people don't really think about these things. Many of our people simply accept them because of their selfishness and their shortsightedness. The men with the briefcases and the suits are glad to have someone to mow their lawns and collect their garbage and do the other things that they consider beneath their own dignity and the dignity of their children.

When I was a boy I used to mow lawns and do every other kind of rough and dirty work to earn money for the things I wanted. I even picked cotton and helped bring in other crops. I worked on an egg farm for a while, washing eggs. That was nasty work, and I didn't like it at all, but I did it anyway. But nowadays this work is considered beneath the dignity of White teenagers as well as adults. Now we hire non-Whites to do it. What a terrible, terrible mistake that is! For the sake of our momentary convenience, our momentary luxury, we give our whole heritage away -- and our children's heritage. We protect them from having to do strenuous or unpleasant work -- but at the cost of growing up in a society where they will become a minority during their lifetimes and will be at the mercy of a non-White majority. That is the very worst sort of selfishness and shortsightedness.

In contrast to these people who don't think about what non-White immigration is doing to America because at the moment they believe that it is benefiting them, there are people who **do** think about it -- after a fashion. These are the ones who believe that the laws of Nature have been repealed. These are the ones who babble about how wonderful "diversity" is because they hear other people babbling about it on television. These are the ones who claim to believe that there is no difference between Haitian immigrants and Norwegian immigrants. These are the ones who claim to look forward eagerly to the time when Whites will be a minority in America, because then we will have an end to racism and everyone finally will be able to get along with everyone else.

When I am on radio or television talk shows I run into lots of these idiots. I run into people who tell me that they wouldn't want to live in an America which had become White again. There wouldn't be enough "diversity" to make their jaded lives interesting. They would no longer have their choice of Vietnamese or Mexican restaurants, no longer be able to see such an interesting

mix of skin colors and racial types everywhere, no longer be able to listen to Jewish comics and admire Black athletes. They would be very bored if all of their neighbors and co-workers were White, they tell me.

Part of this pathology is related to the breakdown in the sense of community, the sense of family, of belonging, of rootedness, which used to characterize White Americans and its replacement by extreme individualism. Fifty or sixty years ago Americans used to identify very strongly with their community, with their ethnic group, with their race. They felt a sense of responsibility for others of their own kind around them. We were like a large, extended family.

Now too many people are retreating into individualism, caring only about their own pleasures and their own interests. They do not even feel any sense of responsibility for their own children. They are not concerned about the type of world their children or their grandchildren will inherit. All that matters is their own gratification -- now.

And I run into people who spout the sort of idiot pop-morality promoted by the media. "We took California and Texas away from the Mexicans," they say, "so why should we complain if they take it back now? We have no right to keep them from crossing the border, because it used to be their land." If you want to see one of these idiots backtrack in a hurry, tell him you believe that he has hit on an excellent principle, which ought to be applied in the Middle East. We certainly should not help the Jews hang onto land which they have stolen from the Palestinians. Instead, we should be helping the Palestinians take it back. That will shut him up.

Of course, there is nothing rational or consistent about the beliefs or the arguments of the people who want to keep America's borders open. These people take the positions they do simply because they are the positions which are promoted by the media, positions which are currently fashionable, and these people would rather **die** than be thought **unfashionable.**

I'll give you a position which is rational and consistent. We took this land because we were stronger than our opponents and because we needed the land to raise our families. As long as we remained strong in spirit as well as in body we held onto the land so that our children and their children also would have land to raise their families. But then malicious aliens came into our land and got their hands on our information media and our entertainment media, and these aliens spread spiritual poison among our people, so that our spirits became corrupted and our minds became confused. These aliens were able to make some of us feel guilty for taking this land for ourselves. They were able to make some of us feel guilty for being concerned about our own people, for being race-conscious. And they were able to promote their pop-morality among the fashion-conscious. But those of us who are not confused and whose souls are not corrupted are growing in numbers now. We are becoming stronger.

And we understand that the strong will inherit the earth. We understand that if the aliens are able to keep our people weak and confused, then some other race will take our land away from our children and use it to raise their families instead. We understand that people who are race-conscious are stronger than those who are not. We understand that people who feel a sense of community with others of their kind are stronger than those who are concerned only about themselves.

We understand that it is not moral to be weak or to favor other races over our own. It is not moral to give away what our ancestors struggled and died for. We understand that it is moral to survive, that it is moral to be strong, that it is moral to defend our land, that it is moral to fight against those who would take our land, just as it is moral to fight against those who would corrupt our spirits. We understand that the laws of Nature have not been repealed, that they rule now, just as they always have ruled. We understand that Nature is not immoral, and that we are not immoral when we follow the instincts which Nature has given us. It is moral to act in accord with those instincts and try to build a secure future for our posterity.

It is moral for us to mow our own lawns, drive our own buses, collect our own garbage, cook our own food, wait on our own tables, and pick our own crops. We understand that no honest work is beneath our dignity or the dignity of our children. We understand that it is better for our children to do strenuous work and dirty work and to become physically hard and disciplined than it is for them to grow up soft.

We understand these things, and we accept our responsibility to help all of our people understand them also. The purpose of *American Dissident Voices* and *Free Speech* is to spread understanding among our people. Spreading understanding is the purpose of everything we do. And it is a difficult task, because the malicious aliens who control the mainstream media are working overtime to corrupt and confuse, and their resources are greater than ours at this time.

But we are growing. We are becoming stronger. More people are beginning to understand. And when we have spread understanding to enough of our people, then we will be able to put an end to the non-White immigration which is destroying America and destroying our heritage, and we will be able to begin undoing the damage. With understanding, with the adherence to a real morality, the morality of Nature, the morality of our ancestors, instead of the pop-morality promoted by the alien masters of the media, we will be able to solve every other problem confronting our people in addition to the immigration problem.

We can do it. Together we can do it.

Why Our Government Is Corrupt

Well, Bill Clinton's handlers have him working on a new program to reduce the amount of racial hatred in America. The theory seems to be that if they can get Mr. Clinton to keep his trousers up long enough, perhaps he can do some things to help Blacks and Whites get along better. I doubt it.

Actually, I'm not interested in having Blacks and Whites get along better together. I want Blacks and Whites separated. In the long run, that's the only way to eliminate racial animosity, racial resentment, racial friction. And it's the only way that either race can survive in the long run. But the people who're behind all of these programs for making Blacks and Whites live with each other and like it aren't really concerned about our survival. They themselves are neither Black nor White, and their only concern is to keep both races under control.

Race relations really aren't the main thing I want to discuss. I want to talk about government programs for solving problems generally. I wonder if you have become as cynical about such programs as I have. Many people are concerned about the declining educational standards in America, and so the government has had one program after another to improve education. And of course, educational standards have continued to fall.

Look at the programs. Look at the details. Typically they're a hodgepodge of half-hearted, lukewarm semi-measures. One gets the impression that their real purpose is to fool people into **thinking** that the government is doing something about the problem.

Why is that? Why do things in this country continue to get worse and worse while the government spends more and more of our money on programs which are supposed to make things better

The basic reason is that as the population of the United States has become more and more diverse, the country has become more and more difficult to govern. It has become more and more difficult to devise programs that will make most people happy or that will serve most people's needs.

Consider, for example, the schools. Fifty years ago, before the schools were racially integrated by government decree, schools were either Black or they were White, for all practical purposes. In the White schools there was a reasonable degree of homogeneity, and the government could make a program for White schools based on reasonable assumptions about the students to which it was to be applied. The same was true for Black schools -- but the assumptions about the needs of Black students were, of course, different from the assumptions about White students, and so the programs for Black schools would be different from those for White schools. Which is to say, the programs were tailored much more closely to the people they were intended to serve and therefore were much more likely to be successful.

Of course, even in schools where the students and teachers all were of the same race, there was a range of abilities, of interests, and of behavioral characteristics. But this range was small enough

so that one program still could work reasonably well for everyone in a school system. If the programs could be tailored more closely to individual abilities, interests, or behavior, they generally worked even better. For example, there might be one program for students of high ability and one for students of average ability.

To people with a democratic turn of mind, the very idea that some students might have more ability than others is abhorrent, so even before the racial integration of the schools there was resistance to programs which were tailored to these differences. The Politically Correct idea was that everyone should fit the same mold, and one program should work for all.

After the schools were racially integrated and Political Correctness became the law of the land, we had an impossible situation. The temperaments and behavioral norms for Black students are quite different from those for White students, and the scholastic abilities of Black students are substantially lower than the average for Whites, and so programs intended to apply to integrated schools were almost guaranteed to be ineffective.

That hasn't stopped the government's program-makers from continuing to come out with one new program after another for improving America's schools, but all of real significance that has been done in the schools is a lowering of both the standard of conduct and the academic standard in order to accommodate the much greater diversity in the students.

And what has been true of the schools has been true of just about every other facet of our society. As our society has become less homogeneous and more diverse, it has been harder and harder to devise programs which work well. Programs have necessarily had to become less specific and more general in order to accommodate a more diverse population, and to the extent that programs are less specific they are less effective, as a rule.

It's not just that greater diversity makes it harder to solve problems: the greater diversity is itself the cause of many of the problems. The problem of racial hatred which Mr. Clinton has been pretending to address recently is an excellent example of this. Why do we have so much racial conflict and racial antagonism in our society today? It is because the government has insisted on increasing the racial diversity in every sector of our society, has insisted on bringing more and more non-Whites into the country and then forcing us all together, whether we want to be together or not. **It is diversity and forced mixing which cause race hatred, nothing else.**

There are a number of organizations in the hate industry in this country: organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center. These organizations make money from hate. They keep track of what they call "hate crimes," and they tell their supporters that hate in America is increasing, so please send money so they can fight it. The more hate they have to report, the more money they make. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that all of these hate-industry organizations are strongly in favor of more "diversity" in America and more forced mixing. They know what it takes to bring in contributions from their supporters.

Mr. Clinton, who is in the pocket of these organizations, is working on a new program to combat hate, he says, while at the same time he is promoting more "diversity" and more mixing.

Why do we have so many of these phony programs, these unrealistic and unworkable programs, which seem to be designed more to fool the public into thinking that the government is doing something than actually to solve the problems they purport to address?

Is it not because the whole system of government in this country has become crooked? Isn't it because the politicians who dream up these programs and administer them are people accustomed to lying to us and pretending to believe what they don't believe and pretending to be what they aren't? Isn't it because the people who give us the programs that are supposed to improve our educational system understand that there's not really much that can be done to improve education without addressing the race issue, without addressing the fact that racial integration is at the root of the failure of our educational system, and as long as they are not allowed to address this issue all they **can** do is go through the motions and try to fool the public? Isn't it because Bill Clinton, crooked though he is, is smart enough to understand that the racial friction and hatred can only grow as he pushes for more racial "diversity" in American life, because that is what his handlers demand, and so all he can do is pretend to deal with the problem?

And why do we have a crooked and ineffective government, when we desperately need a government that is honest and competent? Why must we put our lives in the hands of crooked politicians, who only pretend to be concerned with solving the problems which beset us, when we desperately need real leadership? Why is the **system** corrupt?

Is it not because the system is manipulated by the people who control the news and entertainment media in this country? Is it not because the media have gained such a powerful grip on the whole political process in America that they can virtually dictate to the politicians? Every politician who offers himself as a candidate for public office knows that the number of votes he receives will depend on the way in which the media present him to the public. Whether he wins or not will depend almost entirely on the image of him which the media create.

Bill Clinton is a perfect example of this. He has palled around with drug dealers and gangsters throughout his political life. His own brother was convicted and sent to prison for selling cocaine right out of the governor's mansion in Little Rock while Bill Clinton was governor of Arkansas. His habit of sending Arkansas state troopers to scout up women and bring them to him was well known among his associates long before the Paula Jones case. The media people certainly knew about his drug connections and his use of Arkansas state employees to satisfy his sexual appetite. If they had revealed these things to the American people in 1992, if they really had made an issue of these things, Bill Clinton never would have been selected as the Democrat Party's candidate. If the media had made an issue of the fact that Bill Clinton was leading pro-Viet Cong demonstrations back in the 1960s when 58,000 young Americans were being killed by the Viet Cong, he never could have been elected.

But the media chose **not** to make an issue of these things, because Bill Clinton is exactly the sort of man they want in public office: a man without principles or morals, a man who will do whatever seems advantageous to him -- and in particular will do whatever the media bosses tell him to do in return for their support. Now some of Clinton's immoral and illegal activities are beginning to come out. The media are beginning to tell us about some of Bill Clinton's activities,

although certainly not about all of them, because for one thing he cannot be President for a third term and for another thing it's their way of keeping him under control. By keeping the pressure on him, by keeping him worried about the Paula Jones case and the illegal campaign contributions and a few other things, they keep him constantly aware of his dependence on them. If the media began harping on all of the immoral and illegal activities in which Bill Clinton has been involved they could have him impeached. They could have him out of the White House and in prison. And he knows that. So he is not likely to try to do anything contrary to the wishes of the media bosses during the next two and a half years.

Bill Clinton is an example, but the process of media control is basically the same for all of the politicians. And so the real question for us is, **why** do the media bosses use their control over the political process in America to damage and weaken America? Why did they push for an immigration policy which is flooding America with non-Whites? Why do they push for more and more racial "diversity," when it is clear that these policies are destroying not only our schools but our whole society?

We know the answer, don't we? I've talked about it many times. The answer is that the people who control our mass media, our media of news and entertainment, are not our people. They are not people who share our interests, our concerns, our values. They are an alien people, with different interests, different concerns, different values. They are a people unto themselves. They are Jews.

Every time I'm on a radio or television interview program and I mention this fact, every time I begin talking about the Jewish control of the media, the host will try to deny it or make light of it or change the subject. They know who signs their paychecks, and they will lie to protect those people. But the facts really are undeniable.

Let's look at some of those facts. The two biggest media conglomerates in the country, the two biggest media empires, are Time-Warner-CNN and the Disney Company. Time-Warner-CNN is controlled by Gerald Levin. Through the Time-Warner-CNN media empire he controls a vast array of news and entertainment media: publishing, films, and television. And Mr. Levin is Jewish.

The Disney Company, which also owns the ABC television network and lots of other things, is controlled by Michael Eisner, who also is Jewish. The Disney Company was built by one of our people, by Walt Disney, and it used to produce healthy and wholesome entertainment. But then Mr. Eisner got control of it, and now it's just part of a Jewish media empire: debased films, television, and publishing.

Or consider newspapers. The big three, the three most politically influential newspapers in the United States, are the *New York Times,* the *Wall Street Journal,* and the *Washington Post.* All are owned by Jews. They were not created by Jews originally, but they were taken over by Jews and they are now owned by Jews. All three of them. Quite a coincidence, isn't it, when you consider that Jews make up just two and a half per cent of the U.S. population?

Or consider news magazines. There are really just three news magazines in this country of real significance: *Time, Newsweek,* and *U.S. News and World Report.* They're all under Jewish control. All three of them. *Time* is part of Mr. Levin's Time-Warner-CNN empire. *Newsweek* is owned by the Jewish Washington Post Company. And *U.S. News and World Report* is owned by Mortimer Zuckerman, who also just happens to be a Jew.

If you doubt any of this, if you're not absolutely certain about the Jewish control of the mass media -- and I can understand that some of you may be uncertain about this, because the media lie about it and try to mislead people -- if you have any doubt at all about what I've told you, check it out for yourself. If you think, for example, that maybe Mr. Levin is an Irishman instead of a Jew, or that Mr. Eisner may really be a German or a Scotsman instead of a Jew, check it out. The facts aren't really all that difficult to find. If you think I haven't told you the truth about who owns *U.S. News and World Report,* check it out for yourself. If you think that the films coming out of Hollywood that promote interracial sex and homosexuality, that tell us that we owe the Jews a living because of the "Holocaust" -- if you think these films are produced by anyone but Jews, check it out. The facts are available for anyone with eyes to see.

The Jews control the media. But why do they use their control of the media to corrupt our government and destroy our society? Why when a Jew like Eisner takes over a non-Jewish film company like Disney, does he immediately change the type of films the company produces? Why does he switch from wholesome films like *Snow White* and *Fantasia* to films like *The Crying Game* and *Priest,* films which promote homosexuality and racial mixing? Why do these powerful Jews promote things like gangsta' rap in a way deliberately intended to corrupt young White people? Why does MTV (which, incidentally, is owned by the Jew Sumner Redstone, through his media holding company, Viacom) specialize in such degenerate entertainment aimed at our young people?

They do it because that is their nature. They have always done that sort of thing. They always seek control, they always seek power, and then they use that power to corrupt and destroy. That's what they're doing to America now. And if you want to know what you can do about it, what we can do about it together, join the National Alliance.

The Campaign Against "Hate Crime"

Mr. Clinton says he is involved in a campaign to end racial hatred and "pull America together." What this actually means is that Mr. Clinton and his handlers want White Americans to shut up and stop complaining about the government's programs to cram more non-Whites down their throats. White Americans have made it clear that they not only want an end to the Clinton government's program of continuing to bring more non-Whites into the country, but they also want the government to end its programs aimed at forcing Whites and non-Whites together and providing special privileges for non-Whites: programs such as affirmative action, for example.

But the Clinton government needs these programs. Signing up a million immigrants, nearly all of them non-White, so that they could vote in the 1996 Presidential contest, was important to Mr. Clinton's re-election. And to keep them voting Democratic the government needs to reward them with programs like affirmative action. So the Clinton government has denounced White opposition to these programs as "racial hatred" and is hoping that that label will intimidate opponents of the Clinton racial programs into silence.

That's a clever tactic by Mr. Clinton and the media, but it's also a typically crooked tactic. There are very few White Americans who are in favor of racial hatred -- or hatred of **any** sort. We are not by nature haters. Most of us don't approve of it. Mr. Clinton and the media bosses understand that, and that's why they always begin talking about "hate" when they want to shut up their opponents. They want the public to believe that any opposition to the government's racial programs is "hate."

Now, the truth of the matter is that while most White Americans don't want to be thought of as "haters," most of us also don't want more non-Whites crammed down our throats by the government and the media. That's not because we're "haters"; it's because we **know** a few things about non-Whites. We know enough to be quite sure that we don't want or need any more of them in our society. We don't want to mix with them -- not because we are a bunch of hateful bigots, as the controlled media and Mr. Clinton would have everyone believe, not because we are full of blind prejudice, but because we **know** a few things about non-Whites. We know about their proclivity to murder, rape, and steal, for example.

When I say something like that on a radio talk show, I get howls of protest from the Politically Correct host. "You're worried about murderers?" the host screeches. "What about Timothy McVeigh? He murdered 168 people, and he's about as White as they come." This is supposed to embarrass me into silence. It 's the same sort of barroom debating tactic they use when I begin talking about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media. Then the Politically Correct host will say, "Jewish media control? What about Ted Turner? He's not a Jew."

No, Ted Turner isn't a Jew, but he has a Jewish boss, because Ted Turner's CNN is a subsidiary of Gerald Levin's Time-Warner media empire. And Timothy McVeigh didn't even put a dent in the racial crime statistics.

Those racial crime statistics are gathered by Mr. Clinton's FBI, because the FBI believes it they can do its job better if it understands what's happening. The controlled media don't like to talk about those statistics, of course, but they are a matter of public record, and any citizen can get them from the Department of Justice. The latest figures I have are for 1995, and they come from the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Report.

This supplementary report contains data from those states which break down their crime reports into White, Hispanic, Black, Asian, and American Indian categories. This is important, because many states lump Whites and Hispanics together in the "White" category, so that what such states report as "White" crime is actually White **and** Hispanic crime. I've taken the data just from those states which break down their crime reports into White, Hispanic, Black, Asian, and American Indian in order to be able to make the most accurate and meaningful comparisons between White crime and non-White crime. What these data show is that in 1995 Asians in the United States committed murders at a rate 1.23 times the White rate. Another way of saying this is that if in a group of one million White people 100 of them committed a murder in 1995, then in a group of one million Asians 123 of them committed a murder in 1995. That is, Asians are 23 per cent more likely to commit murder than Whites are.

That's interesting, because the impression deliberately fostered by the media is that Asians are more law-abiding than Whites. That may have been true 50 years ago, when Asians were a very tiny minority in America and tended to be on their best behavior. Now that we have a lot more of them here and they feel more at home, they are showing their true natures.

American Indians also are more murderous than Whites. They commit murders at twice the White rate.

But that's nothing compared to the Hispanics. They commit murders at 4.8 times the White rate. A Hispanic is nearly **five times** as likely as a White person to be a murderer.

And, as you might have guessed, Blacks take the prize for murderousness. They are 10.1 times as likely as Whites to commit murder. Is it any wonder that most of us don't want Blacks in our schools, our neighborhoods, or our workplaces?

You would hardly guess any of this from listening to Mr. Clinton or reading any of the controlled newspapers. They like to talk about things like the burning of Black churches or other offenses they can attribute to White "haters." They certainly don't like to talk about the fact that Blacks are far more violent and commit far more crimes than Whites. In fact, **every** non-White group in America is more criminal and more violent than Whites. But when Mr. Clinton talks about "hate crimes" he's talking about crimes committed by Whites against non-Whites. That's the kind of crime he wants you to believe is the big problem in America. That's the kind of crime he hints is keeping Blacks and Whites apart. If we could just keep those White "haters" from committing their "hate crimes," he suggests, then we could "pull America together."

One of the goals Mr. Clinton has announced for his program to "pull America together" is "making sure that the American people have facts, not myths, upon which to base their judgments about people of different colors and backgrounds."

But do you really believe that Mr. Clinton is going to give the American people facts about the racial differences in crime rates? I don't believe it. I think Mr. Clinton is just telling us one more lie when he promises us facts. I think that the only things Mr. Clinton will be telling us are tales designed to dampen the resistance of White people to racial mixing.

Mr. Clinton isn't the only one who is lying to us when it comes to racial matters. On June 14 Mr. Clinton gave the commencement speech at the San Diego campus of the University of California, and he used the speech to push his anti-hate campaign. The Associated Press report on that speech stated that Mr. Clinton's governmental appointments "mirror ethnic and racial percentages of the national population."

That is not true. In particular, Mr. Clinton has appointed Jews to government positions at more than **ten times** their percentage of the national population. That's another fact that we won't be hearing from Mr. Clinton, because he would rather have us believe the myth that his appointments mirror the ethnic and racial percentages of the national population.

In his June 14 speech to students in San Diego, Mr. Clinton made the biggest plea yet to keep the affirmative action programs which bring Blacks into universities in far larger numbers than would be the case if admission were determined by academic performance. Affirmative action has been rejected overwhelmingly by the voters, but Bill Clinton, for obvious reasons, doesn't want to end it. Blacks voted overwhelmingly for him in both of his Presidential campaigns, and he wants to keep them on his side.

Do you want to know what causes racial hostility? Do you want to know what causes Whites to resent Blacks? More than anything else, it has been affirmative action. Whites -- even Whites who never think about crime statistics -- resent programs which give Blacks an advantage over them. They resent having academic standards lowered and work performance standards lowered just to make it easier for Blacks. Bill Clinton is a master of misdirection and deceit. He promotes programs which **cause** racial hostility, and at the same time, in the same speech, he blames this hostility on White racists.

In his San Diego speech Mr. Clinton looked out over the graduating students, among whom there were a great many Blacks, nearly all of them there through affirmative action programs, and he put on his best used-car salesman's smile, and he said to the White students, "Now, you be honest with yourselves, and you'll know that you learned a lot more here than you would have if all of the students had looked like you." What a line of baloney! Of course, the media people there -- and the Blacks -- loved that line. But if any of the White students had the courage to buck the pressure to conform and were honest with themselves, what could they say they learned by having the campus packed with affirmative action Blacks? How to cope with the threat of rape on the campus? How to minimize the chance of being mugged if they had to go to the library after dark? Well, yes, those are useful things to know in the sort of place America is becoming under the Clintonistas.

Everyone understands that the White students learned a lot **less** in an affirmative action university than they would have learned in an all-White university, because the standards have been lowered to accommodate the Blacks. Of course, to the trendy, liberal, air-head types who

applauded Mr. Clinton's line of baloney, the really important things to be learned at a university aren't chemistry, mathematics, biology, and history. The important things are learning how to get along in a multiracial world: learning how to smile ingratiatingly and step out of the way when Black ball-players on scholarship come swaggering down a campus sidewalk, learning how to be sensitive and never say anything which minorities might find offensive, learning how to apologize for being White.

It would be bad enough if Mr. Clinton's deceitful campaign to "pull America together" were nothing more than the use of his office as President to promote his multiracial agenda through media events like his speech in San Diego, trying to bully and intimidate the opponents of affirmative action and immigration reform into silence. However, Mr. Clinton's speeches are only one facet of a war against White America that the Clintonistas are waging. The Clinton speeches -- and the favorable media publicity they receive -- are intended to persuade the public that what keeps America from being pulled together are the activities of what the Clintonistas call "hate criminals."

Their definition of a "hate criminal" is any White person who acts or speaks in opposition to their program to continue increasing America's racial "diversity" and racial togetherness. When Mr. Clinton is not trying to salvage his affirmative action schemes and prevent immigration reform, he warns of the need for a crackdown on "hate crime." He cites a few examples of what he means by "hate crime": a homosexual beaten up, a swastika daubed on the door of a Jewish university student, vandalism of a house in a White neighborhood after the house is sold to Blacks. All of his examples just happen to involve alleged actions by Whites. In an announcement from the White House just a week before his San Diego speech, Mr. Clinton said: "It is time for us to mount an all-out assault on hate crimes, to punish them swiftly and severely, and to do more to prevent them from happening in the first place."

We will be hearing much stronger calls for new laws against so-called "hate crimes" as Mr. Clinton's campaign to "pull America together" progresses. We will see a new facet of the campaign emerging: a call for criminalizing Politically Incorrect speech -- what the Clintonistas call "hate speech." It's hard to see how new laws against vandalism or beating up homosexuals can accomplish much, since vandalism and assault already are illegal and have been for a long time. It doesn't really help their campaign much to elevate these offenses from the realm of ordinary crimes to the realm of political crimes -- and you know, really, that's exactly what all of these so-called "hate crimes" are: they are political crimes. What the Clintonistas are aiming at is outlawing Politically Incorrect speech. Everything else is window dressing.

This whole campaign to intimidate Politically Incorrect Americans -- so-called "hate criminals" -- began 20 years ago. In states such as New York and New Jersey where Jews exercised a very large degree of political control, Jewish pressure groups were able to have state laws passed against "hate crimes." In parts of the country where the spirit of freedom was stronger, however, the Jews were unable to persuade the local legislatures that a White man should be punished more severely for punching a Jew in the nose than for punching another White man.

Then in 1990 they succeeded in having a new Federal law enacted by the Congress. It was the so-called "Hate Crimes Statistics Reporting Act." This new law seemed innocuous enough at

first glance. It merely required the Justice Department to gather statistics on a new category of crimes: namely, those defined by the Jews as "hate crimes." So the FBI was required to gather statistics from the whole country: how many homosexuals had been beaten up, how many Blacks had been chased out of White neighborhoods, how many Jews had had their shop windows smashed, how many lesbians had found offensive graffiti scrawled on their cars. No new punishments: just statistics.

The purpose of this law was to force the government to accept the **idea** of "hate crimes": the idea of a crime defined by what the offender was thinking when he committed an act rather than by the act itself. This whole notion of "hate crime," of thought crime, is offensive to the White man's sense of justice, to all of our legal traditions, but in 1990 the Jews succeeded in subverting that sense, in subverting that tradition. Once they had forced the country to accept the **idea** of thought crimes, they found it much easier to have actual legislation passed which set penalties for various acts based on what the offender was assumed to have been thinking at the time. And in order to establish what the offender was thinking, the government could examine his private correspondence. They could examine the ideological content of any books or magazines found in his residence. They could explore his religious, social, and political associations. All of these things could be used as evidence against him in court.

Now Mr. Clinton is explicitly and publicly pushing for a great expansion of these laws against thought crime, against political crime. The next step will be the criminalizing of Politically Incorrect thought itself, not just acts based on Politically Incorrect thought. The Jews long have been calling for laws outlawing books, radio programs, and any other expressions of Politically Incorrect opinion: what they cleverly call "hate speech." Before his term in office is finished, Mr. Clinton also will be calling for the criminalizing of "hate speech." That is what all of his current baloney about "pulling America together" is aimed at. That is what we must prepare ourselves to fight against with all of the means at our disposal.

The Importance of Courage

The Fear of Being Politically Incorrect Has Reached Ridiculous Proportions

I've never been a boxing fan, and so normally I wouldn't feel qualified to say anything about the sport. However, I have been amused by all of the public commentary by media spokesmen, politicians, and boxing officials about the fact that one boxer of the African persuasion saw fit to bite a sizable chunk out of the ear of another boxer of the same persuasion during a recent match. Rather, I have been amused by the fact that the one thing none of these people has mentioned in the discussions of the ear-biting incident is the racial dimension. They all have carefully avoided saying anything at all about the fact that Mike Tyson is a Negro, lest anyone think that they are suggesting that his race had anything to do with his behavior. Heaven forbid!

The refusal of the media to say anything about race in the Tyson affair doesn't mean they aren't aware of it. For the next six months they'll be scraping up every affirmative-action Black rocket scientist, every affirmative-action Black brain surgeon, every affirmative-action Black university president, and every affirmative-action Black Air Force general they can sign up to interview on TV for one thing or another, in an effort to neutralize the damage Tyson has done to their carefully promoted illusion of racial "equality."

All of this is eerily reminiscent of George Orwell's novel *1984*, in which people are able to ignore the evidence of their eyes and ears, are able to shut down their reasoning processes, and are able to interpret everything around them in a Politically Correct manner. The force which makes Orwell's characters subordinate reason to Political Correctness is fear: fear of the Thought Police.

In America today we do not have Thought Police -- not yet. We do have thought crimes and thought criminals. They are called "hate crimes" and "hate criminals" and are defined in terms of what the perpetrator was thinking at the time he committed an act. Our beloved Big Brother -- Bill Clinton, that is -- is campaigning hard for more laws against thought crimes, and so are the Jewish media and the other minions of Political Correctness. I suppose it won't be long before we do have a new secret-police agency to catch thought criminals. Perhaps they will be called the "Hate Police" or the "Equality Police" or something of the sort. Or perhaps thought criminals will continue to be hunted down by the FBI, as at present.

However, it is not fear of being caught by the Thought Police and tortured, a la *1984*, which keeps all of the boxing commentators from suggesting that Mike Tyson's race has something to do with his behavior. It is fear of being condemned by all of the other commentators, fear of being ostracized from the ranks of the Politically Correct, fear of not being invited to Washington, New York, and Hollywood cocktail parties. And ostracism can have very real economic consequences. In certain fields, it can result in the loss of employment, for example. To be Politically Correct, one must not only have the Correct thoughts at all times oneself; one also must condemn and shun anyone who manifests Incorrect thoughts. One must drum the Politically Incorrect person out of Correct society.

This fear of being Politically Incorrect has reached ridiculous dimensions. Take the widespread phenomenon of "White flight," for example. Millions of White people are fleeing areas which have a high percentage of Blacks, Mexicans, and other non-Whites and are relocating to predominantly White areas. Sometimes this just means a move from city to suburb, or from one suburb to another; sometimes it means moving to another state or another region of the country with fewer non-Whites. But if you ask one of these fleers why he is fleeing, you will hear every sort of answer except the true answer. Hardly anyone will admit that he is moving to get away from non-Whites. He is terrified of being thought a "racist." I am sure that many of these fleers don't even admit their racial motive to themselves. I am sure that many of them feel pangs of guilt whenever they do think about their motives.

This is a deplorable situation, and it is an impressive proof of the enormous power of the mass media to brainwash the population. What George Orwell's "Ministry of Truth" did in the author's imagination, Time-Warner-CNN, Disney-ABC, and the other Jewish media conglomerates are doing in fact.

The more I see things like the reaction to Mike Tyson's cannibalism, the more I am convinced that the reason White Americans have let themselves be backed into the corner they're in now is not because they're stupid: it's because they're lacking in the courage to say what they really believe, if they may be criticized for saying it.

I'm sorry to say that I've seen the same sort of timidity in myself. When interviewers have asked me whether or not I'm a racist, I have responded by asking, "Well, what do you mean by the word ‘racist’?" I've tried to wriggle out of giving a direct answer to the question, because the Jewish media have made such an enormous investment in demonizing the label "racist" that one has to screw up one's courage a bit to come right out and say, "Yes, of course, I'm a racist."

One can quibble over the details of the definition of the word, but it's pretty clear what the interviewers have in mind when they ask me whether or not I'm a racist. These days anyone is a racist who refuses to deny the abundantly clear evidence that there are inherited racial differences in behavior, intelligence, and attitudes. A racist is a person who will not pretend that he sees no differences -- which is why all of the boxing commentators pretend that race is irrelevant and won't mention Tyson's Blackness in connection with his attempt to eat his opponent in the ring.

A racist is any White person who prefers to live among other Whites instead of among non-Whites and prefers to send his children to White schools.

A racist is any White person who feels a sense of identity with, a sense of belonging to, his own tribe, his own people, his own race, and who shows an interest in his race's history, heroes, culture, and folkways -- which is why Western civilization, European history, and other traditional, race-oriented curricula are being phased out at American universities and are being replaced with various "multicultural" offerings designed specifically not to stimulate racial feelings in the students.

A White racist is a person who finds the members of his own race more attractive physically than members of other races and who is instinctively repulsed by the idea of racial intermarriage or by the sight of a White person intimately involved with a non-White -- which is why the Jews in Hollywood are turning out so many films which promote racial mixing, films which portray interracial romance as glamorous and fashionable.

A racist is a White person who is disgusted with the multiracial cesspool that America is becoming under the present government and media policies. A racist is so alarmed about the threat to the future of his people that he is willing to derail these policies -- which is why the media and Mr. Clinton have become so shrill recently about the need to combat "hate criminals."

Courage: that is the key to our survival. Courage is more important than money, more important than intelligence, more important than friends or political and business connections. Unless we have the courage of our convictions, neither we nor our convictions will survive.

I don't believe that a coward can change his nature and become a hero, but I do believe that many of us who have let ourselves be intimidated and bullied because we didn't want to give offense, didn't want to be rude, didn't want to seem ungentlemanly, didn't want to be unpopular -- I do believe that we can begin reasserting ourselves. We can begin finding a little bit of courage in ourselves, we can resolve that we will no longer be bullied into going along with the crowd when we know that the crowd is wrong.

In my case, I have resolved not to refrain from speaking out whenever speaking out is the proper thing to do. I've resolved not to try to wriggle away from saying exactly what I believe when someone asks me whether or not I'm a racist. I believe that it would do many other people a lot of good to make a similar resolution. I believe that it would be good for their souls.

This doesn't mean that we have to be deliberately rude or offensive. It means that when an interviewer asks me what I think about Mike Tyson's snacking on his opponent in the ring, I'm not going to waste my time talking about Mike Tyson. I'm going to say that we should not judge the behavior of other races by our standards. I'm going to say that spectator sports in the United States have become a disaster, and that they will remain a disaster until we have swept the whole theory and practice of multiracialism into the trashbin of history, where it belongs.

Professional sports in the United States today have the spirit of the contests staged in the Roman Coliseum during the last phase of the Roman Empire, when slaves from every part of the Empire fought against other slaves for the gratification of a degenerate mob of onlookers. We need to return instead to the spirit of the Greek Olympics, in which only Greeks participated. In the Olympics, as opposed to the contests in the Coliseum -- in the original Olympics -- all of the contestants and the onlookers were of the same race and shared the same values. The Olympics were an expression of the Greeks' striving for excellence. They were a racial expression as well as a spiritual expression. Compare that with what we have in the United States today, where degenerates like O.J. Simpson and Mike Tyson, the recent descendants of our African slaves, put on contests for the amusement of a debased citizenry.

Yes, I am a racist, and I believe that we should not make a fuss about the behavior of Black athletes. I believe that their behavior should be none of our business. I also believe that they should not be viewed on our television screens and held up by the Jewish masters of the media as role models for our youth, nor should they be involved in any of our athletic contests. I believe that we should get them out of our country and out of our lives. I believe that we should do away with the system which in this century has changed athletics in America from something at least remotely similar to the Olympics into something very much like what took place in the Coliseum. I also believe that we should get rid of the people behind that system, the people who deliberately conspired to make professional athletics in America what it is.

And as I said, there's no need to be rude about this, no need to use the "n" word or engage in name-calling. But we do need to be completely honest for a change, both with ourselves and with others. We need to have the courage to face the whole truth regarding our situation and what we need to do about it. That doesn't mean that every time I speak with an interviewer I have to tell him that we can't restore America to spiritual health until we restore her to racial health, and that means total, geographical racial separation. I don't have to mention all that, unless he specifically asks for it. But it does mean that I should not equivocate when asked whether or not I'm a racist. I should be as straightforward and direct and clear and honest as I can be.

I'll say just one more thing on the importance of having the courage to tell others what we believe. It's not just a matter of personal pride. It's not just a matter of being able to feel good, of being able to pat ourselves on the back because we weren't afraid to stand up to the media bosses. If we had shown more courage from the beginning, if we had spoken out the first time and every time the Jews and their collaborators had tried to implement their policies for changing America from a White republic into a multiracial garbage dump for the New World Order, I think the Jews would have found themselves some other country to subvert. I think they would have decided to try their poison on the Turks or the Mexicans or the Indonesians instead of on us. If we hadn't let ourselves be bulldozed and manipulated and backed into a corner, but had said what we believed from the start, I don't think we'd be in the mess we're in today. Courage is catching; it's contagious. If a nation's leaders show courage, so will the ordinary citizens. But when the leaders are afraid to be honest, then you can't expect the ordinary citizens to be very courageous.

A concrete example of this is the ongoing scandal of the rape and sexual harassment of White women in our Army by Black officers and Black noncoms. The Jewish media have had very little to say about this scandal. They have preferred to focus on non-racial stories, such as Lt. Kelly Flynn's resignation from the Air Force after being charged with adultery. But the more the Army’s investigators dig into the sexual-harassment scandal, the bigger it becomes and the clearer the racial dimensions are. The highest profile case the Army’s investigators have turned up so far is that of Sergeant Major Gene McKinney, a Black noncom who was appointed to the Army’s highest post for enlisted personnel at the prodding of the Clinton administration. This top Black noncom used his position systematically to extort sex from White women in the Army. The first case came to light in February, when a White female sergeant major went public with the story of what McKinney had done to her. Before her case became public the Army had ignored her complaints. Since then case after case of McKinney’s use of his office to force himself on White female soldiers has come to light.

A 25-year-old married White sergeant described under oath to Army investigators how McKinney had raped her last October, when she was nearly eight months pregnant. She is the fourth White female soldier assaulted by McKinney to give evidence in the investigation so far. And the case of Sergeant Major McKinney is only the most prominent of hundreds of cases in the Army in which Blacks used their positions of authority over White women to rape or sexually harass them.

Why was this horrendous situation allowed to develop? It certainly wasn't because the Army's leaders wanted it to develop. It may gratify some of the nutcase racial egalitarians in the Clinton White House to read about White women being raped by Blacks, but the Army's leaders definitely are not gratified. They didn't want this situation, but they didn't have the courage to prevent it. They were afraid to take steps to protect White females from Black males. In nearly every case which has come to light so far, the women victims have testified that when they reported what had happened to them to their White superiors they were ignored. The White officers were afraid to get involved. They were afraid that they would be charged with "racism" if they took action against the Black rapists.

And let's face it, they would have been. That's the standard Black excuse for everything: "racism." And it's the excuse of their Jewish promoters in the media too. But that's no excuse for the cowardice of the Army's leaders. The horrendous situation we have in our Army today is the result of the failure of courage on the part of the Army's leaders to deal forthrightly with the racial issue.

And the racial mess we have in American society today is a consequence of the failure of courage on the part of our society's leaders. When the courage of our leaders fails, our whole society fails, and then we become the victims of the Jewish predators who control our media.

The one thing that all of us can do about this now is to resolve that our own courage will not fail, that we will not be intimidated, but that we will stand up and speak out forthrightly.

The Meaning of Affirmative Action

It has been interesting watching the television commentators and other minions of Political Correctness wring their hands and moan about the falling enrollment of Blacks in some of America's universities and professional schools recently. Black undergraduate enrollment has fallen by one-half in some branches of the University of California. The number of Blacks in the law schools of the University of California and the University of Texas has fallen even more drastically. Until recently these schools had been very proud of themselves for having a higher percentage of Blacks among their students than in the general population, and now they have lost nearly all of their Blacks. The media spokesmen and the Clintonistas are wailing about the loss of "diversity."

And they all know who is to blame for this dreadful turn of events: it is those hateful people who have forced the scuttling of affirmative action programs in some areas. It is "White racism" which is keeping Blacks out of the schools.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that it was affirmative action programs which were keeping Blacks **in** the schools, and when those programs were ended the Black enrollment plummeted. What the diversity-mongers really are alarmed about is that what has happened where affirmative action programs have been dropped exposes their lie of racial "equality." What we see in California and Texas now is that when the prop of affirmative action is taken away the artificial "equality" it had been supporting collapses. This is something the media bosses and the Clintonistas really don't want us to see, because it exposes the artificiality and the lack of viability of the multiracial society they have been trying to ram down our throats for so long.

We were told many years ago, when affirmative action programs first were imposed on us, that they were necessary to compensate for "White racism" -- that Blacks were being kept out of universities and professional schools by "racist" officials, that Blacks were being denied employment, promotions, and other opportunities by "racist" employers, and so on. We were told that we needed to end this so-called "racial discrimination" and extend a helping hand to Blacks, so that they would have an "equal opportunity" to become lawyers, doctors, and business executives. The tacit assumption was that Blacks are "equal" in ability to Whites, and that if they were given an equal chance they would succeed equally. We were told that affirmative action programs would provide this equal opportunity.

Of course, equal opportunity was never the intention of the media bosses and the other promoters of affirmative action. Their aim was to give Blacks more opportunity than Whites. Their aim was to ensure that Blacks would succeed equally, regardless of what had to be done, regardless of how much extra opportunity had to be given to them in order to achieve this.

There was very little if any "White racism" holding down Black enrollment in American universities even before the government began enforcing affirmative action programs. University officials already were very liberal and were happy to have more Blacks. They didn't get many Blacks because, in the first place, not many Blacks applied, and in the second place, most of those who did apply could not compete effectively with the White students. There is a very

substantial average difference in IQ, in problem-solving ability, in intelligence, between Whites and Blacks, and it shows up very significantly on examinations and in success rates.

Affirmative action programs require school officials and employers to ignore these differences in ability between Whites and Blacks and to recruit Blacks at all costs. Affirmative action requires school officials to boost Blacks ahead of Whites, to give them economic rewards not available to Whites, to give Blacks preferential treatment in order to get them into school and to keep them in school.

Affirmative action requires employers to behave similarly by offering Blacks more than they offer Whites, and by hiring and promoting Blacks who are less qualified than Whites. The government wants schools to graduate a certain percentage of Blacks, and it doesn't care how they achieve this result. The government wants employers to have certain percentages of Black employees and Black executives, regardless of how many Whites have to be trampled on in order to achieve this. And so for many years school administrators and business executives have been almost pulling Blacks out of trees and graduating them or putting them in the boardroom in order to keep the government happy.

There's been a great deal of deceit involved in these affirmative action programs from the beginning. The government and the media tell us that they don't involve quotas or racial preferences, when they clearly do. The government and the media tell us that affirmative action does not hurt Whites at all; it merely helps Blacks -- it gives Blacks a little boost without taking anything away from Whites. That is simply a lie, although many Whites have been willing to swallow it rather than seem to be "racist." The media have deliberately insinuated that any White person opposed to affirmative action is a "racist."

Now a few White people in California and Texas have rebelled and have managed to get themselves out from under the yoke of affirmative action. In fact, a few Blacks have rebelled too, because they are unhappy about the resentment against them which is being caused by affirmative action. And the media and the government are screaming about how this very small rebellion is destroying "diversity," about how this is taking us back to the bad, old days of segregation, and so on.

The thing for us to understand is that affirmative action is only **one part** of a much larger scheme which has been imposed on us. The aim of the media bosses and their hangers-on in the government is a multiracial society: a society in which Black teachers and Black professors teach White students; a society in which Black athletes become heroes and role models for young Whites; a society in which Black brain surgeons, Black rocket scientists, Black astronauts, Black Army generals, and Black political leaders are prominent; a society in which Black drill instructors lord it over White recruits; a society in which Blacks and Whites mix intimately and intermarry with each other at every social level.

The media bosses have been very successful at creating the illusion that we have such a society. The news, entertainment, and advertising we see on television are all designed -- very carefully and skillfully designed -- to support this illusion. The TV world is an artificial world. On television we see Blacks behaving like Whites, speaking like Whites, and showing themselves

equal or superior to Whites in every way, including intelligence, creativity, industry, morality, civility, and sense of responsibility. The agencies on Madison Avenue which design advertisements for television carefully cultivate this illusion. Blacks are just like Whites, except for being a little darker --- and perhaps a little smarter, a little more civilized, and a little better dressed. Black families are just like White families, except for being a little warmer and more loving and taking a little better care of their yards.

The scriptwriters in New York and Hollywood who give us our entertainment are engaged in exactly the same sort of deception. If there's a White male Southerner in a film, for example, the chances are about nine out of ten that he'll either be a despicable bigot or he'll be a credit to his race by standing up against the despicable White bigots all around him. If there's a Black in a major role in the film the chances are good that he'll be brighter, more resourceful, braver, and more moral than the Whites around him. The first commandment of casting in Hollywood is, "Thou shalt not portray a person of color in a negative light."

The same racial slant is found in the treatment of the news. Any White-on-Black crime gets star billing and is repeated endlessly, while Black-on-White crime, even of the most atrocious sort, is ignored if the media bosses think they can get away with it and buried as soon as possible if they feel obliged to mention it. The shooting of a convicted Black drug dealer and his girlfriend by a boozed-up White soldier at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, a little over a year ago was hyped and kept in the headlines for months in order to create the impression that murderous White racists were taking a terrible toll among innocent Blacks. I'm sure you've heard about it -- many times. But just three months after the Fort Bragg shooting -- in March of last year -- a non-White sergeant at Camp Pendleton, the big Marine base in southern California, shot his White executive officer to death and tried to kill his White commanding officer while shouting anti-White gibberish, and hardly anyone outside the San Diego area heard of it, because the media bosses decided it wouldn't be good for their racial program to report it.

The unfortunate fact is that today the artificial world of television shapes most people's ideas and attitudes even more than the real world around them does. Nevertheless, the real world won't go away, and so reality has a nasty way of contradicting the fantasy world of television and deflating the multiracial pipe dream constructed by Hollywood's scriptwriters and Washington's spin doctors. The way to make the real world conform to the fantasy is affirmative action. If real-world Blacks aren't quite up to the standard of the television world, then have the government give them a boost with a little affirmative action. Make sure that White university students see plenty of Black students around them. Make sure that the Black students get grades at least as good as those of the White students. Then have an appropriate quota of Blacks in caps and gowns at graduation, even if it means trashing academic standards.

But now a few rebels in California and Texas have forced the schools in their states to deal honestly with students for a change, and reality has reared its ugly head, spoiling the carefully constructed illusion of racial equality. As soon as the prop of affirmative action was removed, the illusion simply collapsed. Black enrollment plummeted. And now there is a real danger that Whites in California and Texas may realize that when Blacks must compete on an equal basis with Whites they lose consistently, except in those areas of physical activity -- basketball, boxing, ear-biting, sprinting, and jumping -- to which they are especially suited. This is the

reason that the Clintonistas are so desperate to keep the affirmative action props in place everywhere. This is why Mr. Clinton was so upset about the dropping of affirmative action at the University of California that he made a special trip to California in an effort to keep the illusion propped up.

I'll recapitulate what I've said so far, because it's quite important for us to understand what's happening and to keep it in mind. There are people who desperately want all of us to believe that everyone is born with equal ability, regardless of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, etc., and that the only reason some people are less successful than others is because they aren't treated fairly: in other words, because of racism, sexism, homophobia, or whatever.

Some of the people who are desperate to have us believe this actually believe it themselves. They have watched so much television that they have fallen under its spell, and they feel guilty for being White. The only way they can escape their guilt is to strive for a world in which there is no inequality, and in which, therefore, no one can be guilty for being more successful, more intelligent, more civilized, or more beautiful than anyone else.

But the people who control television and who want us to believe in equality certainly **do not** believe in it themselves. They believe that they are a Chosen People, ordained by their tribal god to rule over all the nations of the earth. Their strategy for ruling is to destroy the sense of identity and nationhood of other nations by mixing them all together and convincing them that they are all the same. They use television and the other media they control to create the illusion of equality. They present us with an image of a world in which Blacks are at least as capable as Whites in all the arts of civilization and also at least as foresighted, self-disciplined, and moral as Whites. In fact, they generally overdo it, and present us with a fantasy world in which Blacks are morally superior to Whites if not intellectually superior.

But because what they present us with is a fantasy and is contradicted by reality, they use their influence over the politicians to promote government programs, such as affirmative action, which obscure reality, which conceal it from White Americans. Since most Blacks simply are not capable of succeeding in a White society, the equality-mongers give them an artificial sort of success through affirmative action.

And when the affirmative action is suddenly taken away, reality reasserts itself, and the illusion of equality is shattered. The fakery is exposed. The phony world of successful, affluent, attractive, creative Blacks collapses. That's what has happened at the University of California and at the University of Texas law school. That's why Mr. Clinton is running around the country giving speeches in favor of more affirmative action, while the Hollywood and Madison Avenue Jews crank out more fantasy.

The reason why all of this is so important, the reason why I'm so concerned about it, is not because affirmative action takes away from Whites and gives to Blacks. And it does do that, regardless of the lies of its promoters to the contrary. But if that's **all** it did I'd be in **favor** of it, because the resentment it generates among Whites will be very useful in bringing about the restoration of our society some day. But unfortunately that's not all affirmative action does. One of the other things it does is bring about a lowering of the average proficiency in the skills

needed to sustain our civilization. The more that we force an artificial equalization of Blacks and Whites in our society, the closer we approach to the sort of skills and standards we can see in Tanzania, Zaire, or Rwanda. Actually, I guess that Zaire is no longer called Zaire, since the latest Black dictator and generalissimo-for-life took over a while back.

The advances in technology we have made in this century tend to obscure the effects of this lowering of standards, because a few very bright people now can carry the problem-solving load for a much larger number of people than in the past, but the effects of affirmative action are still visible and still increasing. They are especially noticeable in such things as growing bureaucratic inefficiency and corruption. In some areas of the United States local government operates on the level of a banana republic. Washington, DC, with its exceptionally high degree of affirmative action, is an outstanding example.

Another effect of affirmative action -- and in the long run it is the most catastrophic effect -- is the social and economic equalizing of Blacks and Whites. In the past the lower success rate of Blacks tended to keep them socially and economically separated from Whites, even without any legal barriers between the races. This social and economic separation resulted in a relatively low rate of miscegenation, of sexual mixing between the races. A few Black athletes -- O.J. Simpson, for example -- became wealthy enough to acquire White wives, but the overall genetic mixing was relatively minor. By artificially boosting Blacks economically and socially, affirmative action has greatly increased the rate of miscegenation. It was planned that way from the beginning by the equality mongers.

This is why we must regard every advocate of affirmative action as an advocate of genocide against our people and why we must hold these advocates accountable for their actions.

The Psychology of Political Correctness

Today I'll discuss something I've discussed earlier, but it's very important and is worth talking about over and over: having the courage to speak up for what we believe. Courage of this sort -- moral courage -- has always been important, but now, with the enemies of our people pushing hard to silence opposition to them and their destructive policies by enacting new legislation against what they call "hate crime" and "hate speech," moral courage is essential for our survival.

We have a President who is running around the country trying to drum up support for a repressive program of legislation he says is necessary to "pull America together" and achieve racial harmony. He is telling the groups to which he speaks that they don't have much longer to wait before there will be a non-White majority in America, and then the White racists -- the "haters" -- won't be able to cause any more trouble. Mr. Clinton is gloating that soon there will be a truly multiracial America: an America without a "dominant European culture." He is gloating about this, and many of his audiences are gloating with him and cheering him when he says this. All we have to do now, he tells them, is keep the racists under control with new laws until we get rid of this "dominant European culture." And many of the audiences cheering him when he says this are White students and faculty members at American universities.

It is the trendy, fashionable thing these days to be anti-White. It is fashionable to let everyone know how much you despise White people and European culture and how much you admire Africans, Indians, Jews, Orientals, and mestizos; how superior you believe their cultures to be; and how much you look forward to seeing them become a majority in the United States.

I remember witnessing the beginning of this fashion when I was a university student myself back in the 1950s and then a professor in the 1960s. What I noticed first, back in the 1950s, was the pressure to make the universities more "democratic" -- that is, to admit a great many more students. The argument was that the universities were too "elitist," that rich kids went to the prestigious private universities and thereby earned a ticket to an easy and prosperous life, while working-class kids were denied these opportunities. This argument was pure baloney. I was a poor kid myself, but I had applied myself and won a scholarship to a prestigious private university, as had many of the other students at my university. That was Rice University, in Texas. There has not been a time, at least during the past 60 years, when a student with real scholastic ability was kept from getting a good university education in America by having no money.

The anti-elitists began prevailing by greatly increasing the number of curricula. Subjects that were more appropriately taught in trade schools, or perhaps as high school electives, became the basis for new university curricula. We used to joke about offering courses in basket-weaving, golf, or fly-tying in order to accommodate students who had no aptitude for mathematics or history. All too soon these jokes became reality. And students who couldn't even pass a course in basket-weaving were brought in on athletic scholarships.

But this dumbing down of the universities wasn't the most important part of the destructive work carried on there. The key was our enemies' gaining control of the socialization process at the

universities. This was even before television had become the dominant opinion-control medium that it is today. Teenagers arriving at a university are somewhat disoriented and unsure of themselves. They are on strange turf. A few have the self-confidence and inner strength to find their own way, but most don't. Most look to those around them for guidance. The Jews were the one coherent, self-conscious group at most universities, both among the students and the faculty, and they began dominating the discussions. Always very verbal, very pushy and outspoken, they made themselves heard while others kept their opinions to themselves. With academic standards relaxed, students had more time to spend in socializing activities. By the 1960s these activities were firmly in the grip of the Jews and their leftist collaborators. Incoming students were subjected to intense social pressure to conform their ideas and opinions to those of the Jews and the leftists. Political Correctness became the prerequisite for social acceptance, and social acceptance was an overwhelming need for many students. They could be made to spout any sort of nonsense or wickedness, even to believe it, if that would lead to popularity.

I remember witnessing this phenomenon, but I didn't fully understand its significance at the time, so for the most part I kept my opinions to myself. I didn't have time for a lot of socialization anyway. I feel guilty about that now. I really should have spoken up much more loudly. I should have encouraged others to speak up. I should have organized opposition to the Jews and the leftists. But I didn't. Mostly I just went about my own work. Of course, there were no *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts for me to listen to and to help me understand what was happening and to encourage me to take a stand. You don't have that excuse.

The Jews have been way ahead of the rest of us in understanding psychology and the way it can be applied to control the thinking and the behavior of the people around them. They used the same techniques of brainwashing in the Soviet Union back in the 1920s and 1930s to control the non-Communist majority around them. They kept everyone immersed in discussion groups, in worker-education groups, in "sensitivity training" seminars, and the like, using a constant barrage of words, first to disorient people and then to bring them into conformity with what was Politically Correct. They had dissidents confessing to their own thought-crimes in group sessions, pledging to think only correct thoughts in the future, and begging to be punished for their past errors. The same mind-control techniques are used in cults today to control the minds of the cult members. People susceptible to this sort of socialization can be made to believe anything and do anything, even commit mass suicide, in order to receive and retain group approval.

It is in the universities where the Jews have used these socialization techniques to do the worst damage. They have White students enthusiastically promoting programs aimed at the extinction of the White race. When we remember the mass suicide of cult members at Jonestown a few years back or more recently the mass suicide of the Heaven's Gate cult members in California, we should not be surprised that Bill Clinton is cheered by groups of White university students when he tells them that the end of the "dominant European culture" in the United States is in sight.

Jews, of course, are not the only ones able to use psychological techniques capable of controlling the minds of cult members or university students. What's needed is a group setting where these socialization techniques can be used, group leaders with verbal skills adequate to use the

techniques effectively, and a group of people sufficiently lacking in self-confidence and sense of self-worth that they crave acceptance by the group more than anything else. Intelligence by itself is no protection against this sort of mind control. Even bright people are susceptible, so long as the need for group approval is strong enough. Women are more susceptible than men on the average, and the sort of wimpy, 'sensitive" men we are seeing all too much of these days are more susceptible than those with more normal glands, but even men who seem strong and assertive can be brainwashed by the sort of socialization techniques used at American universities today.

I have in front of me a recent newspaper column by a journalist, Gwynne Dyer, which provides a splendid example of the sort of mind-set which is formed by this socialization process. He is a true Clintonista, and he looks forward in his column with glee and eagerness to a future in which his own race will be extinct. He exults over the soaring rate of miscegenation in America and the increasing influx of non-White immigrants. He is especially pleased by the fact that White women who have served in the armed forces, where they are subjected to a brainwashing program based on the same psychological principles used by the Jews at our universities and are exposed to a high concentration of Blacks in every facet of their daily lives, are seven times as likely to couple with a Black male as are women who have not had military service. His real hero, after Bill Clinton, is Tiger Woods, the hopelessly mixed, part Chinese, part Negro, part White, part Indian golfer. He thinks that it is just wonderful that someone can have such a mixed-up ancestry and still learn how to hit the little, white ball into the hole. If mischlings can win golf tournaments, he believes, why then obviously they can do everything else. He concludes his column with the gloating prediction: "It will take another generation or two, but the old racist games are over -- and the future is light brown."

It is too easy to dismiss this sort of anti-White raving as a "sickness." Certainly, Gwynne Dyer and all who think like him are spiritually sick, ideologically sick, but most of them were more or less normal, healthy people before going through the socialization process I have described. In most people the need to be accepted, the need to be part of the group, the need to be fashionable, is strong enough to overcome reason and instinct. If such people are socialized in a healthy way, if their attitudes are shaped by leaders who have healthy racial and social attitudes themselves, they will develop a healthy spirituality, a healthy racial ideology. But when the socializing influences are Jewish, we end up with desperately sick people like Gwynne Dyer.

I began my comments today by saying that it is essential for our survival as a race that a great many of us have the moral courage to speak the truth, to stand up for what we believe in the face of the sort of sickness exemplified by Gwynne Dyer and Bill Clinton. The Jews have succeeded in subverting our universities, they have succeeded in converting them into factories for turning out moral basket cases like Gwynne Dyer, because we did not stand up to them back in the 1950s and 1960s: I and many others who knew better. I didn't really understand the full significance of what was happening back then Ñ but you don't have that excuse.

It is essential to speak out now because what the Jews are doing to our young people is by no means inevitable. It is by no means irresistible. It depends for its success on there being no effective opposition, no credible opposition. The situation is very much like that described by Hans Christian Anderson in his story about the emperor's new clothes. As long as no one had the

courage to speak out, the hoax worked. But when one little boy said aloud, "Look, mama, the emperor is naked," the bubble burst; the illusion was shattered; the hoax collapsed. The Jews are able to persuade people to believe things contrary to reason and instinct because they are able to create the illusion that everyone else in the socialization group already believes these things. This illusion provides a strong pressure to conform. But when someone has the courage to stick a pin in their illusion, they lose this advantage.

I have another newspaper column on my desk. It is from the New Orleans *Times-Picayune,* which is part of the Jewish Newhouse chain, and it was written by a thoroughly socialized Clintonista, who was formerly an editorial writer for the paper. He now belongs to a group of socialized Christians in St. Petersburg, Florida, who have been meeting regularly for the past two years to keep each other appropriately "sensitized" on racial issues. And they try to bring new members into their group and use socialization techniques on them to bring them into conformity with the party line.

They made the mistake of inviting a man to their group who has the habit of saying what he believes instead of what he thinks others want to hear. It really tore the group up. The columnist's aim in writing this particular column seems to have been to show that there's still a lot of "insensitivity" in the White population which needs to be cured. He quotes the dissident's comments at the meeting. The dissident, Tom, told the others that he didn't see why Whites needed to apologize to Blacks for anything. Whites didn't force Blacks into slavery, Tom said. Blacks were enslaved by their own kind in Africa and then sold to White or Jewish slave dealers and brought to America, he told the group. And Blacks today ought to be grateful for that, Tom said. If their ancestors had not been brought to America, the present generation of Blacks would be in Africa today instead of in America, and their lives would be far worse.

Now, this is just the plain, unvarnished, historical truth, but it's a Politically Incorrect truth, and the others at the meeting couldn't deal with it.

They went through the familiar hooting and loud groaning routine, which is supposed to shame a dissident into changing his views. They rolled their eyes back and threw their hands up in exasperation. They gasped in disbelief that anyone could hold such bigoted views. But none of these techniques worked on Tom. He just kept coming out with more truths. He told them, "I guess it must hurt some people to hear that, but it's the truth." Poor Tom: he just didn't understand that the **truth** is the **last** thing these people wanted to hear. What they wanted was more reinforcement for the falsehoods and perverse ideas which already had been imposed on them.

One Politically Correct White man at the meeting told Tom angrily, "I want to throw up! What you say makes me want to vomit." Another member of the group, referring to Tom, remarked with hatred in his voice, "He hasn't learned anything!" A Politically Correct White woman stared bitterly at Tom and said, according to the columnist, "Why is it that we have to take this from him? Why should the people who are hurt always be the ones who answer with kindness? Why do we have to keep opening our hearts up to bigots?"

All of this hatred, this disapproval and pressure to conform directed at Tom made him uncomfortable, but he stood his ground. He refused to repent or to retract anything. The others couldn't cope with this unexpected behavior. The meeting broke up with some members wondering aloud whether the races could ever live together in peace.

It's hard to say what effect Tom's courage and honesty had on this group in the long run. Most of the members probably recovered from their shock and began admiring the emperor's new clothes again. They already had been too thoroughly socialized, and Tom was the only dissident among 35 true believers. But Tom may very well have caused one or two waverers to rethink their positions. He may have caused a few of them to make contact with reality again. And if Tom had said what he believes to the whole group from the time the group was formed, he probably could have prevented the flight from reality to Political Correctness for many more of the members.

We have a similar situation at our universities today. Not everyone is equally weak and eager to parrot the party line. Many still have a bit of independence in them, a bit of respect for truth. All these waverers need is to hear one little boy say, "But, mama, the emperor has no clothes on." All they need is one example of courage and honesty, and they will be able to resist the Jewish brainwashing. The lemmings, of course, the people with no internal sense of direction at all, the ones who must have group acceptance at any cost, will still follow the Jewish party line in many cases. But in many other cases the Jews will not be able to create the necessary illusion at all. They will not be able to make even the most impressionable and eager-to-conform young people abandon reason and instinct and begin rooting for the annihilation of their own race.

And that, my friends, will be a real accomplishment. If you can, with a simple demonstration of courage and honesty, keep one other person from being socialized by the Jews -- if you can open the eyes of one young White woman and keep her loyal to her own race, if you can keep one young White man in touch with racial reality -- then your life will have been worthwhile. Your existence will have been justified.

And if you and enough others make a regular habit of standing up for the truth, of standing up for what is right, we will foil the Jews and the Clintonistas and guarantee a future for our people. We will assure that, contrary to what Gwynne Dyer would like, the color of the future will be White.

Who Are the Haters?

My organization, the National Alliance, concerns itself with all things relevant to the welfare and progress of the European peoples, the White people of this earth. We are advocates for all things which could be beneficial to our people, and we are opponents of all the influences and tendencies and groups who are harmful or to our people. As a consequence of this we receive a certain amount of hate mail, and I find it interesting to read these hate letters and try to understand the psychology, the motivations, of the people who write them. I won't read any of these hate letters to you today, because they're all pretty nasty and tend to lean pretty heavily on the use of four-letter words. They also tend to be blindly and irrationally hateful and to be based less on what I actually have said or done than on some misrepresentation about me or the National Alliance which has appeared recently in the controlled media.

In fact, there's a strong correlation between some sensational story appearing on television or in the *New York Times* or the *Village Voice* about the National Alliance being a so-called "hate group" and my novel *The Turner Diaries* being a "blueprint" for various acts of domestic terrorism on the one hand, and on the other hand the arrival of these hate letters at our office a few days thereafter. It is clear to me that these sensational stories in the controlled media, which all purport to be against hate -- in fact, they claim to deplore the growth of hate in our society, to be alarmed about it, and to be seeking ways to ameliorate it -- these stories denouncing hate have the effect of causing the arrival of hate letters at our office. There is a cause-and-effect relationship. And the more I've thought about it, the more I've become convinced that it was planned that way.

Which is to say, all of these media protests about the growth of hate in America are intended for the specific purpose of **provoking** hate, of inciting hate. If you collect these stories from the *New York Times, Time, Newsweek,* or other Jewish publications and study them, you'll see a certain pattern. For example, they always use the word "hate" in writing about me or the National Alliance. Even a short story may use the word "hate" or "hater" or the phrase "hate group" a dozen or more times. It's clear that this isn't just a fluke, because it occurs so consistently. What they're deliberately trying to do is create an association in the mind of the average reader or television viewer between any mention of me or my organization and the emotion of hatred. In fact, they not only want the listeners or viewers to reflexively think "hate" when they hear my name or the name of the National Alliance, they want them to **feel** hate. And it seems to work to a certain extent, judging from this correlation I mentioned between the appearance of these stories and the arrival of hate mail at our office.

It's an irrational, Pavlovian sort of thing, because as I mentioned a minute ago, the National Alliance is **not** a hate group of any sort but instead is a group dedicated to the welfare and progress of our people. But clearly there are folks out there who feel threatened by any such effort: folks who regard any activity aimed at building a sense of racial solidarity and racial consciousness among Europeans as a threat to themselves. And foremost among these folks are those who control the mass media: those who own the *New York Times*, the *Village Voice, Time, Newsweek,* and the rest. They are a deceitful bunch. They don't come right out and say that they are opposed to White people regaining an understanding of our roots and an appreciation for our

own unique qualities in a rapidly darkening world and a sense of responsibility for the future of our people. They don't say this. Instead they attempt to generate negative associations in the minds of their mass audience. They attempt to use psychological trickery to keep our people confused and disorganized. They don't want us thinking clearly about what is in our own interest and what is not. They deliberately attempt to incite hatred against me and others who are concerned about the future of our people.

They've had a lot of experience at inciting hatred. If you're a person of German ancestry, you'll certainly understand this. For the past 60 years, ever since the late 1930s, the media bosses have been cranking out films -- hundreds of them -- designed to incite hatred against Germans: crude, heavy-handed films, full of distortions and outright lies, but still effective enough to profoundly affect public opinion and national policy.

You may be better able to understand this media bias if you compare the films they have made about Germans with the films they have made about Japanese. You know, it was Japan who attacked the United States in the Second World War, not Germany. The Germans wanted to avoid a conflict with America and even ignored the deliberate provocations of the Roosevelt government, such as American attacks on German ships. After we were in the war, the Germans treated American prisoners correctly, in contrast to the Japanese, who often behaved brutally toward American prisoners, starving and torturing them. But the films coming out of Hollywood don't reflect this reality. For every anti-Japanese film there are a hundred anti-German films. In fact, Hollywood's tendency has been to generate sympathy toward the Japanese by reminding Americans at every opportunity about our internment of Japanese civilians in concentration camps in this country during the war. By way of contrast, the Germans are portrayed as sadistic automatons, clicking their heels and shouting *"Sieg Heil"* as they massacre prisoners.

Think about this difference between the Hollywood portrayal of Japanese and Germans. You won't have to think very long to understand that the reason the media bosses want to incite hatred against the Germans but not against the Japanese is based on the fact that the Germans were in the business of freeing their own country of Jewish influence and of fighting against Jewish Communism everywhere in Europe, while the Japanese were blessed by not having a Jewish problem to deal with. The media bosses, in other words, couldn't care less about the fact that the Germans treated American prisoners of war correctly and the Japanese didn't; all they care about is the way their fellow Jews were treated. That ethnic self-centeredness of theirs shows up in almost all of their propaganda.

For the last few years their hate propaganda has been directed not just at Germans, but also at everyone who is not Politically Correct -- especially those groups like the National Alliance whose stand on the Jewish issue or the race issue differs from their own. And they have added a new twist: using a pretended campaign against hate to incite hate.

You know, I didn't think much about hate myself until becoming the target of this Jewish hate campaign. And then I had to ask myself, am I really a hater? Certainly not in the way the people who send those hate letters are. But, yes, I suppose I do hate some people.

Whenever I look at what has happened to our cities and our schools during the past 30 or 40 years, I cannot suppress my feeling of hostility toward the Blacks, mestizos, and Asians who have made so much of our country an enemy-occupied wasteland. I feel a surge of anger every time I see a non-White face on television or in an advertisement. Thirty or 40 years ago, before all of the new civil-rights laws gave them a privileged status and when there were 25 or 30 million fewer of them in the country, I didn't feel this hostility. I figured that we could each stay in our own communities and we wouldn't get in each other's way. But now I want them out of our country, out of our living space. But even so, my hostility toward these non-Whites who are overrunning my world is not the nasty sort of hatred embellished with obscenity that I see expressed in the hate letters I receive.

When I see a hate letter I often feel a flash of anger at the hater who wrote it, but I cannot say that I really hate even these hate-letter writers. They are simply the people, most of them White, who are incited by the real hatemongers, the media bosses. My feeling toward these Jewish media bosses -- and all of the clever, little Jewish propagandists who write news stories about so-called "hate groups" in an attempt to make ordinary people hate me -- is much closer to real hatred. Over the years they have done enormous damage to our people with their poisonous propaganda, and they aspire to do even more. One way or another we must stop them and make sure that they can never harm our people again.

But I reserve my most heartfelt hatred for the collaborators among my own people who make it possible for the Jews to do their damage: collaborators who consciously and deliberately betray their own people, lie to their own people, in order to gain advantage for themselves -- the politicians, generals, public officials, clergymen, professors, writers, businessmen, and publicists who are not incited to hatred by the psychological tricks of the Jews, as are the suggestible fools who write hate letters, but who consciously and deliberately choose race treason, believing that they will gain a personal advantage from it. There is no fire in hell hot enough to punish these traitors, and there will be no place for them to hide when the day of retribution comes.

Yes, I hate traitors, I hate liars and deceivers, and I cannot say that I feel at all apologetic about the fact that I hate them. Hate may be an unpleasant sort of emotion, but it can serve a good purpose, and that is why Mother Nature gave us the capability to hate. It is one of the faculties which protects us from traitors and deceivers by ensuring that we will punish them, that we will weed them from our midst when we catch them, instead of forgiving them and giving them a chance to betray us again.

Nevertheless, I reject the label of "hater," with which the real hatemongers have tried to brand me. I spend very little of my time hating and a great deal of my time spreading understanding with the hope that it will benefit my people. One of the things I believe that we must understand, that we must always be aware of, is the motivation of the professional hatemongers, as well as the trickery with which they ply their trade.

Their trick of using the pretense of altruistically **fighting** hate in order to **incite** hate against their enemies is relatively new. They invented the terms "hate crime" and "hate speech" only a little over a decade ago -- unless one wants to give the credit for that to George Orwell, who popularized the essentially identical concept of "thought crime" in 1948, with his futuristic novel

1984. In any case, they used their political influence to force the government and the various police agencies around the country to give official recognition to their invention, or Orwell's invention if you prefer, with the passage of the so-called "Hate Crimes Statistics Reporting Act" of 1990. Then almost overnight all of the mass media began using the terms. Now they've got the President of the United States running around the country giving speeches about stamping out "hate crime" and "hate speech." It's their way of demonizing their enemies, of making their enemies seem like irrational, dangerous, and hateful people: the sort of people that it's all right for decent folks to hate.

So the trick is new, but the hate they bear against humanity certainly isn't new. Two thousand years ago the great Roman historian Tacitus noted as the principal distinguishing characteristic of the Jews their hatred for every nation but their own. This hatred they bear against other peoples may serve a useful purpose for the Jews by helping them to remain apart and to retain their own identity while existing as a small but influential minority among much larger host populations, but it certainly isn't helpful to our people. They almost instinctively are hostile to every institution of ours which holds us together and gives us our strength and solidarity. Back during the Vietnam war they were at the forefront of the flag-burners, and they persuaded a whole generation of university students and other young Americans to despise patriotism. Today their deceptive hate campaign is still directed against patriots, whom they portray as terrorists or potential terrorists.

Consider the whole set of ideas and attitudes associated with Political Correctness. Political Correctness really has not been codified in any formal way, so that one can refer to some official proclamation in order to determine what is Politically Correct and what is not. Nevertheless, we all know. We absorb this knowledge from the mass media.

We know, for example, that the United Negro College Fund and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People are Politically Correct. No one flinches or protests at the mention of those very real organizations. But at the same time we all know that if anyone dared to attempt to organize a college fund reserved for White students, he would be met with howls of outrage from the guardians of Political Correctness. We know that any association for the advancement of White interests will be branded immediately a "hate group" by the Jewish media and all of the politicians who dance to their tune, as the National Alliance is. In fact, any club or other organization with an all-White membership is bound to be under suspicion of being a "hate group," although the same suspicion is never directed against an all-Jewish organization, an all-Chinese organization, or an organization all of whose members are American Indians.

We all know that to express revulsion for the practices of homosexuals is the height of Political Incorrectness and will get us branded as "haters" in an instant. Even if we want to give our own children positive examples of heterosexual masculinity or heterosexual femininity in order to guide the development of their own attitudes toward sex, we had better do it quietly if we don't want to be accused of "hate." Likewise, any expression of support for the maintenance of traditional sex roles -- any suggestion that armed combat is not a proper role for women, for example -- is sure to bring one under suspicion as a "hater."

We all know that whenever White people, European people, are in conflict with non-Whites, whether in South Africa or America or anywhere else on this increasingly overcrowded planet, it is Politically Correct to be on the non-White side. To be on the White side is to be a "hater." If one expresses agreement with the French people who believe that the French government should cut off the immigration of Africans from the former French colonies in Africa, for example, one is a "hater." If one agrees with the Germans who believe that there are too many Turkish "guest workers" in Germany, one is a "hater." If one agrees with Englishmen that the Pakistanis in England should be sent back to Pakistan, one is a "hater." And if we suggest that the American government should not let wetbacks continue to pour into the United States across the Rio Grande, we are "haters." Indeed, only a "hater" would dare use the term "wetback" these days.

If we are sufficiently sensitive to the message of the controlled media, we understand that any expression of concern for our people, any effort to safeguard the future of our people, any public support for our traditions and our culture and our folkways is hateful. The unspoken message is that we will be hated if we are not Politically Correct. The message is that the sort of trendy fools who send me viciously obscene hate letters will be incited to hate anyone who does not toe the political line of the Jewish media.

It's a shame that it still has to be that way for a while yet. It's a shame that any of our people are incited to hate others of our people. But we have a big mess to clean up in America and elsewhere throughout the White world, and until the mess has been cleaned up there will be hatred.

At least, we can understand who is responsible for this hatred. We can understand who the real haters are.

The New World Order

We have discussed many topics in *Free Speech.* We have discussed social issues, moral issues, and political issues. We've talked about race, about nationalism, and about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media. Now, I will discuss "the big picture." I'll talk in broad outline about the salient developments of the past few years and the way in which they affect our people.

There's been much talk in various quarters recently about the New World Order. Until seven or eight years ago the New World Order was a poorly kept secret. It was discussed in private by the people who considered themselves qualified to decide for all the rest us what sort of world we wanted to live in, but they didn't often let us in on their discussions. They were concerned that in our backwardness and ignorance we might not want to go along for the ride if we learned what these elitists had planned for us.

Nowadays, however, with Bill Clinton in the White House and the general public dancing mindlessly to whatever tune is played by the mass media, they are much less concerned that the *hoi polloi* will be able to upset their applecart, and so the New World Order is discussed within earshot of us commoners as a matter of course. Despite this general familiarity with the term, however, there is very little real understanding on the part of most people of the concept of a New World Order -- and there is even less understanding of the real motivations behind this concept and of their historical development. I will try to remedy this lack of understanding, at least in some small part, during the next few minutes. Let's look at the history of the New World Order concept first.

The idea of a world government certainly isn't new, of course. The Roman Empire achieved a world government to a large extent 2,000 years ago. And during the Middle Ages the Christian Church constituted a universal order of sorts, despite the schism between its western -- or Roman -- branch and its eastern -- or Greek -- branch.

In modern times the idea has appealed to several groups of people. In the first place there are the amoral, super-wealthy elements: cosmopolitan and raceless individuals who already wield a great deal of power through their wealth and like to flatter themselves with the thought that they deserve even more power over the lives of the rest of us. In many cases there's more than self-flattery involved: many of these men are involved in giant, multinational business enterprises, and they see more profit for themselves in the conversion of the world into a sort of global plantation, with themselves in the role of owners and overseers, and the rest of us as their serfs.

These cosmopolitan big-business elements are the elements that most of the unsophisticated opponents of the New World Order think about. Often these unsophisticated opponents simply rail against "the international bankers" and attribute to them the dominant role in New World Order scheming. At least as important as these super-wealthy big-business elements, however -- and vastly more numerous -- are those who support the New World Order for reasons of ideology or fashion. The idea of a world government has had a trendy sort of appeal among leftist academics and clerics, as well as among a number of shallow intellectuals influenced by the former and Christians influenced by the latter. Bill and Hillary Clinton, as well as many of

their friends and associates, are among the former: the New World Order has been fashionable among the crowd they have run with since high school, and these people are nothing if not fashion conscious. They are people who would rather be torn apart by wild horses than be caught with an unfashionable idea in their heads.

Many of the Christian supporters of the New World Order are tormented by feelings of White racial guilt or of misplaced compassion for the non-White hordes of the world. They see the New World Order as a way to "equalize" the world racially by redistributing the world's wealth and to punish the Whites by bringing them down to the level of the non-Whites.

Also among the ideological boosters of the New World Order are those who claim to see greater security for everyone under a world government or who are simply attracted by the concept of a more orderly world under centralized control. Since the early part of this century groups such as the Council on Foreign Relations have been working behind the scenes on the political and the academic fronts to promote the idea of a New World Order. These people argue that with weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear bombs, on the loose, the only way for humanity to be safe is under a world government. Only through the establishment of a New World Order, they assert, can we hope to eliminate war and its associated evils. Yet these same intellectuals were hotter than anyone else to unleash the Second World War -- the most destructive and murderous war ever inflicted on the world -- and to develop and use nuclear weapons in that war. Their conspiring and their behind-the-scenes maneuvering succeeded in turning a regional conflict in eastern Europe, primarily between Germany and the Soviet Union, into a global campaign to destroy Germany and save the Soviet Union. Their great disappointment was that the war in Europe ended too soon for them to use nuclear weapons against Germany. Despite their professed abhorrence of war, they are all too ready to resort to it in order to prevent what they consider the wrong sort of New World Order, or even the wrong sort of New European Order.

And this brings us to a third element -- and the most important element -- among the proponents of the New World Order. This is the Jewish element. Anyone who reads the Old Testament with eyes not blinded by Christian piety cannot miss its central message: the Jews are a special people who are morally superior to the other peoples of the earth, "a chosen people": chosen by their tribal deity to inherit the earth and all its riches and to be served by non-Jews. Isaiah, for example, spells out this message clearly and explicitly. Orthodox religious Jews believe it literally. Even atheistic Jews believe it, in a sense. They believe that they are smarter, more resourceful, and better organized than non-Jews and so deserve to exploit them and rule over them.

And, at least as far as being better organized, they certainly are correct. They have ten times as many organizations per capita to represent their interests as any other race or ethnic group. Some of these are strictly internal educational or cultural organizations, aimed at maintaining Jewish cohesiveness and the Jewish sense of identity. Others are aimed at exerting pressure or influence on the Gentile majorities around them. Some of these latter organizations, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, are quite powerful and have Gentile politicians dancing to their tune.

And in a collective sense the Jews may be justified in thinking that they are smarter. Which is to say that they have developed a collective strategy for survival and self-advancement which so far has been extraordinarily successful. Central to this strategy is the maintenance of a sense of grievance against the non-Jewish world, a sense that Jews not only must stick together, but that they are justified in using deceit and any other tactic in their dealings with the Gentiles, because the Gentiles are out to destroy them. Certainly no other race celebrates its alleged "persecutions" the way the Jews do theirs. In their annual Purim festival, for example, they still nurse a 2,500-year-old grievance against the ancient Persians.

More than anything else, however, it is the Jews' control of the news and entertainment media which gives them their immense power. For more than 50 years they have consistently used their media power to advance the schemes of the New World Order gang.

Clearly the Jews see a dominant role for themselves in a world government because of the power they already wield. Beyond this, with their highly leveraged situation -- that is, their need to maintain their control over numerically much larger Gentile populations everywhere, increasing centralization of governmental power is the only strategy which makes sense for them. They have a tiger by the tail, and they dare not let go. Their great fear is that a strong and genuinely patriotic leader may arise in some nation, another Adolf Hitler, and he will succeed in breaking the Jewish control over his people and ending Jewish power in his nation. If that is permitted to happen in any major nation, it may spread quickly to other nations. That is why they pulled out all the stops to destroy Germany during the Second World War. And, if they were not already convinced, the Second World War redoubled their conviction that they must make every nation subordinate to a world government under their control.

What the Jews and the other New World Order schemers have in mind goes far, far beyond the United Nations Organization that they created at the end of the Second World War. The UN has been moderately successful at bullying small countries into line with the threat of so-called "peace keeping" forces, but it has no power over large nations. The Jews want a final end to the possibility of the resurgence of any nationalism -- except their own, of course. They want to eliminate forever the possibility that the people of Russia, the United States, Germany, Britain, or any other country except Israel will act of their own will.

This total elimination of national sovereignty is in accord with the interests of the non-Jewish New World Order schemers as well. The whole idea of patriotism has been in bad odor with the leftist academics and their semi-intellectual hangers on for a long time. Patriotism is an alien concept to them. They are instinctively hostile to patriots. Bill Clinton, who demonstrated against his own country during the Vietnam war, provides an excellent example of this mind-set. And patriotism is contrary to the universalist ideas of the Christian clerics backing the New World Order.

Finally, the international capitalists also are hostile to national sovereignty. They want a truly global plantation, with a global labor pool for them to exploit and a global market for them to milk. National boundaries and any tendencies toward protecting national interests just get in their way and cut into their profits.

So now we can begin to understand some of the things which have been happening to us during the past few decades in terms of these goals of the New World Order schemers. For example, the refusal of the United States government to control our borders. We have millions of illegal aliens in the United States and hundreds of thousands more entering the country every year. Stopping the flow of illegal aliens across our borders and deporting the illegals already here would be a trivially easy thing for the United States government to do.

It would cost far less money than is spent each year in providing various social and medical services to illegal aliens now. Any military or police operations involved could be integrated with training programs and could provide valuable experience for military and police personnel. But the Federal government has consistently refused to take any effective action to halt illegal immigration.

Federal officials have simply play-acted in this regard, spending a tiny amount of money to beef up a border fence along the Mexican border in one area and leaving the border unguarded in another area. In response to public outrage by citizens in border areas who demand action by the government, a few dozen more Border Patrol agents will be hired or some other action will be taken to make it seem that the government wants to control the borders, but every action taken is **deliberately** ineffective -- and I mean **deliberately.**

The truth of the matter is that the New World Order people ultimately aim to create a New World Population of serfs for their global plantation, a homogeneous population of coffee-colored serfs --- a population of docile, predictable, and interchangeable serfs -- and they definitely don't want any large reservoir of White people anywhere who might rebel.

So from the point of view of the New World Order planners, the more Mexicans, Haitians, and Vietnamese who pour into the United States, the better. But they are not ready yet to announce publicly that their aim is to destroy the racial character of the U.S. population. So when the citizens squawk too loudly about illegal aliens, the government puts on a pretense of doing something about the problem. What they want to do is keep the illegals coming in while they continue to enforce their racial mixing and their anti-discrimination laws. Their aim is to homogenize the population and destroy its White character gradually, without provoking an uprising.

Or consider Bill Clinton's current campaign to have more legislation enacted against so-called "hate crimes." This may score a few votes from Black, homosexual, and feminist voters for the Democrats, but the Democrats were getting all of those votes anyway. As I have explained before, Mr. Clinton's campaign to outlaw "hate" makes very little sense if it is taken at face value. It is understandable only in the context of a much larger campaign to scrap the Bill of Rights.

In fact, what we see when we look closely at the principal backers of the New World Order and at the people who have been loudest in their demands for curbs on First Amendment rights, in their demands for the elimination of all Second Amendment rights, and in their calls for governmental behavior contrary to the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments as well, all in the name of increasing public security -- what we see is that these are the same people.

The people who want to outlaw what they call "hate speech," the people who want to confiscate all private firearms, the people who believe that Political Correctness should take precedence over the right to due process and a speedy trial, to freedom from double jeopardy, from being compelled to testify against oneself, and from unlawful search and seizure -- all these people are fervent promoters of the New World Order.

And all of the people who have been scheming for the New World Order understand that the one thing which could upset their applecart is a rebellion by White patriots, and they're determined to have the government tighten its grip on the people in order to prevent a rebellion from taking place.

I apologize for not having enough time to present more details, for not carefully documenting everything with plenty of evidence, but I've done that on other *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts.

What does all this mean for our future? It means that the government's assault on our freedom will not abate; instead it will become more intense, more vicious, more reckless. The government lawlessness that we saw at Ruby Ridge and at Waco will intensify. The government is irrevocably committed to repressing dissent, to stifling opposition, and to intimidating its critics.

The New World Order schemers are absolutely determined to have their way. They have been able to go a long way toward their goal by using subterfuge and deceit. But ultimately the transformation of a world of independent nations into the global plantation they are aiming at will involve changes so profound and so traumatic that subterfuge and deceit will not be enough to keep the serfs under control. They will need raw police power, applied KGB style. They want to begin developing that power now. They're a pretty bold and arrogant bunch of schemers, but they understand that according to the old way of looking at things -- according to our way -- they are traitors. They understand that if the general public ever gets a real inkling of what they are up to, if they ever lose their grip on the situation, they'll all end up hanging from lampposts. What they are planning is so monstrous, so evil, that the thought of being brought to account for it frightens them. They want to use every means at their disposal to make sure their plan succeeds.

And, my friends, we will resort to every means at our disposal to insure that their scheme does **not** succeed and that they do indeed end up hanging from lampposts.

The Feminization of America

I always have been very fond of women -- perhaps too much sometimes. I always have enjoyed their company greatly. I have really worshipped feminine beauty. I have admired and respected women when they have served their purpose in the life of our people, as much as I have admired and respected men who have served their purpose.

Having said this I must tell you now that I believe that a great part of the present pathology of our society can be ascribed properly to its feminization over the past century or two, to its loss of its former masculine spirit and masculine character.

This came to mind most recently when I saw and heard the reaction to Timothy McVeigh's statement to the court on August 14, at the time he was sentenced to die. What McVeigh said was very relevant, very pertinent. He said that the government teaches its citizens by its example. When the government breaks the law, then its citizens will not respect the law.

But the spectators almost uniformly were disappointed by this statement. They complained that they wanted to hear him say that he was sorry for what he had done, that he was sorry for the innocent victims of the Oklahoma City bombing. They weren't even interested in hearing about the much larger issue of government lawlessness that Mr. McVeigh raised. They only wanted an apology for the suffering of individual victims. This is a feminine attitude, this focusing on personal and individual feelings rather than on the larger, impersonal context. It is a feminine attitude, despite the fact that it was expressed by grown men.

Many other people besides me have come to similar conclusions, although not all of them have wanted to come right and out and say so, because that would be the height of Political Incorrectness, the height of "insensitivity." As far back as the 1960s some perceptive commentators were remarking on the generally unmasculine character of the young men they encountered in our universities. Male university students even then tended to be too timid; too soft; too lacking in boldness, pride, and independence; too whiny in adversity; insufficiently willing to endure hardship or to challenge obstacles.

We have always had both soft, dependent men and hard, proud men in our society, but the commentators were comparing the relative numbers of masculine and non-masculine men they saw in our universities in the 1960s with what they had seen in the 1930s and 1940s. The 1960s, of course, were a time when the whinier men were making extraordinary efforts to remain in the universities in order to avoid military service, while many of the more masculine men were off in Vietnam, but this isn't enough to account for the change these commentators noticed.

Something written by the American historian Henry Adams back in 1913 was recently called to my attention. Adams wrote "Our age has lost much of its ear for poetry, as it has its eye for color and line and its taste for war and worship, wine and women." Now, Henry Adams was a man who had much more than a passing interest in such matters -- he was a lifelong student of these things and also was a professor of history at Harvard back in the days when the professors at that university were expected to know what they were talking about -- so we ought to pay some

attention to his observation of the state of affairs in America in 1913. Incidentally, he was a member of one of America's most distinguished families. He was a great grandson of the founding father and second President of the country, John Adams, and a grandson of the sixth President, John Quincy Adams.

Henry's brother, Brooks Adams, had written a book 18 years earlier, in 1895, on the subject commented on by Henry. It was *The Law of Civilization and Decay,* and in it Brooks made an even more general observation than that stated later by Henry. Brooks saw two types of man: the type he described as spiritual man, typified by the farmer-warrior-poet-priest; and the type he called economic man, typified by the merchant and the bureaucrat. I believe that Brooks must have known a different breed of priests than those I am familiar with. He was thinking of Martin Luther and Giordano Bruno, not Billy Graham and John Paul II.

He saw spiritual man as having the leading role in the building of a civilization, with the economic men coming out of the woodwork and assuming the dominant role after the civilization had peaked and was in the process of decay. Spiritual men are those with vision and daring and a close connection to their roots, their spiritual sources. Economic men are those who know how to calculate the odds and evaluate an opportunity, but who have cut themselves loose from their spiritual roots and become cosmopolitans, to the extent that that offers an economic advantage. The spirit of adventure and the current of idealism run strong in spiritual men; economic men, on the other hand, are materialists. And Brooks was referring only to European men, to White men. He was not even considering the Jews or Chinese.

Most of us are a mixture of the two types, and it's difficult to find examples of purely spiritual or purely economic men. Michelangelo and Charles Lindbergh tended toward the type of spiritual man. Pick almost any prominent politician today -- Bill Clinton or Newt Gingrich, say -- and you have a good example of economic man. Which is not to say that all economic men are politicians, by any means: just that, since they are not likely to be distinguished in the arts, scholarship, or exploration, politics is where economic men are most likely to find fame.

So what does this have to do with the feminization of our society and the preponderance of whiny young men at our universities today? Actually, these things are very closely interrelated. They also are related to the things which caught the attention of Henry Adams: the loss of our aesthetic sense, our warrior spirit, and our feeling for what is divine, along with our masculinity.

When I say "loss," I am using this word only in its relative sense. Our society still has masculine elements, masculine characteristics; it's just that they are weaker now than they were 200 years ago. And 200 years ago there were some effeminate tendencies to be found; tendencies which today have become much more pronounced. It would be an error, I believe, to attribute this shift in balance solely to the machinations of feminists, homosexuals, or even Jews. They are responsible for the condition of our society today primarily in the sense that the pus in a ripe boil is to be blamed for the boil. The feminists, homosexuals and Jews characterize our society in large part today -- they are symptoms of the pathology afflicting our society -- but we must look deeper for the cause of our decay.

Let me repeat Henry Adams' observation. He wrote: "Our age has lost much of its ear for poetry, as it has its eye for color and line and its taste for war and worship, wine and women."

If he were writing today, he might note that the immortal lyrics of his contemporary, Tennyson, have given way in favor to the pretentious drivel of Maya Angelou; that the Western tradition in art, which had culminated in the 19th century in the paintings of Caspar David Friedrich and John Constable, has been shoved aside in the 20th century by the trash-art of Picasso, Chagall, and Pollock; that the profession of arms, which was still a more or less honorable profession in the 19th century, a profession in which gentlemen and even scholars still could be found, has become at the end of the 20th century a vocation for bureaucrats and lickspittles, for men without honor or spirit; that worship, once taken seriously even by many intelligent and sophisticated men, is now the business of Christian democrats, with their egalitarian social gospel, and of vulgarians of the Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker stripe, with their television congregations of superstitious, amen-shouting dimwits.

Can we properly describe this change noted by Henry Adams as the feminization of our society? Or should it be thought of as the replacement of aristocratic values by democratic values, a general vulgarization of standards and tastes? Actually, these two ways of looking at the change are related. But let me take Brooks Adams' position now and say that the change can be attributed most fundamentally to the growing materialism in our society, to the replacement of spiritual values by economic values. What does that have to do with feminism or with democracy?

Actually, a great deal. In a very broad sense, aristocratic values are masculine values, and democratic values -- egalitarian values -- are feminine values. It is also true that, in a very broad sense, materialism is a feminine way of looking at the world. It is a way which puts emphasis on safety, security, and comfort, and on tangible things at the expense of intangibles. It is not concerned with concepts such as honor, and very little with beauty, tradition, and roots. It is a way with a limited horizon, with the home and hearth very much in sight, but not distant frontiers. Reverence and awe for Nature's majesty are unknown to the materialist.

As spiritual man gives way to economic man, when one historical era merges into another -- as idealism gives way to materialism -- society gives a freer play to the feminine spirit while it restricts the masculine spirit. Words gain over deeds; action gives way to talk. Quantity is valued over quality. All of God's children are loved equally. Pickaninnies are considered "cute" or even "adorable." The role of the government shifts from that of a father, who maintains an orderly and lawful environment in which men are free to strive for success as little or as much as suits them, to that of a mother, who wants to insure that all of her children will be supplied with whatever they need.

It is not just society which changes, not just government, not just public policy; individual attitudes and behavior also change. The way in which children are raised changes. Girls no longer are raised to be mothers and homemakers but rather to be self-indulgent careerists. Boys no longer are raised to be strong-willed, independent, and resourceful. That requires hardness and self-denial; it requires masculine rule during the formative years. A disciplined environment gives way to a permissive one, and so the child does not learn self-discipline. Spanking becomes

a criminal offense. The child is not punished for disobedience, nor is he given the opportunity to fail and to learn from this the penalties that the real world holds for those who are not strong enough to succeed. And so boys grow up to be whiny and ineffective young men, who believe that a plausible excuse is an acceptable substitute for performance and who never can understand why the gratification they seek eludes them.

The move from masculine idealism to feminine materialism leads inevitably to hedonism, egoism, and eventually narcissism. Henry Adams also claimed that we have lost our taste for wine and women. Well, certainly not in the sense that we have become less interested in alcohol or sex. What he meant is that we have lost the keen edge of our appreciation for civilization's refinements, for the finest and most subtle things in life: that our appetites have become grosser as they have become less disciplined. Our interest now is in alcohol for its ability to give us a momentary buzz, not in fine wine for its inherent artistry.

A similar consideration applies to the way in which our taste for women has changed. And is this not to be expected? It is the masculine spirit which appreciates woman, which appreciates feminine qualities, and as this spirit declines, our taste for women loses its edge and becomes coarser. We move from an age in which women were not only appreciated but also treasured and protected into an age in which homosexuality is open, tolerated, and increasingly common; Madonna is a celebrated symbol of American womanhood; and feminine beauty is a mere commodity, like soybeans or crude oil: an age in which parents dump their daughters into the multiracial cesspool that America's schools and cities have become to let them fend for themselves. In an age in which materialism and feminism are ascendant, this is the only way it can be. To attempt to make it otherwise -- to attempt to decommercialize sex, for example -- would be a blow against the economy, against the materialist spirit. And to elevate women again to the protected status they had in a more masculine era would be fought tooth and nail by the feminists as a limitation on women's freedom.

This subject is a little fuzzy, and I've been speaking qualitatively rather than quantitatively. For almost everything I've said, an opponent could produce a counterexample. And that's because I'm talking about very large-scale phenomena, involving many people, many institutions, and many types of interactions. Even during periods of history which I would characterize as masculine or as dominated by the masculine spirit, one can find examples of feminine tendencies and of institutions with a feminine spirit, just as one can find masculine tendencies in our society today. For example, while I claim that our society is becoming more effeminate today, someone can attempt to counter that by noting that masculinized women are more prominent today -- female lawyers, female executives, female military officers -- and one can attribute that to masculine influences in our society. I would counter that by saying that when men become less masculine, women become less feminine.

Likewise, when I relate materialism and feminism, or when I say that the rise of the economic spirit is associated with a decline in masculinity, someone else can find plenty of men with no shortage of testosterone -- strong, aggressive capitalists -- who are epitomes of what Brooks Adams called "economic man."

What it really amounts to is that the masculine character, like the feminine character, has many components. The component I have emphasized today is the spiritual component -- and there are other components. It is a complex subject. But I still believe that we can meaningfully describe what has happened to our society and our civilization during the past couple of centuries as a decline in masculinity. I believe that such a description sheds a useful light on one aspect of what has happened to us. And I believe that Henry Adams' comment on our society's loss of its artistic sense and of its sense of reverence, along with its warrior spirit, is a generally true statement which has value in helping us to understand our predicament. Adams, to be sure, was a scholar of considerable depth, and he wrote a great deal of carefully reasoned material to support the one-sentence summary which I quoted.

By the way, one subject with which Henry Adams -- and his brother Brooks too -- were familiar in this regard was the role of the Jew in undermining civilization. Henry made a number of comments about the destructive role of the Jews in the economic and cultural aspects of European civilization. His observations on this subject are perhaps best summed up by something he wrote in a letter to a friend in 1896: "The Jew," he wrote, "has got into the soul . . . and wherever he . . . [that is, the Jew] goes, there must remain a taint in the blood forever." How much worse that taint has become during the century since Henry Adams made that observation!

I apologize for being so abstract in my own comments today. But I believe that it's useful to back off every now and then and try to see the big picture, to try to develop an intuitive sort of understanding of our situation, even if it means talking about things which are by their nature somewhat fuzzy.

The Giant Gold Robbery

I've mentioned the Jewish program of extortion against Switzerland before, but this is such a fascinating subject I just can't stay away from it. Almost every day the Jews outreach themselves in setting new records for arrogance, deceit, and greed. It's really breathtaking to watch them.

For the sake of review, the whole thing started last year when a group of Jews, looking around for a new way to milk more money from the "Holocaust," hit on the idea of announcing that Swiss bankers were keeping money that had been deposited by Jews before or during the Second World War who had then died or been killed during the war. Like most clever swindles, this one contained a grain of truth. Among the dormant accounts in Swiss banks there are some which did belong to Jews who died during the war. Every bank in the world accumulates dormant accounts, and some of these accounts undoubtedly were opened by Jews.

Now, the Swiss bankers have standard procedures for dealing with their depositors and for handling dormant accounts, and those procedures have nothing at all to do with the ethnicity of the depositor. Jewish depositors are and always have been treated just like everyone else. The same efforts are made to contact the owners of dormant accounts, regardless of whether those owners are Jews or Gentiles. And regardless of what you think about bankers as a whole, Swiss bankers are generally recognized as especially reputable -- as bankers who are especially careful to play by the rules. That's one of the reasons Swiss banks are so highly regarded around the world.

If a group of Tibetans or Laplanders had begun raising a fuss about dormant accounts their grandfathers had opened in Swiss banks, the Swiss bankers would have dealt with them in the standard manner: the bankers would have said to them, just show us some proof that you are the legitimate heirs of depositors who have died, and we will give you any money in the accounts, and that would have been it. No one would have expected more than that, and no special media attention would have been given to the Tibetans or Laplanders.

In fact, before this particular swindle was launched last year, Jews, along with people of just about every other race and nationality on the planet, had claimed and been awarded dormant accounts in the standard way, without any special difficulty.

But the Jews who launched this scheme weren't interested in having dormant accounts handled in the standard way. They were interested in blackmail and extortion on a grand scale. And they had reason to believe that they could get away it, while the Tibetans and Laplanders obviously couldn't. That reason was the control of the news and entertainment media by their fellow Jews.

The first act in the scheme went like this: The schemers got together with some of their buddies in the media, and front-page articles appeared simultaneously in newspapers all over the world to the effect that Swiss bankers were unscrupulously holding onto as much as $7 billion which belonged to the heirs of so-called "Holocaust" victims. The members of the Jewish group wanted the Swiss bankers to turn this money over to them. The Swiss responded, as one might have expected, with denials and outrage. The president of Switzerland denounced the Jewish demands

as an extortion attempt. And had only Tibetans or Laplanders been involved, that's where the affair would have ended. But instead, the Jewish media shifted into second gear and counterattacked, feigning outrage themselves over the charge of extortion. How could a bunch of nice, Jewish boys possibly be involved in extortion -- especially when the magic word "Holocaust" had been invoked to sanctify their claim for money?

Then the Swiss made their first big mistake: they apologized for accusing the Jews of extortion. They explained their procedure for claiming dormant accounts. They hired public relations firms. They said that there couldn't possibly be $7 billion in dormant accounts belonging to "Holocaust" victims, but that there might be some money and that they would make another examination of their dormant accounts. They announced that as a charitable act they would donate $180 million to the Jews, not from dormant accounts but from their own general funds, just for the sake of goodwill.

The Swiss didn't understand the Jewish mentality. They didn't understand that Jews aren't people you can live with. With Jews there's no compromising. The Jews correctly viewed the Swiss apology and the Swiss offer of a charitable donation to "Holocaust" survivors as signs of weakness, and so they stepped up their demands. They got one of their step'n'fetchit Gentile politicians involved, New York Senator Alphonse D'Amato, who is chairman of the Senate Banking Committee and who has made a career out of doing favors for the Jews. And they began escalating their demands and their threats.

And the Swiss kept making mistakes. They kept apologizing and backtracking and trying to placate the Jews. Aside from their reputation for honesty, the big thing Swiss banks had going for them was their reputation for confidentiality. A person could put his money in a Swiss bank account and reasonably expect that no one would ever learn about it if he didn't announce the fact himself. Last month, in an attempt to prove to the world that they weren't hiding any Jewish money, Swiss bankers compromised their reputation for confidentiality by publishing a list of the names of the account-holders for all 1,756 accounts they could find which had been dormant since the end of the Second World War. These accounts contained a total of approximately $40 million.

Do you think this pleased the Jews a bit? They scrutinized the list, and the first thing they noted was that fewer than ten per cent of the names on it were Jewish. They didn't say much about this, however, except in their own Jewish community newspapers, because it tended to deflate the fable they had concocted of the Swiss bankers hoarding the savings of many thousands of Jewish "Holocaust" victims totaling billions of dollars. Instead they began screaming that, based on a similarity of names, eight of the 1,756 accounts on the list might belong to people who had been connected in one way or another with the German government during the war. There were names on the list which were the same as or similar to a former vice-president of the Reichstag, Hitler's official photographer, the wife of a top SS official, and five others. "Oy, veh! You've been doing business with Nazis!" the Jews shrieked.

The Swiss reminded the Jews that Switzerland had been a neutral country during the war and that Swiss banks had customers from both sides of the conflict. Reminding everyone of that was another mistake for the poor Swiss. The Jews, Senator D'Amato, and the rest of the Jews' camp

followers began moaning that the Swiss really had sympathized with the Germans, that they had wanted the Germans to win and had helped the German war effort by trading with Germany.

Now, that's another one of those little grains of truth in this whole fabric of lies the Jews have constructed. A great many Swiss, especially in the German-speaking parts of the country, were pro-German. And of course, they did carry on trade with both the Germans and their allies as well as with the allies of the Jews, such as the United States and the Soviet Union. The Jews seized on the fact of Swiss trade with the Germans and began beating the Swiss on the heads with that. The gold the Germans gave the Swiss in return for manufactured products during the war probably had been confiscated from Jews, they screamed. Some of it probably was gold teeth extracted from Jewish concentration camp victims. "Give it back! Give it back to us!" The Swiss responded by apologizing for having remained neutral during the war and by donating another $100 million to the fund for "Holocaust" victims they already had set up.

That's nowhere enough to satisfy one Jewish leader, Avraham Burg, the head of Israel's Jewish Agency. (That's actually its name: the Jewish Agency.) Burg has demanded for the Jews not only all the gold which had gone to Switzerland from Germany during the war to pay for manufactured goods, but also gold which the victorious Allies confiscated from Germany at the end of the war and have been doling out ever since to various countries occupied by the Germans during the war to compensate these countries for their wartime losses. Burg claims that this gold once belonged to Jews, and he has demanded that all of the vaults holding this gold be sealed until it is officially turned over to Jews. He has demanded -- and I quote him exactly -- "that the corrupt division and distribution of Jewish spoils from World War II to world governments must immediately be ceased, and every last cent must be returned to Jewish hands."

Isn't that interesting wording? "[E]very last cent must be returned to Jewish hands." Not necessarily to the hands of the Jews Burg claims originally owned the gold, since it would be impossible to determine who those Jews were, but just "to Jewish hands." Just get it away from the Gentiles and put it into Jewish hands. The Jews will figure out what to do with it.

Imagine how that demand would sound if, instead of Jews, Lutherans or Baptists were claiming the gold. During the war the Soviet government forced millions of ethnic Germans -- the so-called "Volga Germans" -- off the land they had owned for 150 years, since being invited to Russia by Catherine the Great, and deported them to Siberia. After the war the communist and democratic victors forced millions of other ethnic Germans off their land in eastern Germany in a huge and murderous "ethnic cleansing" program, to which the western Allies consented.

Most of these plundered and dispossessed Germans were Lutherans, and what was stolen from them dwarfs any claim the Jews have made. Imagine the Lutheran church demanding today that it be compensated for everything that had been stolen from those plundered Germans during and after the war. We would laugh at the absurdity of the church's claim. The fact that Avraham Burg and his fellow Jews make such a claim today tells us something about their mentality, about their ethnocentricity and sense of racial solidarity, about their "us against them" attitude toward the world, as well as about their greed for gold. And it tells us about the folly of thinking of Jews as merely people with a different religion, who become anything other than Jews when they change their religion.

The reason that Avraham Burg can confidently make such demands, while no Lutheran spokesman dares do the same, is based on the fact of Jewish media control. The Jews have spent 60 years, since before the Second World War, using the media to complain about their mistreatment by the Germans, the Poles, the Ukrainians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Hungarians, the Croatians, and so on. After the war they poured such a deluge of pro-Jewish propaganda out of Hollywood that most Americans today think of Jews as being the principal victims of the Second World War. Almost no one has heard about what Jewish Communism did to the Russians, the Ukrainians, the Poles, and the other European peoples unfortunate enough to be ruled by Communists before, during, or after the Second World War. Almost no one has heard about the mass murder of millions of German civilians after the war. In fact, most Americans can't even give a good estimate of the number of Americans who died in combat during the war. But everybody has heard about the grossly inflated figure of "six million" Jews supposedly killed in gas chambers by the Germans and then converted into soap, lampshades, and gold dental fillings.

This incessant Jewish "Holocaust" propaganda has got most people, including the Swiss, buffaloed. It has given the Jews a special status, a martyr status. Most people are afraid to criticize them or contradict them. But even the Swiss bankers and politicians who aren't fooled by the Jewish "Holocaust" exaggerations are afraid of the power of the Jewish media. They understand that the U.S. government is practically under the Jews' control. They understand that American politicians who are in the Jews' pockets, like Senator D'Amato, can cause them a lot of trouble. They understand that the Jews have enough political power through their media control to persuade the U. S. government to go along with a boycott of Switzerland if they demand one. And so instead of standing up to the Jews the Swiss keep on apologizing and trying to buy the Jewish blackmailers off. And the Jews continue to see this as weakness, and so they keep on pushing. They keep on demanding more.

And, hey, don't think that's because the Jews are greedy! They're not really interested in the gold, but only in the principle of the thing, they assure us. Israel Singer, the secretary of the World Jewish Congress, one of the groups applying pressure to the Swiss, has announced, "This is not about money. It is about justice." Right.

This business of demanding reparations for things which allegedly happened 50 or 60 years ago does bring up some interesting principles. The descendants of our Black slaves in this country are a bit slower at spotting opportunities than the Jews are, but even they can recognize a profitable principle when they see one. They're beginning to talk about the reparations that White people owe them for slavery. They might want to add up all of the man-hours their slave ancestors worked, multiply that by, say, $5 an hour, add interest at six per cent since the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, and present us with the bill. Why not?

And what about the Indians and the real estate they can claim we owe them for? Why should it be only the Jews who can get away with making such claims -- and with collecting on them? They've already extorted $55 billion in reparations from the German people since 1948. Suppose the Germans started figuring up what is owed to them? Or suppose the Scots presented a bill to the English? Or suppose the English presented a bill to the people of Normandy? Why is it only

the Jews who are entitled to go back into history and add up their carefully nursed grievances and present a bill to the rest of the world?

The latest concession they've blackmailed the Swiss into is a $5 billion so-called "solidarity fund" to be used to compensate "victims of poverty, war, and genocide." A panel, a majority of whose members are Jews, is to decide how to dole out this money after it is collected from the Swiss people. If the Swiss are prompt in coughing up this money, then the Jews say they will not organize an international boycott of Switzerland.

Fortunately for the Swiss, they have at least one patriot among their politicians. He is a 56-year-old industrialist and member of the Swiss parliament, Christoph Blocher, and he is telling the Swiss people that they ought not to give in to this blackmail. He is telling his people that they owe nothing to the Jews and they ought to pay them nothing. And he is gaining strong support from Swiss voters. We'll see what happens next year, when the Swiss vote on whether or not to let the Jews take them to the cleaners for another $5 billion.

So far the Jews have been so pleased with the way the Swiss are caving in to their demands for gold that they're talking about similar claims against Sweden, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey. Hey, why not? When you've got the whole world buffaloed with "Holocaust" baloney, why not go for everything you can get?

If you really want to get some insight into the Jewish mentality, go to any big library -- or to the Internet -- and start collecting news clippings on these Jewish claims for reparations. Study the details. Try to see the big picture. Make some of the comparisons I've hinted at today: comparisons of the way the Jews look at their history to the way in which other races, other nations, look at their own histories. It will amaze you. It will take your breath away. And it will convince you that it's time for the world to do something about getting this Jewish monkey off its back.

Black On White Violence

Everyone has heard about the three White teenagers in Michigan who hopped a freight train, accidentally got off in a Black neighborhood in the city of Flint, and were attacked by a gang of Blacks while trying to find a telephone so they could call their parents. The Blacks beat and robbed all three White youngsters, stripped and raped the White girl, then shot all three of the young Whites in the head, execution style, leaving them for dead. One of them, a 14-year-old boy, did in fact die from his gunshot wound. The other two, a 15-year-old boy and the 14-year-old girl who had been beaten, stripped, and raped, played dead after being shot, and eventually they escaped.

All of this happened back in July, and at first I had no plans to say anything about it. After all, it's the sort of thing that happens all the time in this wonderful, multicultural America we live in. Everyone understands that and accepts it, so it didn't seem like a very promising topic. In fact, I was surprised by the amount of media coverage the crime received. It was nowhere near as much coverage as there would have been if a group of Whites had attacked three young Blacks, of course, but still it was much more coverage than these Black-on-White racial crimes ordinarily receive from the controlled media. I think what caught the attention of the media in this case was the fact that there were three victims. Just one White girl being gang-raped or one White boy being murdered would have received only momentary and strictly local notice.

More than that, though, was the way in which the crime happened: it's the sort of thing which most White Americans -- certainly those who live in large cities and drive to work every day -- have nightmares about: accidentally taking the wrong freeway exit while coming home at night and ending up in a Black neighborhood. That nightmare scene was the key element in Tom Wolfe's best-selling novel, *Bonfire of the Vanities.*

I had no plans to comment on this racial crime until someone sent me an account of it from the July 21 issue of *Time* magazine. The first thing that caught my attention in this *Time* article was the headline. It said: ". . . three white teens are allegedly assaulted by a group of Black youths." **"Allegedly."** I think it is reasonable to use that word in talking about a specific suspect who, prior to his trial and conviction, is only "alleged" to be guilty. In the case at hand, however, there was no question at all that an assault had taken place. There were three White teenagers with bullets in their heads, one of them dead and one of them raped, and the shooting and raping had taken place in an all-Black area. There was no question at all about the race of their assailants. The use of the word "allegedly" in the *Time* story clearly was an indication of unwillingness to accept the Politically Incorrect facts of the Black-on-White assault, and it set the tone for the whole article.

Suppose the attackers had been White and the victims Black. Do you believe that *Time* would have used the word "allegedly"?

Other things in the *Time* story also caught my attention. The three White victims are in several ways typical of the worst elements of White society today. They are the type who wear baseball caps backward with baggy shorts and hang around shopping malls with nothing useful to do

except swap cards with photos of Black basketball players. Everything they know they have learned from watching television: mostly MTV. And their parents seem to be no better. Their parents certainly did nothing to prepare them for life in multicultural America. The kids had no idea of the danger they were in when they got off the train in a Black neighborhood. Their Politically Correct parents had never warned them.

The most sickening part of the *Time* story is the revelation that the mother of the murdered White boy has two other children -- by two Black fathers. *Time* considers this ironic: that this **good** woman, who has tried so hard to be a true multiculturalist, a true Clintonista, and has kept her son free of any sense of his Whiteness, has lost him to a group of misguided Black youths.

I'm reminded of Nicole Brown Simpson, whose parents never warned her either about Blacks -- who, in fact, seem to be proud that they raised her without any sense of racial identity. If only all of the White victims of Black savagery who are raped and murdered in this country every year could be those who are lost to our race anyway!

Unfortunately, that's not the case. It is depressing contemplating the situation of White Americans today. And it doesn't do any good to rage at their lack of courage or their lack of understanding or even to promise ourselves that when the revolution comes we'll roast everyone connected with *Time* magazine over a bonfire. We'll never have a chance to build that bonfire and roast any of the deceivers and betrayers of our people unless we are able to help White Americans improve their situation first. And I've always believed that knowing the truth, knowing the facts, is the way for anyone to begin improving his situation. So let's look at some facts: some **racial** facts.

And let's not begin in some backwoodsy backwater like Flint, Michigan, but instead in the national showplace of Clintonism and multiculturalism, the world center of diversity and affirmative action: Washington, DC. I've never been to Flint, but I lived in Washington for 18 years. I still have the stench of the place in my nostrils. Washington is 70 per cent Black. Some of its inhabitants like to refer to it as "Chocolate City." Some Whites in the suburbs call it "Zoo City." One of the reasons there are so many Blacks in Washington is that it is ground zero for equality and the New World Order. It is a good city for them, with lots of gravy and chitlins. In the first place the Federal government subsidizes the operation of the city to the tune of about a million dollars a day, because it can't afford to let the nation's capital sink back into the jungle and begin looking like Kinshasa or Port-au-Prince. In other words, we taxpayers around the country are paying for the upkeep of the place. The Washington city government is almost entirely Black, with a Black school officials, a Black mayor, and so on. The city's schools are staffed with Black teachers and Black principals: all sorts of role models for young Blacks. Furthermore, the Federal government, which is by far the largest employer in the area, is heavily overloaded with Black employees. There's an abundance of undemanding jobs with high salaries and lots of benefits. And on top of that the welfare is good in Washington. Handouts are easily available for everyone, because the government doesn't want people sleeping in empty shipping cartons on the sidewalk in front of the White House. Makes a bad impression on foreign tourists.

So anyway, with all of this benevolence and special attention from the Great White Father, maybe you'd expect our colored brothers in Washington to be on their best behavior. Maybe

you'd be expecting them to want to prove to the world that they really are our equals. Well, the truth of the matter is that they behave in Washington about the same way they behave in Flint -- or in Kinshasa and Port-au-Prince. Fifty per cent of the Black males in the District of Columbia between the ages of 18 and 35 are currently entangled in the criminal justice system. That is, they are in jail, they are out on bond awaiting trial on criminal charges, there is an arrest warrant out for them and the police are trying to find them, or they are on parole or probation after being convicted of a criminal offense. Fifty per cent. One out of every two.

And that does not include those who were formerly entangled in the criminal justice system: that is, those who already have served their sentences for a criminal offense and no longer are on probation -- like the mayor, Marion Barry, for example, who was convicted on a crack cocaine charge and finished serving his time several years ago. The fifty per cent figure I just gave you came from a study of the crime problem in Washington which was published in the *Washington Post* on August 26, 1997.

I don't have an exact figure for those who, like the mayor, are former offenders without current charges against them. It is reasonable to say, though, that **most** of the Black males between the ages of 18 and 35 you will meet on the streets of Washington, DC, are felons, with either current charges against them or previous criminal records. You wander into the wrong neighborhood in Washington -- which is just about any neighborhood outside of the heavily policed government area or the White area in the northwestern part of the city -- and you're likely to end up like those clueless White teenagers in Michigan, whose parents never warned them that Blacks really aren't the same as Whites.

Most of the White people who must spend any amount of time in Washington -- and those are mostly White employees of the Federal government -- aren't clueless. They warn each other about the reality of living and working in Washington. Of course, the warnings are usually given in a sneaky sort of way, without actually talking about race. Code words are used, because the Whites in Washington are at least as Politically Correct as Whites in the rest of the country. They feel obliged to maintain the pretense that they believe in equality, that they believe Blacks are no more dangerous or inclined to criminal behavior than anyone else. They want you to know that they believe that if a neighborhood is dangerous, it is only because of poverty. It certainly has nothing to do with race. Crime is an economic problem, not a racial problem, they will tell you.

They feel obliged to maintain this pretense, but they also want to stay alive. So they use code words and code phrases to warn each other. And then every once in a while the truth actually will slip out in one of the principal organs of Political Correctness, such as the *Washington Post.*

There are other clues as to the fundamental and profound differences between Blacks and Whites besides the vastly greater criminality of Blacks. There are the innate differences in intelligence, in problem-solving ability. I've talked about these intellectual differences on other programs. Again, like criminality, the difference in intelligence is something which is widely recognized by knowledgeable Whites, but very rarely talked about, because it is Politically Incorrect to do so.

Occupational patterns provide another clue. Originally, nearly all of the Blacks in America were engaged in agricultural work -- by necessity rather than choice, of course. They were plantation

slaves. After the abolition of slavery, most Blacks initially remained in agricultural work, some as sharecroppers and some with small farms. In any event, the percentage of Blacks engaged in farm work was higher than the percentage of Whites in farm work. Over the past 130 years, however, that situation has changed radically. The change has been especially rapid since the Second World War, but it really began when government welfare programs became generally available. Blacks left the land and moved to the cities in far larger numbers than Whites. Today Blacks constitute 13 per cent of the overall population of the United States, but less than one per cent of the farmers. Less than one per cent!

Both Whites and Blacks have been moving from farms to cities since the Civil War, but proportionately Blacks have flocked to the cities much more than Whites. Why is that? Can it be blamed on White racism? Or does it have something to do with the demands on farmers in general, demands inherent in the nature of the work? I mean, how much crack cocaine can you smoke and still get the crops planted and harvested on time?

I'm certain that if *Time* magazine ever does an article on the disappearance of Black farmers in the United States they'll blame it on White racism. And I must admit, I haven't spent a lot of time trying to analyze this particular problem myself. I've just been struck by the statistic itself -- fewer than one percent of the farmers in the United States are Black -- without undertaking a big research project to discover why that is so. To me it's just another clue that Blacks and Whites really are different. The statistics on the race of farmers in the United States, by the way, are available from the Department of Agriculture in Washington. If there's one thing our government knows how to do, it is collect statistics: employment statistics as well as crime statistics.

White people ought to pay more attention to these statistics -- to these racial facts -- and less attention to the people at *Time* magazine and elsewhere who try to persuade us that these statistics don't mean anything, because we're really all the same, all equal. *Time* would have us believe that we ought not to warn our children to stay away from Blacks and not wander around Black neighborhoods. *Time* would have us believe that Nicole Brown's parents raised her correctly when they let her date Black football players as a teenager. *Time* would have us believe that the mother of the 14-year-old White boy who was murdered in Flint has behaved admirably by having two mongrel children by Black fathers, in addition to her now dead White child. That sort of behavior provides the diverse, multicultural home environment that we all need in order to grow up without racial bias, *Time* hints.

Sometimes I am as angry at these Politically Correct White parents, who send their children out into this jungle world we live in without any of the knowledge they need in order to survive -- as I am at the people at *Time* magazine who set the ideological tone for the parents. The difference is that the people who own *Time* magazine and *MTV* and the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and the rest of the fashion-setting media, spread their poison deliberately, with malice aforethought. They are mostly Jews, working in concert. Their aim is the total moral disarmament of White Americans. They want to make it impossible for us to defend ourselves racially. There is no question about what needs to be done about them.

I try to be more understanding with the fashion-conscious White parents who follow the Jewish media line. After all, most of our people are born with an innate need to be fashionable and

without the sense of discrimination to be able to distinguish healthy fashions from unhealthy fashions. It is not bad that people feel a need to be fashionable. It is a part of the feminine spirit that we are born with. What is unfortunate is that in this era that feminine spirit is not balanced by a masculine spirit which discriminates between what is healthy and what is unhealthy, between what is beneficial to our people and what is hostile. In this era the feminine spirit is ascendant, and it is a spirit which tells us not to resist those who want to destroy us. It is a spirit which in the case of racial conflict tells us to yield, to surrender, to roll over on our backs and bare our throats to our enemies in the hope that they will spare us.

The fashionable, feminine line that these parents have learned from the Jewish media is that we are living in a world which is becoming increasingly less White, that soon White people will be a minority even in the United States, and that instead of doing whatever is necessary to reverse that situation and remain masters in our own land we should try to accommodate ourselves to it; we should try to ingratiate ourselves with non-Whites in the hope that they will tolerate us. Some of these feminized, fashion-conscious parents go so far as to welcome miscegenation: if we are willing to interbreed with the descendants of our slaves, these parents think, then surely they will forgive us for our Whiteness and let us live. And so they fill the minds of their own children with these poisonous ideas and then send them out into the jungle, the way Nicole Brown Simpson's parents did and the way the parents of those three White children in Michigan did.

I try not to be angry at fools and instead to save my anger for those who are consciously evil. In the long run foolishness will be its own punishment, but in the meantime it also will take a lot of innocent young people down with it.

Contrasts

I've been looking again at some of the photographs which have come back from the recent Mars landing. It's really amazing stuff. I used to work at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, where much of this latest Mars mission was planned. Seeing what the folks there have accomplished made me proud to have been associated with the place.

And I've been thinking about some of the contrasts in our society today. In fundamental scientific achievements we've been doing quite well -- perhaps not as well as in the 19th century, but still we've really increased our understanding of the world quite a bit. And in the technological applications of our science we've never done better. From computers to pharmaceuticals to space ships we've made huge progress, progress of which we have every right to be proud. We can do astounding things when we really try.

Now contrast the technological achievements of our society with its political highlights. Contrast the Mars mission with the election of Bill Clinton to the White House -- twice. It's breathtaking, isn't it? Or contrast the abilities and the achievements of the relative handful of people who made our Mars mission possible with the sort of mob mentality we saw in the mass reaction to Princess Diana's death. Diana was a woman without any outstanding qualities at all. She was ordinary to the point of vulgarity. But of course when she was married to the Prince of Wales, and even after they separated, she was the focus of attention of the media fashion-mongers. Undoubtedly it was her ordinariness, combined with the celebrity status bestowed on her by the media, which made so many very ordinary people identify with her. She was what they all dreamed of being: a twit with a vacant smile, lots of money, always dressed in the latest fashion, and invited to all of the most glamorous parties. The response to her death was an example of what I call "the Elvis phenomenon."

Everyone ought to be entitled to choose his own heroes, his own idols, no matter how inane. But this contrast between outstanding intellectual achievement by a few on the one hand and the shocking degree of corruption associated with mass politics and the degree of vulgarity and inanity associated with mass idol worship on the other hand is only one of the really striking contrasts in our society today.

The same educational system which turned out the people who designed the Mars mission is turning out millions of people today who not only haven't a clue about physics, chemistry, or mathematics, but who also haven't a clue about the history of our people -- or even about the proper use of our language. And I'm talking about university graduates. Why bother to take courses in the language of Shakespeare and Milton when one can graduate instead by taking courses in subjects like "California Wines" or "Park Science" or "Black Hair As Culture and History"? Believe it or not, Texas A & M University actually has a "Department of Park Sciences and Rural Sociology." And Stanford University, which used to be a first-class institution before being stricken with a fatal attack of democracy, actually offers a course titled "Black Hair As Culture and History."

Distressing as this vulgarization of our educational system is to me, it is something we can live with, for a while, at least, because it still is possible for a few students to get an excellent education in America -- as the team at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory who designed the Mars mission have proved. And I don't believe that anyone should be prevented from taking courses in California wines or "park science" or astrology and pyramid power, if he wants to waste his time on those things. But there are other consequences of mass democracy in America that will kill us very soon.

Two years ago I visited Pasadena, where I had been a physics student at Caltech long ago, before I worked in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. The Caltech campus is still a pleasant and civilized place, and students there still have an opportunity to get the best possible education. Democracy has done a lot less damage to Caltech than it has to other schools. But one can drive southwest on the freeway from Pasadena for just a few minutes and find oneself in the truly horrifying Third World jungle that is south-central Los Angeles.

There are similar situations all over the United States. We can build hydrogen bombs, we can send robots to Mars, we can discover the most closely guarded secrets of life or of the atom, but we cannot maintain even a semblance of civilization in our cities. Many of our cities still contain enormously expensive glass-and-steel towers, and all sorts of financial power flows through them, and men in expensive suits, carrying briefcases, eat in their restaurants and ride in taxis, but they are not civilized places. Just look at the swarms of sub-humanity on the sidewalks and in the bus and train stations. If the police presence is removed for a day, the jungle will reassert itself. What a contrast with the Caltech campus in Pasadena!

This problem with our cities isn't just something we haven't quite finished solving yet because we've been too busy with Mars missions and other things. The problem with our cities is something which we created ourselves fairly recently, and it is a problem which we are making worse through our own efforts. We are importing millions more subhumans from the Third World into our cities every year. It's not that we don't know how to solve the problem of our cities, don't have the power to solve the problem, or even that we aren't worried about the problem. Many of us are simply afraid to address this problem in any realistic way. We are afraid to talk about the problem honestly.

We build supercomputers which can simulate the enormously complex phenomena inside a hurricane. We build radiotelescopes which scan our galaxy for signs of extraterrestrial intelligence. But we tolerate a system which installs a creature like Bill Clinton in the White House, a system which gives us the corrupt, treasonous, deceitful gang of criminals we have making our laws! This is a system based on the notion that the subhumans swarming in south-central Los Angeles are the political equals of the people at Caltech. The Princess Di fans and the Elvis fans have as much individual power at the ballot box as do the Mars mission designers at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and collectively the former swamp the latter into complete insignificance. What a contrast between our science and our politics!

This is one of those things which will kill us. We have a government which promotes an immigration policy, an education policy, a welfare policy, employment policy, and a housing policy all of which hasten the destruction of our civilization. We have a government which is

working as hard as it can to increase the percentage of non-Whites in our society, a government which is promoting policies which will make us a minority in America in the coming century. We stick our heads out of our laboratories, libraries, or offices for a moment, and we see this destructive insanity, this lethal insanity, all around us, and we say nothing; we do nothing. We just go back to work planning the next Mars mission.

There's nobody who's a bigger enthusiast for Mars missions than I am. But we really do need to address this problem of what the government and the media are doing to our world. We really do need to worry about the consequences of the Elvis phenomenon, about the consequences of the fact that the growing masses of mindless, trendy couch potatoes have swamped our political system. If we don't do something about it very soon, there won't be many more Mars missions before the jungle takes over even places like the Caltech campus and forever puts an end to our dreams of exploring the universe.

Let's set aside the pretensions of Political Correctness for a moment. Let's clear our heads of all of this baloney about equality, democracy, and diversity. Let's try to understand what handing our world over to subhumans will **really** mean. It certainly won't mean that we will be seeing more of the slick, polished Blacks of the sort you see in TV commercials. No, we will be seeing more of the sort of creatures you see on the streets of Los Angeles, New York, or Washington. It will be more like what you see in any Third World country. It will mean witchcraft, beastliness, rape, and murder. It will mean a descent back into the jungle.

I have in front of me a news story from Reuters news agency about riots and lynch mobs in West Africa. There's a witchcraft craze sweeping the area which has resulted in hundreds of Blacks being lynched, being beaten or burned to death, in recent weeks because they were suspected of being sorcerers. In the current craze sorcerers are said to be able to cause a man's penis to shrink or even to disappear just with a handshake. Those suspected of being penis thieves, or penis shrinkers, are being murdered in the most gruesome ways on the streets of the capital cities of Senegal, Ghana, and the Ivory Coast. There's been a similar surge in killings of suspected witches and sorcerers in South Africa since that country was turned over to Black rule.

When I think about what is happening demographically in the United States today, I am reminded of what happened in Haiti a little over 200 years ago. Haiti used to be the most prosperous part of the New World. It was the jewel of the Caribbean and the pride of France's colonial empire. Great mansions dotted the countryside, and the social life in Haiti's towns rivaled that in the cities of France. Then the democracy craze hit France, and the madness also infected many of the Frenchmen in Haiti. Liberty, equality, and brotherhood were to be applied even to the Black plantation workers who had been brought to Haiti from Africa. That was the Politically Correct thing, and Political Correctness had deranged just enough of Haiti's French population so that the population as a whole was not able to put up any sort of solid front against the madness. They sat in their clubs, their drawing rooms, and their libraries, sipped their wine, and observed what was happening around them in Haiti as the Blacks were declared "equals" and "brothers." They discussed the situation, but they couldn't quite bring themselves to do anything about it. Then the massacres started, and it was too late. And so all of the Frenchmen, and the women, and the children were slaughtered, most of them in ways too horrible to describe. And the books from their libraries and the paintings, tapestries, and sculptures from their town houses

and their plantation manors became trinkets and baubles for the Black plantation workers. The subhumans had Haiti all to themselves, and that's the way it has been ever since.

Now, I'm sure it won't happen exactly that way in the United States. The details certainly will be different. Maybe we won't all be slaughtered in the streets, as in Haiti. Maybe our scientists won't be dragged from their laboratories and burned as sorcerers. Maybe we won't even become a nation of mulattos right away. Maybe for a while it will only be democracy, equality and a gradually darkening population of Elvis worshippers. But the result in the end will be the same: a return to the jungle. And no more Mars missions, ever.

In the past our people were able to dream of new worlds and to apply their minds to understanding this world without letting themselves become infected by any sort of egalitarian lunacy. They could plot the courses of the planets through the sky or design steam engines without losing their grip on reality. They could understand the difference between civilization and savagery. I think it's because they didn't grow up as soft, as permissively, as far away from their roots as we do today. They stayed a little closer to Nature. They hadn't forgotten all of Nature's hard lessons -- including the lesson that when you are faced with a mortal threat you must **do** something about it. When you recognize a mortal enemy you must kill him before he kills you.

Today we have some people whose minds are as good as those of our best people 200 or 300 years ago. But we've lost some of our ability to face reality and deal with it. We have a lot of people who have let themselves be convinced that the difference between the Caltech campus and south-central Los Angeles is based only on economics and culture, that genes have nothing to do with it, that race has nothing to do with it. We have people who have let themselves be persuaded that our manned exploration of the universe will be done in a Politically Correct way, as it's portrayed in *Star Trek*, with explorers of every race, sex, and sexual orientation. We're all the same, really, we're all equal.

But we still have some people with a little better grip on reality than that. We still have some people who not only can design rockets and telemetry systems, but who also can understand that we must do something about the jungle which is encroaching on our civilization. We still have people who can understand that we must keep the Elvis phenomenon from encompassing all of us.

Our situation in America today is a bit like that of the Frenchmen in Haiti toward the end of the 18th century. Some of them were determined to be Politically Correct and go with the policy of liberty, equality, and brotherhood. And some of them were determined to keep their grip on reality.

Unfortunately for everyone, Political Correctness prevailed. I wonder if part of the problem back then was that the realists didn't want to be offensive, they didn't want to be rude. Perhaps they hoped that the Politically Correct faction would regain its sanity at the last moment, and there wouldn't be any necessity for rudeness. I believe that that's what accounts for some of the hesitation we see today, for the failure of the sane faction at places like Caltech to speak out.

Because of that belief I'm going to throw politeness and inoffensiveness to the winds. I'm going to be just as rude and crude as I know how, in the hope that some of the people engaged in planning the next Mars mission will snap out of their trance, along with some of the other people who also represent what is creative and progressive in our civilization. The stark truth of the matter is this: Those of us who are still sane, those of us who still have a firm grip on reality, those of us who believe that our civilization ought to be preserved, those of us who believe that we ought to do whatever we can do to keep our race from becoming extinct, have an obligation to do more than just observe what's happening from our laboratories and our offices.

We have the obligation to awaken all the others we can awaken. Then we have an obligation to halt the destructive process which is carrying our people and our civilization toward extinction. We have an obligation to change a government which promotes the policies now being promoted in Washington. We have an obligation to put an end to the use of the mass media for our destruction. We have an obligation to combat the lunatic ideology of egalitarianism which has infected the minds of so many of our people. And we have an obligation, if we are successful in overcoming those who are trying to destroy our civilization -- we have an obligation to raise the next generation of our people to be saner, to have a better grip on reality, than this generation.

The Looting of America

One of the more interesting aspects of the ongoing saga of illegal campaign contributions and money-laundering in the Clinton administration is the Asian connection. A temple full of Buddhist nuns who cannot speak English but who have handy checkbooks, Clinton buddy Johnny Huang, and other assorted Chinese and Indonesian gangsters, bankers, and wheeler-dealers seem to have played a major role in getting the Democrats back in the White House. Some of the things that went on in the campaign to raise money for Mr. Clinton's re-election are so outrageous that they're funny, not to mention criminal. All of this would provide the basis for a good comedy film, if the Jews who own Hollywood were interested in that sort of thing.

what's not so funny about the Clinton administration's Asian connection is the payoff to the Asian community in the form of government contracts. From a strictly technical viewpoint, this payoff probably would be considered legal, because it falls under an affirmative-action policy known as the "section 8a minority business set-aside." Under this policy government contracts, instead of being awarded to the lowest bidder in a competitive bidding process, are "set aside" to be awarded to non-White businessmen and to companies owned by non-Whites. The theoretical justification for this program used to be that it would pump money into Black ghettos by giving government contracts to Black entrepreneurs, who in turn would hire Black workers, and the chance of Black rioting would thereby be minimized.

Asians, like other non-Whites, are able to qualify for 8a set-asides, and the numbers doing so have risen spectacularly during the past few years. In New York City, for example, Asians currently are grabbing 64.1 per cent of the minority set-aside contracts. That's up from just 3.5 per cent a decade ago. Imagine that: up by a factor of nearly 20! Isn't it an amazing coincidence that so much Asian money found its way into Mr. Clinton's campaign fund while the amount of government money going to Asian businessmen was rising so rapidly? The figures elsewhere in the country are not all that different from those in New York. In Alabama, for example, in the middle of the Black belt, Asians got 46.3 per cent of the minority set-aside contracts last year. The figure a decade ago was just 2.6 per cent.

Not surprisingly, the Clinton administration is fighting desperately to keep the 8a minority set-aside program alive in the face of opposition from the majority of Americans who want to do away with all affirmative action programs. Actually, the recent Asian takeover of the 8a set-aside program is a good thing for White Americans. Before the Asians made their move, 8a set-asides were just another taxpayer handout to Blacks in order to keep them from making too much trouble. When the Chinese and the Koreans and the Vietnamese got into the racket, though, they applied intelligence to it which the Blacks simply don't have. They figured ways to milk the program for more money than the Blacks had ever dreamed of. The 8a set-aside program has produced a new class of Asian multimillionaires -- who in turn have been generous contributors to Mr. Clinton and the Democratic Party. We, the taxpayers, of course, are paying for the whole, crooked business. But now, thanks to the excessive cleverness of the Asians and the excessive greed of the Clintonistas, it has become such a stinking scandal that we have a reasonable chance of seeing the whole thing exposed in a way which will deal a major setback to all of those who want to keep affirmative action programs alive. That's why it's good that the Asians have

elbowed aside the Blacks and taken over the 8a set-aside swindle. The Blacks never would have figured out in a million years how to use an affirmative action program to buy massive political influence the way the Asians have.

Exploiting affirmative action isn't the only thing Asian immigrants have figured out how to do. They've also learned how to cheat government welfare programs in new and creative ways. As younger Chinese immigrants have prospered from 8a set-asides they have brought their parents and their grandparents over from China, put them in government-subsidized apartments (often over 90% Chinese, so they needn't feel too homesick), and then signed them up for every welfare program available, including Supplementary Security Income. Hundreds of thousands of elderly Chinese and other Asians, who have never worked a day in the United States and cannot even speak English, are now living very comfortably off the American taxpayers, while their well-to-do children who brought them over continue to get even richer from various government programs favoring non-Whites.

The latest figures from the U.S. Census Bureau are from 1990, and they show elderly Chinese immigrants in California receiving Supplementary Security Income at more than five times the rate for elderly native-born Americans. And Blacks are included among those elderly native-born Americans! Although we don't have figures later than those for 1990, it is quite certain that the disproportion has become substantially greater since then, because the immigration of elderly Chinese has been booming. The word is out all over Asia that the United States is the land of free money for elderly Asians. Most of this Asian welfare racket is illegal. In order to get their parents and grandparents into the country the children sign papers pledging to be financially responsible for them. But after their parents and grandparents are in, the younger Asians ignore those pledges and put their relatives on welfare. Often the children **do** continue to support their relatives (in a manner that can't be easily traced, of course) and simply use the welfare money as extra cash.

Don't hold your breath waiting for the Clinton government to crack down on these Asian welfare cheats. The people in the government know what's going on. They know that this racket is costing White taxpayers billions of dollars every year, but there's no chance at all of any of these Asians being called to account. The Democrats and the Republicans have developed a very cozy relationship with Asian immigrants, and they're not about to spoil it.

The really bad thing about all of this is that as Asians have mastered the technique of milking the U.S. Treasury, more and more of them have come flooding into the country. A few years ago we had a very small Japanese minority on the West Coast and a few Chinatowns in major cities, and that was about it. Now Asians have become a fast-growing minority all across the country, and their presence is becoming increasingly intrusive and disruptive. Unfortunately, many of our people, especially those with libertarian or individualist tendencies, have been slow to understand this threat. They see Asians as intelligent, hard working, and much better disciplined than Blacks. They feel that if they must have a non-White neighbor, coworker, or fellow student, it's much better to have an Asian than a Black or a mestizo. This is a very shortsighted and selfish view of the situation.

For one thing, as the number of Asians flooding to our shores has grown, more and more of their bad habits have begun coming with them: Asian crime and Asian gangs, for example. As I mentioned on an earlier program, despite what many people may believe, Asians are not especially law abiding. The Asian minority in America commits substantially more murders, on a per capita basis, than the White majority. They are even better represented among white-collar criminals. They have a way with money. It is not for nothing that the Chinese are known as "the Jews of the Orient" wherever they have settled as a significant minority.

For another thing, it is precisely the good traits of the Asian immigrants -- their intelligence, self-discipline, and willingness to work -- which make them an especially dangerous minority for us. I know that there are many White Americans with a Pollyanna outlook on Asian immigration. They believe that Asian immigrants will simply blend in and use their good traits to make this a more prosperous country for all of us. They believe that after Asians have lived here for a while they will become just like White Americans, except that they will keep their lawns neater and their kids will make better grades in school.

Hey, wake up! Just because White Americans have fallen for the line of egalitarian baloney put out by the controlled media and the government that people of all races really are the same doesn't mean that the Chinese and the other Asian immigrants have fallen for it. In fact, one of the really admirable things about the Chinese and the Japanese is their very strong sense of race consciousness. They have pride in their own racial characteristics, in their history and traditions and culture, in their uniqueness, and they understand the value of cooperation with their own kind and of sticking together. And as their numbers grow they will become an increasingly formidable force we will have to deal with. We don't want America to become more like China or any of the other countries Asian immigrants have come from. We want them to take their intelligence, self-discipline, and good work habits back where they came from. we'd much rather deal with these people from a distance.

I've briefly mentioned three things today: political corruption, as manifested in Mr. Clinton's Asian connection; the exploitation of the government's various minority-oriented welfare giveaway and affirmative-action programs by Asians; and the problem of skyrocketing Asian immigration and the effects it is having on American society. I've tried to bring out some of the interconnections of these three problems. Each of these three problems is part of a larger problem. The illegal campaign contributions and money laundering associated with Mr. Clinton's re-election are part of the much larger problem of the growing crookedness of the politicians in this country, the growing corruption of the system generally. The Asian manipulation of the 8a minority set-aside program is just one aspect of the rottenness and inappropriateness of current welfare programs generally. And the recent growth in Asian immigration is just part of the much larger problem of the non-White immigration which is changing the nature of America.

An interesting thing about these three problems is that they are generally recognized by the American people -- not just by "extremists" like me. Most Americans have a general awareness of the growing corruption of the government, even if they haven't tried to figure out the details. Most Americans have a growing distrust of the government, a growing disgust with the political process. We can see this in the growth in the percentage of Americans who decline to vote. they're fed up with the whole business.

People are fed up with government welfare programs too -- at least, White people are fed up. You know, welfare used to be a community thing. People used to help each other out. Even the ne'er-do-wells could count on a handout from the churches. Even the village idiot could count on some charity from other villagers. But there was no pretense that the ne'er-do-wells and the village idiot were respectable citizens with the rights and privileges of other citizens or that they were entitled to their handouts. They were tolerated, but not to the point that anyone would be inclined to join their ranks. Welfare was kept to a minimum, and that's the way it should have been.

Today, in the hands of the government, the welfare system has become a socially destructive monster. We have a large and growing class of people in America who believe that they are entitled to a handout. They believe that the rest of us owe it to them. Having to support this welfare class with our taxes is increasingly galling to working Americans. And very few of us are fooled by the government's periodic announcements of so-called "welfare reform."

It has been those aspects of the government's welfare system which are specifically anti-White -- such as affirmative action -- which have generated the most public dissent recently, but the truth of the matter is that the entire welfare system, not just those aspects of it which are aimed at giving non-Whites special advantages, has become a thorn in our side. People are fed up with the whole thing.

And immigration is another issue on which the position of the great majority of the people is far away from the position of the government. The people are very worried about what continued non-White immigration is doing to America. They see more and more Asians, more and more Mexicans, more and more non-Whites of all kinds around them. They see their neighborhoods changing, their cities changing, their schools changing, becoming more alien, more foreign, more non-White, and they don't like it. The government tells us that we **should** like it, that we're **racists** if we don't like it, that we need more diversity, and they keep the floodgates open.

You know what all of this amounts to? You know what all of this government corruption and welfare racketeering and non-White immigration means? It means the looting of America by greedy predators. It means the plundering of our heritage and our children's heritage by hungry predators. Our ancestors came over here from Europe with a more or less healthy and realistic attitude toward the world. They were race conscious. They understood that the strong survive and the weak perish, and they didn't favor institutions to promote weakness. They conquered this continent, and it is ours by right of conquest. Our ancestors understood that we had to remain strong and vigilant if we wanted to remain masters in our land.

But we didn't. We became soft and weak. We became inattentive. We let ourselves be confused -- about race, about our heritage, about the nature of the world we live in. We dropped our guard. Then the predators moved in and went to work. They saw that we were soft and vulnerable, but they realized that we still could become dangerous if we realized our danger and began taking steps to regain our strength. So they did everything they could to make us even weaker while they strengthened their own positions. They preached to us against racism, so that we would not unite on the basis of our racial roots. They encouraged immigration from the non-White world in order to dilute our political strength. They bought the support of non-White minorities -- and of

the dregs of our own people -- with a growing government welfare program. Now the feeding frenzy has begun.

The word is out around the world: Whitey has become soft. The gringos are ripe for the plucking. The honkies are on the run, too confused to understand what's happening, too stricken by a sense of racial guilt to fight back. In China, in the Philippines, Vietnam, Haiti, El Salvador, and India they watch what's happening in America, and they can hardly believe their eyes. The White man has become crazy. He is giving everything away. They think, "There's free money for us in America, and the White man won't even try to keep us out. And if he does try, his government will be on our side, not his."

And so, as I said, the feeding frenzy has begun. And the renegade Whites have joined the plunderers. People like Bill Clinton -- and, for that matter, practically all of the politicians, Republican as well as Democrat -- instead of trying to defend America from the plunderers have been trying to grab as big a share of the plunder for themselves as they can.

And so where does that leave us, the people who are being plundered? What can we do to protect ourselves? Is there any chance that we can preserve part of our heritage for our children?

Actually, I believe there is a chance. The fact that so many Americans are fed up with the government gives me hope. The fact that so many Americans are willing to oppose the government's policies on affirmative action and open-door immigration, even at the risk of being labeled "racists" by the controlled media, gives me hope.

Of course, it'll be a while yet before we'll be able to do what needs to be done. it'll be a while before we'll be able to drag anyone out of the White House and string him up from a lamppost on Pennsylvania Avenue. it'll be a while yet before we can sow land mines along our border with Mexico and begin rounding up Chinese immigrants in California and putting them aboard ships headed west. But the time for that is coming.

And the more politicians who join Bill Clinton in the Washington feeding frenzy -- the more Democrats and Republicans who begin grabbing for everything they can get while the getting is still good -- the sooner will we be able to do what needs to be done.

The Wages of Liberalism

There was a major article on South Africa in last week's London *Sunday Times.* The article was written by the *Times'* Johannesburg correspondent Andrew Malone, and it was titled "Blacks Turn Their Anger on Mandela." The gist of the article was that as the South African infrastructure and economy continue to disintegrate under Black rule, most Blacks in the country, having gotten over their euphoria after having the country handed over to them in 1994, are now looking for somebody to blame for their growing misery.

it's hard for the Blacks to blame the honkies like they used to, because the honkies no longer run things. And it's not as if the Whites left the country in a shambles. When they turned the government over to Nelson Mandela and his Black crew three years ago, things were running well, but conditions have gone downhill rapidly since then. Not only has Mandela failed utterly to deliver the material goodies he promised -- new houses, new schools, new cars, and an easier life for all Blacks -- but Black unemployment has skyrocketed as Black leaders have mismanaged and exploited the economy, and soaring inflation has made life increasingly difficult for those Blacks who still have work.

Just one small reminder of the way in which the infrastructure of South Africa has decayed in three years of Black rule was provided by the mid-air collision of a German and an American aircraft just off the west coast of South Africa two weeks ago, taking the lives of all 33 people on board. The mass media certainly have not had much to say about the cause of this disaster, but knowledgeable airline pilots have put the blame squarely on the incompetence of African air traffic controllers. Since the advent of Black rule, conditions in the air over South Africa have become chaotic, and pilots consider it to be the most dangerous air space in the world.

On top of all this, the horrendous crime situation in South Africa plagues Blacks as well as Whites. When Mandela took over and Blacks began running the police departments, law enforcement simply ground to a halt. Now Black gangs roam the cities and rob, rape, and murder almost with impunity. Johannesburg, which used to be a clean, safe, orderly city under White rule, now has the highest per capita murder rate of any major city in the world. In the countryside, the witchcraft craze is spreading and taking the lives of more and more Blacks. Blacks accused of witchcraft are being stoned to death or "necklaced" in unprecedented numbers.

It is not surprising that many Blacks are turning their anger on Nelson Mandela now -- especially since the corruption and incompetence of his regime are becoming increasingly apparent. He and his Black cronies are living high on the hog, in the traditional manner of Black African potentates, while most ordinary Blacks are living in substantially worse conditions than they did under White rule. News stories about his wife Winnie Mandela's stabbing to death of a 14-year-old Black critic and Nelson's ordering the kidnapping of a witness to the murder have not helped his image.

What really is surprising is the growing number of Blacks willing to openly express their disillusionment with Black rule and their nostalgia for the good, old days of White rule. A 35-year-old Negress interviewed for the *Sunday Times* article was one of many who said she much

preferred White rule. "There were not the problems then," she said." I have got no money now, and my clothes are in rags. At least the police were effective then, and there was no crime. I believed in Mandela, but now I don't."

Not so long ago, such an expression of preference for White rule would have resulted in the "necklacing" of the interviewee: Mandela's followers would have put a gasoline-soaked tire around her neck, wired her hands behind her back, and burned her to death. Nowadays such sentiments are more likely to be condemned by White liberals in the United States or Britain, who would refer to her contemptuously as an "Uncle Tom."

As for the shrinking number of Mandela's followers, they are more likely to blame the declining popularity of their leader on the remaining White minority in South Africa, since there aren't tires enough in the country to punish all of the Blacks who are now disillusioned with his regime. They look enviously at the Whites, who still live in nice homes, now surrounded by walls topped with razor wire and patrolled by armed guards because of the crime problem, and still manage their businesses, or practice their professions as doctors or engineers or writers, or serve as technical consultants for the Black government. And Mandela's people complain that the Whites don't do enough for them, that the Whites spend too much time condemning the government for its corruption and whining about the crime problem, and not enough time praising Mandela and proclaiming their solidarity with his regime. The Whites are too standoffish, the Blacks complain; they keep too much to themselves instead of mixing with the Blacks and demonstrating their belief in equality and brotherhood. And the Whites are too successful, too industrious, too smart, too prosperous, and too rich. Increasingly, the resentful Blacks think about killing the goose which lays South Africa's dwindling supply of golden eggs. The time for that certainly is coming.

Meanwhile, South Africa's Whites concern themselves primarily with coping with the changed conditions in their country -- or what used to be their country, before they voted three years ago to give it away. The most dangerous time for them every day is when they must open their gates and drive out of their guarded enclaves to go to work. Carjacking has become a major industry for Blacks. Sometimes they hide in shrubbery outside a gate, and if a White driver is so careless as to stop his car and get out to close his gate instead of having an armed guard do it for him as he speeds away, they will jump him and take his car. They may kill him. Certainly, if there is a woman in the car, she will be taken away and gang-raped. Raping White women is another major industry for Blacks in the new, "free" South Africa.

When South Africa was under White rule, it was a safe and orderly place, with crime confined almost entirely to the Black townships, and even there it was kept within reasonable bounds by rigorous White policing efforts: efforts which were condemned by liberals in America and Britain as "brutal" and "racist." Every time the White government hanged a Black murderer, the liberal media unleashed a torrent of abuse and complained about the wickedness of apartheid. Now, with apartheid gone, the murder rate in South Africa has risen until it is nearly 100 times the murder rate in Britain. But, of course, the liberal media have very little to say about that. The sort of article I mentioned in the *Sunday Times* is quite rare, and even in such articles the writers feel obliged to refer to "the horrors of apartheid" in the old days, while lamenting that things haven't worked out in South Africa the way the liberals had planned.

Some Whites cope with the way things have worked out by building higher walls around their houses and hiring more armed guards; others cope by emigrating. And every time a White professional or manager leaves South Africa for good, the Black unemployment rate rises and Black desperation grows.

Lest there be some misunderstanding, let me assure you that I am not bothered a bit by Black desperation. I am not bothered by Blacks "necklacing" each other, suspecting each other of witchcraft, or whatever. I think that Blacks ought to be left to do their own thing, as in Rwanda, Uganda, Congo, or Liberia, and Whites ought not to get involved in feeding them, doctoring them, sending them relief supplies, or policing them.

I am not even bothered very much by White desperation in South Africa, because the Whites there voted themselves into their present predicament. Pathetically eager to be fashionable, disgustingly eager to prove to the world that they weren't the racists the liberals were accusing them of being, a majority of them voted to turn their country over to Black rule in 1994. So sometimes I am inclined to say, damn them! Let them reap the reward for their weakness and their folly.

But then I must remind myself that my fellow Whites in America and in Britain have not demonstrated more strength or wisdom than the Whites of South Africa. Wherever there is democracy, and wherever the mass media are in the hands of the enemies of our people, we can expect the same sort of suicidal folly on the part of the majority, the same sort of mindless, self-destructive rush to be fashionable. Really, it is the minority of Whites able to think for themselves but, in a democracy, subject to the foolishness of the majority, with whom I sympathize. I sympathize with the minority of South African Whites who voted against giving their country away in 1994, and who now must suffer the consequences of the majority's folly. I wish that every White South African who is killed during a carjacking and every White South African woman who is gang-raped by Blacks when her car breaks down on a country road could be one of the fashionable twits who voted in 1994 to end apartheid, but I know that that cannot always be so. I know that many of them must be the self-respecting, race-conscious Whites with whom I sympathize, and my heart aches for them.

And, my god, even the twits! Most of them are guilty of no more than the same foolishness and weakness which afflict most of our people everywhere. With good leadership -- with strong, responsible, loyal White leadership -- they can build civilizations and conquer the universe; the best in them can shine. But when they are led by traitors or criminals and misdirected by liberal propaganda, the worst in them shows itself. It is to the liberals we must direct our attention if we want to understand why our fortunes as a race have declined so steeply in this century.

Do you remember the way the liberals were carrying on in America about South Africa before 1994? For two decades, ever since they finished cheering the Viet Cong to victory in Vietnam, the destruction of White South Africa was at the top of their agenda. Do you remember the hatred the liberals directed at South African Whites? It was unremitting. Anyone who spoke up for South Africa was blasted with the same hatred, anyone who did business with South Africa was cursed and vilified, anyone who opposed disinvestment in South Africa or who was not in favor of a boycott against South Africa was hated. Hating White South Africans was absolutely

the trendiest thing on university campuses and in fashionable circles everywhere. Organizing demonstrations and picketing and leafleting against South Africa kept the liberal rank and file busy, while the liberal spokesmen poured out their hatred of South Africa in editorial after editorial.

All of this liberal hatred might have been of no account, except the liberals had the mass media at their disposal, so the politicians danced to their tune. An economic boycott of South Africa was enforced by the U.S. government, and diplomatic pressure was used to persuade many other countries to participate in the boycott. Athletic and cultural boycotts also were organized by associations responding to liberal pressure. It became illegal to buy any South African product or to sell or give anything to South Africans which might be useful to them. The only South African sports figures who were permitted to compete internationally were Blacks, and the only South African writers, playwrights, or film-makers who were given an audience outside of South Africa were Jews, such as Nadine Gordimer, with her anti-White novels, or White turncoats who followed the Jewish party line.

Eventually the White South African majority caved in under the weight of the hatred and voted to give away everything that their ancestors had worked, fought, and died to build for them: the only truly progressive country on the African continent. The liberals, having achieved their goal, have moved on to other causes. South Africa, once their obsession, no longer interests them. And, of course, they accept no responsibility for what they did. Liberals never accept responsibility for the disastrous consequences of their policies, their enthusiasms, and their causes. They just move on to another cause.

I blame the destruction of South Africa on liberals, but what is a liberal, other than a person who just happens to wind up on the wrong side of every important issue? I think we ought to recognize the fact that there were at least two distinct types of liberals involved in the hate campaign against South Africa. First, there are the liberals who are really cause driven, liberals whose hatred for White South Africans was based on some deep-rooted personality disorder, some feeling of guilt, self-hatred, or infantile resentment against their betters which fuels their manic egalitarianism. But these cause-driven individuals, these manic liberals, are a minority, even among the liberal spokesmen and editorialists.

Most people associated with liberal causes are not psychologically abnormal. They are simply **bigots.** They hate **whomever** it is fashionable to hate at the moment. They have a strong streak of authoritarianism in them. That doesn't necessarily mean that they are supporters of the government. Liberals were very critical of the government during the Vietnam war, for example. Liberal authoritarianism manifests itself as a greater than average tendency to go with the flow, as a greater than average trendiness, a greater than average tendency to condemn or to hate any non-conformist.

Most of the university students who were picketing companies which did business in South Africa, most of the pension-fund trustees who made a public show of refusing to buy stock in such companies, were liberals of this sort. They are **feel-good** liberals. They like being part of a mob. Most of the people who wrote rabid editorials denouncing apartheid -- the South African system of racial apartness, of racial separateness -- as the most evil system ever conceived and

who gave direction with their own hate to the rank-and-file haters on the picket lines were also feel-good liberals.

And that's also true of most of the people who still write such editorials today. I have in front of me an editorial by John Simpson, who is the foreign affairs editor for the BBC, and Mr. Simpson writes: "The election of 1994 which brought Nelson Mandela to power in South Africa was such a triumph of the human spirit, such a success for the kind of virtues which rarely appear in political life, that even now no one really wants to describe what is going on there. We all hope it will get better of its own accord. But, instead of being a fairy tale, South Africa is one of the most violent countries in the world. Its government is riddled with inefficiency and corruption . . . ."

We must shake our heads in disbelief when we hear a man like John Simpson, an educated, well informed man in a very responsible position, a man who is neither a Jew nor a Black, describe the campaign of hatred against South Africa which resulted in a convicted Black terrorist being installed as president and the country being brought to ruin as "a triumph of the human spirit." Mr. Simpson, like all liberals, simply refuses to accept responsibility for the damage he and his kind have caused. He refuses to consider the possibility that the cause of forcing White South Africans to turn their country over to Blacks was a **perverse** cause. He refuses to consider the possibility that the egalitarian idea which underlies all liberalism is an incorrect idea. He thinks himself quite bold in recognizing the obvious fact that things have worked out rather badly in South Africa. that's certainly more than **most** liberals will admit.

I Don't know Mr. Simpson personally, but I'm inclined to believe that he is not one of those liberals who has deep-rooted feelings of guilt or inferiority because his potty training went wrong. I suspect he's one of the trendy, authoritarian ones who is simply incapable of entertaining an unorthodox idea. He believes that since his cause was just when he was preaching hatred against White South Africans and apartheid, he cannot be held accountable for what is going on in South Africa today. Something went wrong, but it's certainly not **his** fault, he believes. **It couldn't be.** He has always promoted the trendiest causes, the causes that all of the important people were promoting. So it **can't** be his fault.

Well, Mr. Simpson, we unfashionable people are getting a little tired of you and your kind messing up the world and then refusing to accept responsibility for what you have done. We're fed up. And the day is coming when you and your kind will be held accountable for what you have done. We'll hold you accountable for every White woman raped in South Africa, for every White man killed in South Africa during a carjacking. We'll hold you accountable regardless of what kind of potty training you had.

In Your Ear, Mr. Clinton

Ever since two Israeli terrorists, acting on direct orders from the prime minister of Israel, attempted to murder an Islamic religious leader in Jordan by squirting an especially nasty poison into his ear, I've been waiting to hear what the reaction of the politicians in Washington would be. That was more than two weeks ago, and I'm still waiting.

Imagine what the reaction would have been if Syria's President Assad, say, had sent a team of Arab terrorists into Israel to murder a Jewish religious leader, a prominent rabbi, with an exotic poison they had cooked up in their chemical and biological warfare laboratories, and the terrorists had been caught in the act. There would have been **no end** to the expressions of pious outrage from Washington's windbags, and Bill and Hillary would have been leading the chorus. The State Department would have announced the immediate breaking off of diplomatic relations with the guilty country. Senator Alphonse D'Amato and the rest of the Jews' Gentile step'n'fetchits in our Senate would have been preaching non-stop for an all-out military crusade against Syria. Mr. Clinton would have conferred with Secretary of Defense Cohen about the best way to knock out Syria's chemical and biological warfare capability with a military strike, and our Navy would have transferred several aircraft carriers to the eastern Mediterranean. The editorial pages of the *New York Times* would have been filled with the bloodthirsty screeching of Abe Rosenthal day after day, demanding action against Syria. Billy Graham and America's other political churchmen would be telling us all from the pulpit how terrible such an attack on a religious leader was, how the world must not tolerate such anti-religious terrorism, and so on. And even the soberer columnists and commentators would be telling us all about the dangers of permitting a renegade country like Syria to have the capability for making and using exotic chemical and biological warfare agents -- and about the need to make an example of Syria, so that no other country would be tempted to follow in Syria's footsteps. At the very least, after a preemptive military strike on Damascus, chemical and biological warfare specialists from the United Nations would have to be stationed permanently in Syria to ensure that that country never again tried to rebuild its chemical and biological warfare laboratories.

But, as I said, I'm still waiting to hear the first condemnation of Israel's terrorist activity from Washington. I'm still waiting to hear the first warning about the danger to the world in allowing a paranoid, bullying, puffed-up little excuse for a country like Israel to develop chemical and biological warfare capabilities. I'm still waiting to hear any comments about the religious implications of an officially Jewish country setting out to murder Islamic religious leaders in other countries. I'm waiting to hear any expression of disapproval at all. There is only a deafening silence.

Canada, at least, had the decency to recall her ambassador from Tel Aviv. But our government in Washington is so totally under the control of the Jewish minority in this country, the minority which controls our mass media, that it dares not make the faintest squeak of protest.

This sort of government-sponsored assassination is nothing new for Israel. Back in the 1950s the Israelis pioneered the use of letter bombs to kill and maim people they didn't like in other countries. They also have used car bombs to assassinate people -- including innocent bystanders.

Sometimes they simply gun their victims down on the street, again with total disregard for the safety of bystanders. Sometimes they shoot the wrong person, but they never apologize for their mistakes. When they want to kill someone clandestinely, they use poisons or infectious agents, and it looks as if the victim died a natural death. The botched assassination of the Islamic leader in Jordan was such a routine operation for Israel's Mossad agents that they simply picked up the special weapon used to squirt poison into the victim's ear at the Israeli embassy in Amman, where it was kept for use as needed.

Yes, That's a routine operation for a government based on a religion which teaches that the lives of non-Jews are worthless and that all enemies of the Jews should be killed. But, the only reason that this particular attempted murder by the government of Israel is of interest to us, the only reason that it should be of special interest to all patriots, is that it is of **no** interest to our government. Our government, after all, is one that makes a big pretense of caring about such matters as international terrorism and the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. Our government makes a big thing out of denouncing state-sponsored terrorism -- so long as the state sponsoring the terrorism is not Israel. The non-response of our government to Israel's most recent state-sponsored assassination attempt is a splendid example of the subservience of our government to the Jews.

Do you remember all of the pious statements against terrorism we heard from our government and from the media during the Timothy McVeigh trial? Terrorism is something which must not be tolerated, our government and the media told us. The second Oklahoma City bombing suspect, Terry Nichols, is on trial now, and the government is doing the same sort of preaching about not tolerating terrorism or terrorists. And you also can count on hearing the same sort of anti-terrorist sermonizing from the government during the trial of Ted Kaczynski, the alleged Unabomber.

All of that anti-terrorist posturing is total hypocrisy. The prime minister of Israel is a proven terrorist, a man who ordered the assassination of a religious leader in another country, a man who has ordered other terrorist activities as well. Just a few weeks before his latest murder attempt, he sent another group of terrorists across the border into Lebanon with orders to kill people. Fortunately, that group also was caught before it could complete its murderous mission. And, of course, that murder mission, just like the latest, received zero notice from Washington and almost zero notice from the controlled media in this country. Yet you can be sure that Mr. Netanyahu will be permitted to travel to the United States whenever it pleases him, and that Mr. Clinton will greet him in the White House with a big hug and a smile when he does.

What our government's condoning of terror and assassination by Israel does is pull the moral rug right out from under its stand against terror and assassination by everyone. When the President of the United States bows and scrapes in front of the prime minister of Israel and hugs him and asks him how much more money he needs from American taxpayers to expand his campaign of terror and assassination against his neighbors, how seriously should that President be taken the next time he begins his anti-terrorist posturing against Libya's Moammar Kaddhafi? How seriously should he be taken the next time someone bombs a Federal building in this country, and the President denounces it as an act of cowardice?

What causes political terrorism in the United States is the sort of behavior by the government which causes people to lose their respect for the government, behavior which causes them to have contempt for the government. Just as surely as the Government's massacre of the women and children in David Kroch's church in Waco, Texas, in 1993 caused the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995, President Clinton's condoning of Benjamin Netanyahu's terrorism in 1997 will cause other Federal buildings to be bombed in the future.

If our government were serious about disapproving of terrorism it would break diplomatic relations with Israel immediately, it would halt all aid to Israel, and it would impose a total economic boycott on Israel. It would make an example of Israel, so that no other country would be tempted to engage in state-sponsored terrorism. That's what the U.S. government would do -- **if** it were serious about disapproving of terrorism. But of course, it isn't serious. And serious people notice things like that. Not Joe and Jill Sixpack, of course. Not the couch potatoes. They never notice anything. they're too busy watching ball games. But we do still have some serious people in America, people who notice things, people who still are able to think for themselves, no matter how Politically Incorrect thinking for oneself may be these days.

The Government's stand on terrorism today reminds me of the Government's stand on drinking in the 1920s. Prohibition went into effect primarily because the fundamentalist Protestant churches disapproved of drinking, and they controlled a great many votes. And, no doubt, there were many sober, decent citizens in addition to the fundamentalists who also were concerned about alcoholism and the social ills caused by excessive drinking. But the government never took Prohibition seriously. It failed to make a serious and determined effort to enforce its own laws against alcohol. The politicians preached and postured against drinking, but as soon as the speeches were over they headed for their favorite speakeasies. It was all hypocrisy, and as a result drinking went on pretty much as before, but there was an enormous increase in police and political corruption and in organized criminal activity. There also was a big increase in public cynicism and in loss of respect for the government, because then as now there were some serious people who noticed the hypocrisy.

In a democracy it is the couch potatoes who rule, simply because there are so many of them, and the media bosses control what the couch potatoes think and the way they vote -- most of the time. But the serious people, even though there are not enough of them to outvote the couch potatoes, do become frustrated, and when they become frustrated enough they take action. Sometimes they blow up Federal buildings. And sometimes they overthrow governments. And when they do overthrow a government, there won't be any ball games for a while, so even the couch potatoes may pay attention long enough to help the serious people hang the politicians and the media bosses -- and That's something that really needs to be done in the United States soon.

And that is something I really look forward to. I ache for it. And I know that many patriots ache for it. it's not that we are especially indignant about the Jews squirting exotic poisons into the ears of Islamic leaders and getting away with it -- although it does give me the creeps to think about the fact that the Jews keep their embassies around the world stocked with all sorts of nasty equipment for disposing of people they Don't like in ways designed to make murder look like death by natural causes. I wonder how many Americans they've murdered. I wonder how many

cases there have been where, as soon as it became clear that the Jews were involved, the FBI told the local police to stop investigating. That's a spooky thought.

But the real reason for our growing anger against the government in Washington is not what the Jews do in other countries. it's what our government does -- and does not do -- in this country. Mr. Netanyahu's latest venture in assassination by poison is not what's important: It's Mr. Clinton's reaction That's important. it's the hypocrisy and corruption in Washington that are important to us, not the religious belief of Jews that their god gave them the right to murder anyone they Don't like. And this latest demonstration of hypocrisy and corruption in Washington is only one in a long series of demonstrations, no more shocking than many others and certainly not as bad as some. But what is nice about this latest demonstration is that it is so clear, so unambiguous. And it also is so timely, in that it comes right in the middle of a series of trials of terrorists in this country, right in the middle of a series of government and media denunciations of terrorism. It doesn't give the media bosses or the politicians a chance to use the excuse that that was then and this is now and their policy toward terrorism has changed with time and circumstances.

There is one thing you can say for the Jews. Their religion leads them to do things which are so outrageous and so striking that the crooked politicians among our own people who collaborate with the Jews in order to advance their careers Aren't left much room to make excuses. About all they can do is keep their mouths shut and hope that the couch potatoes Won't notice -- or will forget before the next election.

For example, there is the case of the Jew from Maryland, Samuel Sheinbein, who took a power saw to one of his teenaged neighbors last month and hacked off the young fellow's arms, legs, and head, and then put what was left of him in a plastic bag and left it in someone else's garage. It seems to have been some sort of disagreement over a drug deal that didn't go according to Mr. Sheinbein's liking. When the police began closing in, Sheinbein hopped a plane for Israel, and once there he just thumbed his nose at the police in Maryland. When the police asked that he be sent back to America to stand trial for murder, the government of Israel announced that it has a policy against extraditing Jews. With a smirk on their faces, the Israelis told the Maryland authorities that if they really want to try Sheinbein they could come to Israel and try him in an Israeli court. That offer, of course, was entirely fraudulent. Aside from the enormous practical difficulties for the Maryland authorities, the fact of the matter is that they would find it impossible to convict Sheinbein in an Israeli court.

Israel's policy of not extraditing Jews is based in the Jewish religion, which prohibits Jews from cooperating with Gentile authorities in the prosecution of a Jew for crimes committed against a Gentile. Even providing information about a Jewish criminal to Gentile authorities is a crime punishable by death under Talmudic law.

What this means in practice is that a Jew can commit just about any crime he wants in the United States or Europe -- murder, rape, embezzlement, importing drugs, White slavery, racketeering -- and if he is able to fly to Israel without being arrested, he will be safe. This sort of behavior by any other country would not be tolerated, but Don't expect the U.S. government to put much

pressure on Israel about this. Mr. Clinton just wishes the Maryland state authorities would shut up about the case before the public wakes up and begins asking questions.

The real question here is not why does our government put up with this sort of behavior from Israel; we know the answer to that question. The real question is: Why do we Americans put up with a government like the one we have in Washington?

The government can keep passing more repressive laws, tapping more telephones, hiring more jackbooted thugs, but it cannot survive without the trust and respect of the people -- and I Don't mean just the trust and respect of the couch potatoes; I mean the trust and respect of serious people, who notice things and who are able to think for themselves. The government cannot long survive without their trust and respect, and it has just about used up all of that. The next time there is a major bombing of a government building in this country -- and there will be; Mr. Clinton's behavior guarantees that -- and the government puts on its pretense of outrage and begins weeping crocodile tears for the victims and calls the bombers "cowards," there will be a noticeably more cynical reaction from the serious portion of the public. The couch potatoes may still respond the way the government wants them to, but among the serious people there will be more than ever before who will understand that the bombings will continue until we have a government which is **genuinely** outraged by terrorism, a government which not only genuinely disapproves of terrorism, state-sponsored or otherwise, but which also is actually **our** government, not the government of the politicians, the media bosses, and the Jews.

We want a government which is honest, a government which means what it says and says what it means, a government we can trust and respect and which the rest of the world also will be obliged to respect. We want a government which represents our interests and which is totally free of Jewish control, of Jewish influence. And one day we **will** have such a government.

The Tragedy Of Chautauqua County

A few weeks ago we were treated to yet another case of a Black sexual predator with AIDS infecting as many White girls as possible with his lethal disease by having sex with them. Nushawn Williams, a small-time drug dealer, car thief, armed robber, and would-be "rap artist," liked to take the bus from his Brooklyn, New York, neighborhood to Chautauqua County in the mostly White, western part of New York state and find young White girls to seduce. He had sex with a large number of White schoolgirls in the county, some as young as 13, and infected many of them with the AIDS virus.

When AIDS cases began showing up among schoolgirls in the county, public health officials became alarmed. They didn't tell the police what they knew about the Black AIDS carrier who had been infecting the girls, however, because the homosexual lobby, which is politically very powerful in New York, had persuaded the legislature to pass a law making it illegal to release information about AIDS carriers, even to the police. Finally, as the number of young girls infected by Nushawn Williams continued growing, health officials went to a judge and got permission to inform the police and the public about him. The case finally hit the newspapers in early November, where it made quite a sensation.

One thing that none of the news articles about Nushawn Williams mentioned was the fact that many of his victims were White girls, that he deliberately sought out White girls. The racial angle wasn't mentioned at all, as if it weren't important. One would have to have access to information not available to the general public to know that many of his victims were White, although anyone familiar with the demographics of Chautauqua County, New York, might suspect that he went there because it was a White area.

Newsweek magazine finally spilled the beans in its November 10 issue, which carried a lengthy story on Nushawn Williams, mostly trying to generate sympathy for the Black criminal by detailing his "deprived" childhood and the dysfunctional family in which he grew up. *Newsweek* didn't mention the racial aspects of the case either, but two of the teenaged victims who were pictured in the magazine were White, both blondes.

Williams used to hang around the school playgrounds to pick up White girls. He would treat them to some of his "gangsta' rap" lyrics, flash some of his gold jewelry, and promise them drugs in exchange for sex. He had sex with literally **hundreds** of young, White girls in this way. Dozens of them were infected with the AIDS virus and will die a horrible death as a result.

It is interesting to study the various reactions of the media to the Nushawn Williams case. Generally there is sympathy for his victims. Sometimes there is sympathy for him. Nearly all of the media suggest that what we need to do in response to such cases is teach young people to use condoms. One or two really bold columnists, willing to risk the wrath of the homosexual lobby, have suggested that the public's health is more important than the privacy of AIDS carriers, and so we ought to consider relaxing the ban on telling the police about AIDS-carrying criminals. But **none** of the media have mentioned the racial aspects of the case. That is an absolute no-no.

So who is to blame for what happened to those White schoolgirls in Chautauqua County? Is it the school officials who didn't impress on them strongly enough the need to use condoms? Is it the politicians in the state legislature who pandered to the homosexuals by making it more difficult for public health officials to warn the public about people like Nushawn Williams? Hardly. One almost suspects that these issues are raised by the media as a smokescreen to keep people from putting the blame where it really belongs.

I'll tell you who is to blame for what happened to those young, White girls in Chautauqua County. It is everyone who made it even **thinkable** for them to have a sexual relationship with a non-White. **Everyone.** It is the entire Politically Correct establishment. It is the school officials who distribute sex-education literature urging the use of condoms: literature which has cartoon-type illustrations showing young Whites and Blacks together and subliminally suggesting that one's sexual partner may be of any race. It is the Christian ministers who preach against the so-called "sin of racism," leading young White girls to feel guilty if they reject the advances of a Black male. It is the trendy parents who want their children to be Politically Correct above all else and who therefore fail to train them to have an abhorrence of racial mixing.

Above all others the people responsible for what happened to those girls are the immensely powerful and unspeakably evil men who control the mass media in America. They are the men who promote "gangsta' rap" among young Whites who don't know any better: men like MTV owner Sumner Redstone and Time-Warner boss Gerald Levin.

They are the men who control the television entertainment industry, which has such a powerful influence in shaping the attitudes and behavior of young people today -- and which with increasing boldness promotes the idea of interracial sex, of interracial romance, as being fashionable. They are the owners of the syndicates which distribute comic strips and comic books for children portraying interracial groups as the desirable norm.

Now, nearly all of these powerful and evil men who control the mass media are Jews, and they do what they do knowingly and deliberately. Anyone who has studied them understands that their aim is to encourage racial mixing among Whites and non-Whites. But they are not the only ones to blame. Everyone who collaborates with them, everyone who tolerates them, Jew or Gentile, also is to blame. The advertising agency bosses and the big corporation executives who promote racial mixing, "diversity," and "multiculturalism" because the Jewish media bosses have made these things fashionable and because the advertising agency bosses and corporation executives believe that the more fashionable they appear to be the more money they will make are all to blame. Among these people, many of them Gentiles, who are to blame for what happened to those young girls in Chautauqua County are some of the richest men in the country. They are rich, powerful, intelligent men, understanding the consequences of their actions, but utterly irresponsible, caring only about their own wealth and power -- men like Bill Gates, for example, whose Microsoft Corporation sponsors advertising aimed at making White people feel guilty if they have racial feelings or prefer to be among their own kind.

And there are the politicians and bureaucrats, who hang on every word of the controlled media, cater to every whim of the media bosses, and eagerly dance to whatever tune they play. These are the politicians and bureaucrats who gave us forced racial integration in our schools and an

assortment of so-called "fair housing" laws to force the racial integration of our residential neighborhoods, politicians and bureaucrats who have legislated and enforced "civil rights" laws and affirmative action programs and dozens of other programs and laws designed to "multiculturalize" what used to be a White country -- a country in which it would have been unthinkable for a Black criminal to be allowed to hang around White schools trying to pick up White schoolgirls, and it would have been unthinkable for any White girl to respond to him.

These are the politicians and bureaucrats like Bill Clinton and his crew who are currently engaged in a massive governmental program to "pull America together," as they like to say, and further encourage the mixing of Blacks and Whites. They are the politicians and bureaucrats who have followed the Jewish lead and defined any effort by White people to protect themselves from non-Whites as "hate."

Any sort of action taken by a White person against the Nushawn Williamses of this world in an effort to protect young White girls is called a "hate crime." Any effort by a White person even to warn other White people about animals of the Nushawn Williams type is denounced by these politicians and bureaucrats as "hate propaganda."

I'll give you a specific example. The organization I head, the National Alliance, distributes stickers warning of the dangers of sex with Blacks. It warns that sex with a Black is far more likely, on the average, to lead to AIDS than is sex with another White person. It warns that Black males are 14 times as likely to be AIDS carriers as heterosexual White males. We distribute these stickers because the government and the media don't warn the White public of the danger of sex with Blacks. The government and the media don't mention that Blacks are far more likely to be AIDS carriers than Whites. They don't warn people about this because they don't want to discourage sexual contacts between Blacks and Whites -- quite the opposite, in fact.

Because the media and the government do not disseminate this important information about the danger of being sexually involved with Blacks, my organization works hard to provide this information to the public. And as a consequence our stickers are denounced as "hate literature" by the mass media and by the politicians and bureaucrats who take their cue from the media -- and these include police officials, for example, who certainly are aware of the AIDS dangers associated with Blacks, but who also are more interested in being Politically Correct, for the sake of their careers, than they are in protecting the public.

Now, it's one thing to assign blame for this problem -- it's one thing to point out who is responsible for making our young girls victims of Nushawn Williams and other Black sexual predators -- and it's quite another thing to solve this problem, to punish those responsible and ensure that they do no more damage.

And let me assure you, this is a problem we **must** solve. **Not** because one Black criminal has destroyed the lives of a few dozen White girls. After all, many of the girls affected were pretty trashy: the most empty-headed and fashion-conscious of MTV fans, the sort that it's better, for eugenic reasons, to have removed from our breeding population anyway. No, the Nushawn Williams case is important because it is symbolic of the moral rot of our people.

It's not a **Black** problem that we must solve; it's a **White** problem. We don't care how Blacks behave among themselves; that's **their** problem. Our problem is that we permit Black behavior to affect **us.** Our problem is that we haven't got our own affairs in order; we haven't got control of our own destiny. We used to have a White country. We used to have our affairs under control. But we permitted the Jews to gain control of our mass media, our news and entertainment media, and we permitted the traitors among us to collaborate with the Jews, and together they led us off the correct path and into the present morass, where the sort of thing that happened in Chautauqua County can happen and **will** happen with increasing frequency in the future.

They confused and misled our people. They persuaded us that we owed the non-Whites of the world a living, that we had to take them into our midst and let them into our schools and neighborhoods and let our sisters and our daughters run with them. They told us that we were **racists** and **haters** if we objected to this.

They persuaded the more impressionable of our young people that Black music and Black manners and Black life-styles were fashionable and ought to be imitated. That's why the White schoolgirls in Chautauqua County let themselves be infected with AIDS by Nushawn Williams. And trashy though those schoolgirls may have been, it's the sort of thing that we must not allow to continue happening. We **must** cut the moral rot out of our people that permitted it to happen. We **must** root out of our society those who introduced and cultivated and encouraged that moral rot, and we must destroy them so that they can never do that sort of thing again.

Ultimately, we must separate ourselves from the Blacks and other non-Whites and keep ourselves separate, no matter what it takes to accomplish this. We must do this **not** because we **hate** Blacks, but because we **cannot survive** if we remain mixed with them. And we cannot survive if we permit the Jews and the traitors among us to remain among us and to repeat their treachery. Eventually we must hunt them down and get rid of them. Their presence among us makes us more unclean and more ill than the presence of the Blacks.

All of us understand, of course, that not all Blacks behave like Nushawn Williams. And we don't blame all Blacks for what happened to those White schoolgirls. We don't even blame Nushawn Williams. We blame the fact that the Blacks were brought into our midst. What happened in Chautauqua County couldn't have happened if we hadn't brought Blacks -- the good ones and the bad ones together -- into our midst. They must all go -- the good with the bad -- and work out their own destiny, while we work out ours.

And we understand that not every Jew, not every politician, not every newspaper editor, and not every homosexual approved of what Nushawn Williams did. But we also understand that it was their collective policies, it was the result of all of them working together, which produced the tragedy of Chautauqua County.

Eventually we **will** solve our problem, eventually we will ensure that there will be no more tragedies of this sort, by dealing with these people collectively. It is enough that all of these people supported the general policies which led to Chautauqua. It is enough that they supported racial integration and they all spoke out against White racism. It is enough that they all kept silent when they should have warned our people. It is enough that not one of them pointed out

the racial aspects of the Nushawn Williams case. For that we will hold them **all** responsible, and we will deal with them **all** together: the White Christian preacher who preached from his pulpit about the "sin of racism;" the White politician who catered to the minorities and danced to the Jewish tune to get elected; the White school official, police chief, or government bureaucrat who was careful always to pay lip service to the latest trend in race-mixing policy promoted by the Jewish media. We will deal with them all.

You know, when I have said things like this before, a lot of cautious, timid conservatives have responded by saying that I am too extreme, that I should not talk about America's situation in such rough terms. They hope, even if they do not believe, that there is some **nice way** of arresting America's decline, some safe and easy way of keeping things from getting any worse, some way that will permit them to continue taking their ease and enjoying their comforts and luxuries without stirring themselves, without taking any chances.

Let me remind you that I am a pretty conservative fellow myself. I'm not a wild-eyed bomb thrower at all. But I do like to face **facts.** I do like to look reality right in the eye and not pretend that it's something else. And the reality of our present situation is this: You won't be allowed to continue enjoying your ease and your comfort much longer. The situation is snowballing. Yesterday it was an empty-headed piece of White trash named Nicole Brown. Today it is a bunch of empty-headed, trendy schoolgirls in Chautauqua County, New York. And tomorrow it will be **your** daughter or **your** sister. Too many people do what the Jews persuade them it is fashionable to do. You cannot **isolate** yourself from what is being done to your people. It will be done to you too. You cannot continue to enjoy yourself indefinitely when the very **basis** for the society in which you are living already has been destroyed, already has been rotted out.

Fortunately, more and more ordinary White men and women are beginning to realize that. More and more of them are beginning to understand and to accept that the only way that their children and their grandchildren will have a future in America is to have a total revolution. They are beginning to understand that no matter how destructive that revolution will be, just letting things go on as they have been will be much, much worse. Nushawn Williams has helped them to understand that. And when what happened to those White schoolgirls in Chautauqua County happens to your sister or to your daughter, perhaps you will understand it too.

The Promise Keepers

If you watch the news on television regularly, I'm sure you saw the huge get-together of so-called "Promise Keepers" in Washington: hundreds of thousands of mostly White men hugging each other, holding hands, and rocking back and forth with their eyes closed. Some of them were shaking and crying or singing and clapping their hands much like one used to see in an old-fashioned revival tent. I was fascinated by the phenomenon -- and by the reaction of various elements to it.

The most interesting reaction was that of the feminist organizations. They clearly were worried. They did not like the idea of a large number of White males gathered together for any purpose. Some of the feminist commissars made cautious statements to the media. They expressed their concern about the Political Incorrectness of men getting together **as men.** They saw this as a very dangerous development. What if the all-male Promise Keepers, said to have nearly three million members, decided to use their numbers politically? Suppose they decided to back candidates for public office or to express their collective opinion on some matter of public policy. The very thought gave them the cold shivers.

On such matters as abortion for convenience the Promise Keepers, as a fundamentalist Christian group, do not share the views of the feminists. And the Promise Keepers disagree with the feminists on such matters as lesbianism and homosexuality in general -- although, a lot of male homosexuals must have been looking with considerable interest at all of those men hugging each other.

The concerns of the feminists went beyond specific issues such as abortion for convenience and lesbianism, however. They were profoundly disturbed by the fact that the Promise Keepers were an **unapproved** group. It's fine for Blacks to organize, or Jews, or homosexuals, or women, certainly, but heterosexual White men are the enemy. They're not supposed to organize. They're supposed to be kept disorganized, confused, and impotent, so that they can't get in the way of "progress" and the march toward a New World Order.

But the more I learn about the Promise Keepers, the more I'm inclined to believe that they really won't be much of an obstacle on the road to a New World Order. On the truly essential issues, they are already there. Consider race, for example. The founder of the group, Bill McCartney, used to be a football coach at the University of Colorado, where I got my doctorate, and his daughter used to **love** the Black players on his team. He seems to be proud of the fact that he now has two non-White grandchildren sired by different members of the team.

Although there are very few Blacks among the rank and file membership of Promise Keepers, it's not from lack of trying on McCartney's part. He has an affirmative action hiring program for his organization which has resulted in his office staff being fully one-third non-White. He has vigorously recruited non-White directors for the governing board of the group. At Promise Keepers rallies held anywhere near the Mexican border, he literally buses in thousands of mestizos to add "racial diversity" to the audiences. He talks about the meaninglessness of

borders. His meetings often feature Jewish, Black and other non-White preachers, and he uses posters and banners picturing Whites and non-Whites together.

And he always plays the White racial guilt card. At a meeting of 30,000 men, nearly all of them White, held in the New Orleans Superdome last summer, McCartney complained about the lack of non-Whites in the audience. "Where are the men of color?" he asked. And then he continued, "I want to tell you why they're not here. There's a spirit of White racial superiority that exists in this nation. It's an insensitivity to the pain of men of color. We have not been washing their feet. We have not been feeling their pain." Whenever the opportunity presents itself, McCartney will get down on his knees, pull off the shoes of any Black within reach, and give a personal demonstration of foot-washing.

Now, it's really not important whether one marches toward the New World Order with a copy of the Bible in one's hand, or a copy of *Das Kapital*. It doesn't matter whether one's admission pass is signed by Jesus or by Karl Marx. I really hate to say bad things about anyone that the feminists don't like, but the fact of the matter is that the Promise Keepers, on the basis of their racial doctrines alone, are a dangerous and destructive group.

Perhaps patriots should be grateful that the feminists have a new group to worry about and to contend with on social issues, but patriots should not let themselves be fooled into believing that Promise Keepers can be our allies, just because they are saying the right things on some issues: just because they condemn homosexuality, for example, or because they deplore the decay of the institution of family. They are so dead wrong on race that nothing else they say or do can possibly compensate for this.

Racial egalitarianism and the encouragement of racial mixing are not the only problems with the Promise Keepers. There's something basically unhealthy about these people -- I might almost say unmanly. When I watch a group of them doing their thing -- holding hands and rocking back and forth with their eyes closed and praying aloud -- I become distinctly uncomfortable. I mean, these are grown men. Why are they doing this? Is this religion? Or is it some sort of feel-good group therapy?

The whole thrust of the Promise Keepers' doctrine bothers me, with its emphasis on guilt, confession, self-flagellation, submission, and the washing of Black feet. I realize that there are different currents in Christianity which have come to the fore at different periods in history, but there's something distinctly un-White, something essentially Levantine rather than European, about the current in the Promise Keepers' doctrine. I really don't like this soft and weepy "forgive me, oh Lord, for I am a sinner" approach to the problems we are facing as a race when what's needed is the vigorous use of a whip to drive the destructive and unhealthy elements out of our society.

Even if we had to deal only with the problem of trying to repair the damage which has been done to the American family and oppose the feminists who are largely responsible for that damage, and even if we had to deal with this problem in a Christian manner, we wouldn't need the Mother Theresa approach of the Promise Keepers; we would need instead a much firmer approach. I believe the situation we are in calls for the attitude of the 13th-century papal legate who was

asked by a military leader attacking a city in southern France -- a city which was a stronghold of heretics -- how his soldiers could tell who was a heretic and who was not. The papal legate answered simply: "Kill them all. God will sort them out."

I don't believe that we need to take a religious approach at all to fixing America. However, when dealing with radical feminists, I do believe that the proper approach is closer to that of the papal legate in 13th-century France than it is to that of Mother Theresa. They are an incurably sick bunch.

There's something else that bothers me about the Promise Keepers. It's the style as well the content of their doctrine. Let me go back to what I mentioned a minute ago about their penchant for holding hands and weeping and confessing their sins to strangers in big meetings. These things are not just incidental or peripheral. The men in Promise Keepers are told that this sort of behavior is not only acceptable, but it is necessary. It is a constant at their meetings. It is the central feature.

What this reminds me of more than anything else is so-called "sensitivity training," a brainwashing technique that is very effective with a certain type of person with a weak sense of personal identity, a low level of self-esteem, and a strong need for group acceptance. It is a technique that can be used very effectively to change many people's ideas and behavior. The Communists mastered the technique back in the 1920s and 1930s and used it on a huge scale. The public confessions they obtained with the method are notorious. Today the U.S. government and many businesses use the technique to force White people to change their attitudes on racial matters. Cults also use the technique to control the thinking of their members. It makes zombies of people: the right sort of people, that is, people who are susceptible to the technique.

I am alarmed by the fact that there are so many of our people who are susceptible. This is a time which demands strength from us. The problems we are facing require every bit of manliness we can muster. Among the attributes of a man are a sense of personal dignity, of self-worth, and of self-reliance. This is true of a White man whether he is a Christian or not. The sort of self-abasement we see at every meeting of Promise Keepers is contrary to our concept of manhood. It is much more in accord with the feminists' idea of what a man should be like: weepy and submissive.

We live in an unnatural environment these days which is confusing to our instincts, whether we are men or women. Most boys, in particular, are not raised in a way which naturally strengthens and develops the manly virtues. Boys raised on a farm a century ago were given work to do from the time they could walk. Everyone was expected to pull his own weight. This helped a boy develop a sense of self-worth and self-reliance. And boys learned from a close working association with their fathers what was expected of a man. This association all too often is absent today and in nearly all cases is greatly attenuated in comparison to what it used to be. In very few families today does a boy have an opportunity to do any meaningful work with his father.

On top of this is a Politically Correct educational system which makes things much worse by de-emphasizing everything which used to contribute to a boy's sense of identity and to help him acquire a strong set of standards and values. Take a close look sometime at the old McGuffey's

Readers, which were used 100 years ago to teach young Americans in our elementary schools how to read and to build their vocabulary and sense of style while strengthening their understanding of grammar and the rules of spelling. Nearly every story also taught a moral lesson, beginning with very simple lessons, of the sort found in Aesop's fables, and progressing to stories which illustrated and praised the virtues of courage, truthfulness, courtesy, honesty, diligence, chivalry, loyalty, and industry. Personal dignity too. Many of the stories were based on historical incidents, ranging from Roman times to the American Revolution. By the time a boy had progressed through the whole series of readers and finished elementary school he had been exposed to dozens of historical role models and had developed a strong sense of identity: that is, a historical sense of who his people were and what they were like, what they had gone through during their history, what their values were, and what they believed. And he had acquired at least a rudimentary concept of personal honor. He might still grow up to be a crook or a bum, but at least he knew the difference between honorable and dishonorable behavior.

Now, of course, to modern educators the McGuffey Readers are intolerably racist and sexist. The values they teach are European values, White values, and that just won't do in a multiracial society. The concept of proper behavior is one thing for Europeans and something quite different for Africans or Chinese. The same objection is raised against the historical lessons. Why should boys learn from anecdotes about Romans or Germans instead of Zulus and Ubangis? And to teach boys bravery and chivalry really gets the feminists steamed. So the McGuffey Readers and everything like them were tossed out long ago, our schools have become what they are today, and it is no wonder that a great many of the young men who pass through them are confused and disoriented -- not to mention the young women.

Then, there is the effect of the modern entertainment media, primarily television. I won't even get into that. Let it suffice to say that many of the problems in our society the Promise Keepers talk about are real problems, and they need to be dealt with. But the men who are attracted to the Promise Keepers also have problems -- personal problems -- and those problems need to be dealt with too, but not in the way the Promise Keepers or any of the other cults deal with the personal problems of the people they attract. These personal problems, these personal weaknesses, which have arisen because of flaws which have developed in our society -- in our life-styles, our educational system, our mass media -- are exploited by the cults to win converts. The cults depend on these weaknesses, and they are much more interested in taking advantage of them than in curing them.

Which is to say that when the Promise Keepers encounter a man whose sense of manly propriety and manly dignity has gone so awry that he is attracted, rather than repulsed, by the spectacle of other men hugging each other in public, confessing their "sins" to each other, and looking for Black men whose feet they can wash, the Promise Keepers encourage him to join and do these things himself, rather than trying to help him get a grip on himself and behave the way a man should behave.

This is a fundamental flaw that all cults have. They attract people who have serious personal problems, and in order to do that they encourage and exacerbate these problems rather than trying to cure them. Some cults become quite large and quite strong by this strategy and are even

able to achieve certain goals using their flawed members. But I find this whole cult strategy extremely distasteful.

One of the goals of the Promise Keepers is strengthening the American family, but I'm dubious about their prospects for success in the long run. It becomes a case of the blind trying to lead the blind. It becomes a case of the more seriously flawed men in our society setting out to cure the problems which contributed to their flaws. If we are to cure what's wrong with the American family, then we need men with a strong sense of identity and self-worth, men who know who they are and what they want, to tackle the problem. We need self-reliant men, not men who are attracted to a cult like a moth to a candle.

One of the unfortunate things about life in America at the end of the 20th century is that we'll be seeing a lot more of cults in the next few years, cults of all sorts. As American society continues to unravel, more and more men and women will be grasping for straws, grasping for something to hold to, grasping for something which promises to give them the sense of security and certainty which they so desperately need.

But the solution to our problems, the cure for our ailing society, will not come from these cults: certainly not from a cult which encourages White men to wash the feet of Black men and whose leader boasts of his mixed-race grandchildren. We can only have a healthy society again by solving the problems of life-style, education, and mass media.

We can only have a healthy society and healthy families again when we are able to return to the sort of life-style which allows children to work together with their parents and learn from their parents -- boys from their fathers and girls from their mothers -- and when our educational system has shaken off the last trace of Political Correctness, and our entertainment media, as well as our news media, have been taken out of the hands of Jews.

This does not mean that we must return to the past and all grow up on farms like we did a century ago and all read McGuffey's Readers in school. But it does mean that we must restore to our lives the essential elements from our past which allowed us to be healthy then, and we must get rid of the unhealthy elements and influences which have taken their place. And when we have done that we will have many fewer of the sort of people who look for solutions to their personal problems in cults. It will be a long and difficult task, and we'd better get started soon.

The Lesson of Haiti

This month the last of the United Nations "peacekeeping" troops in Haiti will leave, and the Haitians will be given yet another chance to try to govern themselves. The "peacekeepers" occupied Haiti, along with 23,000 U.S. troops, three years ago, in order to force the government of General Raoul Cedras to resign so that a Clinton favorite, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, could be installed as president. The reasons presented to the American public for this interference in Haiti's affairs were that General Cedras was a "dictator" and that he didn't respect the "human rights" of the Haitians. Mr. Clinton's friend Aristide, on the other hand, was said to be a "democrat" and a respecter of human rights.

Actually, Aristide is a former priest turned Marxist whose idea of respecting human rights is to incite mobs of his supporters to murder his political opponents by breaking their arms, wiring a gasoline-soaked tire around their necks, and burning them to death -- a procedure known as "necklacing." Well, that's about par for making a country safe for democracy the United Nations way!

However, the Haitians didn't care much more for Mr. Clinton's Marxist buddy Aristide than they did for General Cedras, and Aristide is out of office again and the Haitians are about to be allowed to run things themselves once more. Well, almost. Five hundred U.S. troops will remain in the country to keep an eye on things. They will call for more help if the need to "make Haiti safe for democracy" arises again.

The Clintonistas aren't bragging very loudly about the success of their latest effort in that direction, because the situation in Haiti is just about as grim today as it was before the United Nations stuck its nose into things three years ago. About the only significant change is that the flood of Haitian "boat people" washing up on Florida's beaches has slowed somewhat, but that flood was caused in the first place by an embargo imposed on Haiti by the U.S. government in an unsuccessful attempt to force General Cedras out, and the consequent damage to Haiti's already pitifully weak economy. When the embargo was removed, many Haitians decided to stay at home and share in the new goodies brought to them by the Clinton administration.

The U.S. troops built roads, schools, and clinics and pumped a few billion U.S. dollars into the Haitian economy, but a survey of the results of all this effort is not encouraging. The streets of Port-au-Prince still reek of garbage and human waste, political corruption is as bad as it ever was, and violent crime is on the rise. The new roads and clinics built by the United States merely add a superficial appearance of improvement, so that the tourist industry is able to begin making a little money again, but the basic situation of Haiti and the lives of most Haitians remain unchanged.

This sort of thing has happened over and over again in Haiti. It seems that we would have learned something from it. In the 18th century Haiti, then called Saint-Domingue and ruled by the French, was the most prosperous colony in the New World. Its enormously fertile soil produced a great abundance of crops and drew thousands of White French settlers. Unfortunately, Black slaves from Africa were imported to help with the work.

In the late 1700's the madness of the French Revolution, with its truly nutty doctrine of racial equality, infected many Frenchmen, and the Black plantation workers were encouraged to revolt. When they did they brutally murdered every White man, woman, and child in the colony and declared Haiti a republic. What had been the richest and most productive part of the New World promptly sank back to an African level of squalor, misery, and poverty. The roads and cities built by the French fell into ruin. A peculiarly African mixture of anarchy and despotism took the place of French law and order.

A little over a century later, in 1915, following an especially chaotic and bloody period, U.S. Marines were sent into Haiti to force a semblance of order on the country. The reason for sending them was to safeguard American business interests in Haiti, although President Wilson told Americans that the Marines were being sent to "bring democracy to Haiti." The Marines remained in Haiti for 19 years. They not only enforced governmental stability there, but they also built schools and hospitals, a modern telephone system, and more than 1,000 miles of paved roads with 210 bridges. The U.S. government trained Haitian teachers and doctors. We really gave the Haitians the basis for a fresh start. As soon as the U.S. Marines pulled out in 1934, however, the Haitians returned to their own way of doing things, which is to say, to indolence, corruption, and Voodoo. Everything the Americans had built for them gradually returned to the jungle.

In 1958 the United States sent the Marines to Haiti again, this time with the aim of rebuilding the country's economy and infrastructure so that it would not succumb to Communist influences. We propped up the regime of "Papa Doc" Duvalier, who had been trained in medicine during our first incursion into Haiti, but who was a practitioner of Voodoo as well. He was a brutal and bloody dictator. Again we spent hundreds of millions of dollars rebuilding what the Haitians had wrecked and training thousands of them in the skills needed to keep the country running. But when we pulled out again, the country immediately returned to its old ways: its African ways.

And in 1994 we tried the same foolishness all over again, claiming that we were "restoring democracy" to Haiti.

Why can't we accept the plain and simple truth that it is as impossible to make democrats out of the Haitians as it is to teach them how to maintain their own roads? Why can't we understand that the Haitians are fundamentally **different** from us, that they are Africans, not Europeans like us: that they are Negroes, and that left to themselves they must do things in the way Negroes always have done them, with indolence, corruption, and Voodoo?

I have in front of me a book on Haiti written by a British scholar, a fellow of the Royal Geographic Society, following his extended travels in Haiti at the beginning of this century. The book was published by Thomas Nelson and Sons, with offices in London, Edinburgh, Dublin, and New York. The author is Hesketh Prichard, and the title of his book is *Where Black Rules White: A Journey Across and About Hayti.* Prichard chose his title because he was especially interested in the fact that Haiti was a country ruled entirely by its Black population, without the White colonial domination that was present nearly everywhere else in the non-White world at that time. The only Whites in the country were a few hundred businessmen and their agents in the coastal cities. These Whites were not treated well by the government or people of Haiti.

Prichard was basically sympathetic to the Blacks and wanted to see how they lived when they had been introduced to civilization by Whites but were then left completely free to do as they wished, without White control. He writes of Haiti in the first chapter of his book: "There the law of the world is reversed, and the Black man rules. It is one of the few spots on earth where his color sets the Negro upon a pedestal and gives him privileges. The full-blooded African is paramount; even the mulattos and half-breeds are disliked and have been barbarously weeded out as time has passed."

One of the first things Prichard notes about Haiti is the pervasive filth. He was not expecting sanitation to be up to European standards, of course, but he was stunned by the degree of filth he actually encountered, not just in the villages but also in the capital city, Port-au-Prince. And he was struck by the caricatures of finery and elegance which thrived in the midst of this filth. For example, he noticed that every Haitian of any importance at all bore the title of "general" and was equipped with a gaudy general's uniform, replete with gold braid and all the other trimmings. When he inquired into the military establishment in Haiti, where the total population at that time was under two million, he discovered that the Haitian Army boasted 6,500 generals, 7,000 regimental officers, and 6,500 privates.

Prichard recounts a conversation he had one evening with three Haitian generals. It is a conversation with a surrealistic quality, as are many other things in Haiti. At one level the Black generals are able to converse with a semblance of knowledge of military matters, but at another level it is clear that they are completely out of touch with reality. One is reminded of the classical stereotype of the African cannibal wearing an opera hat and a loincloth.

Prichard's book is filled with fascinating anecdotes and with detailed descriptions of his personal experiences with various facets of Haitian life. He remarks on the good-natured, open-hearted character of the people, who could nevertheless commit the most blood-curdling atrocities at the least provocation. The extreme degree of corruption of the Haitian bureaucracy elicits special attention from Prichard, as does the utterly capricious way in which it operates. The dispensing of justice, in particular, is a caricature of European systems, in which many of the same outward forms are observed.

Prichard also comments on the religious beliefs and practices of the Haitians. The official religion, which they inherited from their former French masters, is Roman Catholicism, but the true religion of the people is Voodoo, a peculiarly African religion with Catholic touches. In religion as in other aspects of Haitian life there is a bizarre blending of White forms with Black substance.

Later in his book Prichard generalizes from many of his observations to reach a fundamental conclusion about life in Haiti: namely, that in all matters regarding their connections with the White world, with White civilization, the Haitians are more concerned with show than with substance, and their ability to mimic the characteristics of White people, both individually and collectively, persuades many people who observe them only superficially and who want to believe them equal that they really **are** equal.

Prichard writes: "What most astonishes the traveler in Hayti is that they have everything there. Ask for what you please, the answer invariably is, 'Yes, yes, we have it.' They possess everything that a civilized and progressive nation can desire. Electric light? They proudly point to a [power] plant on a hilltop outside the town. Constitutional government? A Chamber of Deputies elected by public vote, a Senate, and all the elaborate paraphernalia of the law: they are to be found here, seemingly all of them. Institutions, churches, schools, roads, railways . . . . On paper their system is flawless. . . . If one puts one's trust in the mirage of hearsay, the Haitians can boast of possessing all desirable things, but on nearer approach these pleasant prospects are apt to take on another complexion.

"For instance, you are standing in what was once a building, but is now a spindle-shanked ghost of its former self. A single man, nursing a broken leg, sprawls on the black, earthen floor; a pile of wooden beds is heaped in the north corner; rain has formed a pool in the middle of the room, crawling and spreading into an ever wider circle as the last shower drips from the roof. Some filthy sheets lie wound into a sticky ball on two beds, one of which is overturned. A large, iron washing tub stands in the open doorway.

"Now where are you? It would be impossible to guess. As a matter of fact, you are in the Military Hospital of the second most important town of Hayti, a state-supported concern in which the soldiers of the Republic are supposed to be cured of all the ills of the flesh. . . .

"It was the same with the electric light. The [power] plant was here, but it did not work. It was the same with the [Army's] cannon. There are cannon, but they won't go off. It was the same with their railways. They were being 'hurried forward,' but they never progressed. It was the same with everything."

There are many more examples. What had dawned on Prichard is that the Haitians really don't care. To them the imitation of civilization is as good as the real thing. They believe that if they are able to dress like White men and speak the White man's language and mimic the White man's institutions, then they are as good as White men. And I believe what Prichard observed of the Haitians applies equally well to Blacks in the United States today.

Prichard ends his book with a chapter titled "Can the Negro Rule Himself?" And he answers his question:

"The present condition of Hayti gives the best possible answer to the question, and, considering the experiment has lasted for a century, perhaps also a conclusive one. For a century the answer has been working itself out there in flesh and blood. The Negro has had his chance, a fair field, and no favor. He has had the most beautiful and fertile of the Caribbees for his own; he has had the advantage of excellent French laws; he inherited a made country, with Cap Haitien for its Paris . . . . Here was a wide land sown with prosperity, a land of wood, water, towns and plantations, and in the midst of it the Black man was turned loose to work out his own salvation. What has he made of the chances that were given to him?"

Prichard then summarizes the century of Haiti's independent existence, running through a list of Black rulers and strongmen, of revolutions and massacres and disorders. He winds up his survey with these words:

"Suffice it to say that . . . [Hayti's] best president was Geffrard, a mulatto, and that the dictatorship of her Black heads of state always has been marked by a redder smear than usual upon the page of history. The better, the wiser, the more enlightened and less brutalized class has always been composed of the mulattos, and the Blacks have recognized the fact and hated the mulatto element accordingly. But to pass from the earlier days of independence to more recent times: we had not long ago the savage rule of President Salomon, a notorious sectary of snake worship, beneath whose iron hand the country groaned for years, and public executions, assassinations, and robbery were the order of the day. And at the present time? Today in Hayti we come to the real crux of the question. At the end of a hundred years of trial how does the Black man govern himself? What progress has he made? Absolutely none."

That's the way it was a century ago, when Prichard wrote, and that's essentially the way it is today, despite three large-scale efforts by the United States during this century to improve the lot of the Haitians.

Why is all of this important to us? A century ago Prichard was by no means an unusual man of his class. He went to Haiti, he carefully observed life there in great detail over an extended period, and he drew logical and reasonable conclusions from his observations. Other scholars of his day could have done the same thing. But it is **unimaginable** that a scholar today, whether from Britain or America, could make observations like Prichard did, draw similar conclusions, and then publish his conclusions in a book by a mainstream publisher. It is simply not possible.

In the first place, one would be hard pressed to find a scholar from any university in America or Britain today who would have the courage to write honestly about Haiti, because he knows that if he did he would be condemned as a "racist" by a numerous and noisy faction of his colleagues and would be drummed out of the academy. And even if someone did write a book with observations and conclusions similar to Prichard's, no mainstream publisher would touch it. That's how far downhill our civilization has slid in a century.

The Haitians have their Voodoo, with all of its disgusting and bizarre beliefs and practices. And we have our cult of Political Correctness, our cult of egalitarianism. It is a cult based as much on superstition and as devoid of reason and logic as the Voodoo of the Haitians. And it exercises as strong a hold on its adherents. A Haitian would as soon offend a Voodoo witch doctor and risk having a curse put on himself as one of our modern scholars would risk being labeled a "racist!"

Exposing the Warmongers

Every evening when I have turned on the television news during the past few weeks, the message has had the same theme: Saddam Hussein must be stopped! Saddam Hussein is a danger to America! We must destroy Saddam Hussein! About the only difference I've noticed in these daily news messages is that they're steadily becoming more strident, more demanding, more imperative: We **must** destroy Saddam Hussein! And in support of this message the television people are using all of their tricks to stir up public opinion in favor of another war against Iraq. Day after day we hear things like: "Saddam continues to defy the United Nations. Saddam thumbs his nose at America. Saddam challenges us to do something about his illegal actions."

These inflammatory comments are made against a background of old film footage of Saddam in his military uniform, grinning at us. NBC's news anchor Tom Brokaw seems really impatient: "Why don't we take out Saddam now?" he asks. "Why don't we just go in there and kill him? What are we waiting for?" That's pretty much the refrain heard from all of the news commentators.

Now, how exactly is Saddam Hussein defying us? Saddam is saying, "Iraq is our country. It is a sovereign country. It doesn't belong to the United Nations or to the United States. We're tired of you people sticking your noses into our business and telling us how to run our country. Get out! Leave us alone! Go away!" And, of course, he's threatened to shoot down our spy planes if we continue to fly over Iraq without Iraq's permission.

Pretty intolerable behavior, right? A pretty good reason for us to start another war and bomb Iraq back into the Stone Age, right? Complete justification for slaughtering a few hundred thousand more Iraqis, right? What does this guy Saddam think in demanding that we respect the sovereignty of his country? We're bigger than he is, so we don't have to respect him, right?

If these television people who are so hot for a new war against Iraq would just come right out and say that, I would find their warmongering a little easier to take. If they would just say, "Hey, we're bigger and stronger than Iraq, and so we can make the Iraqis do whatever we tell them. We don't have to respect them or treat them the way we expect to be treated. We can push them around as much as we want, and if they don't like it we'll just kill them."

But of course, the last thing we expect from our controlled news media is honesty. They want their war, and they also want to make us believe that the war is Saddam's fault, not ours. And so day after day the television news people tell us about how Saddam is threatening the security of the world and defying America and just begging for us to go in there and "take him out," to use Tom Brokaw's euphemism for political assassination.

If we want to begin justifying high-level political assassination, I can think of a head of state much closer to home than Saddam who ought to be "taken out," someone whose elimination would really do America a lot of good.

It was just 11 months ago, on December 21, 1996, when I predicted on this program that the Jewish media bosses would make a major effort to take us into another war during Mr. Clinton's second term in office. I based my prediction on two sets of facts: first, that Mr. Clinton had just appointed an all-Jewish foreign-policy team for his second term; and second, that Clinton's second term was an opportunity the Jews couldn't afford to miss to use American military force to wipe out Israel's rivals in the Middle East once and for all.

And now, I fear, my prediction is coming true. If this current drive to start another war with Iraq is what I'm afraid it is, then it'll involve much more than merely another attempt to assassinate Saddam Hussein. They'll manage to escalate it into something which will wipe out all of their rivals in the Middle East and leave Israel a free hand to continue her policies of expansion. And it will end up costing America a lot more than a few billion dollars worth of military hardware and a few thousand more unexplained cases of veterans suffering from "Gulf War syndrome." A lot more.

You know, there are many people in addition to the Jews pushing for another war to destroy Iraq. There are the trendy New World Order types who are hostile to the idea of national sovereignty and believe that all of the countries of the world ought to be subordinated to the United Nations and forced to obey UN directives, by military means if necessary. That is, they say they believe that, so long as the country in defiance of the United Nations isn't Israel. Israel has been thumbing its nose at the UN for years and defying one UN resolution after another, building new Jewish settlements on land seized by military force from Israel's neighbors and refusing to permit UN inspection teams to look for evidence of illegal weapons in Israel.

And there are even more people who believe that a war against Iraq can be justified if it will destroy Iraq's capability to build so-called "weapons of mass destruction." The controlled media have been full of horror stories recently about the possibility that Iraq may develop and use biological and chemical weapons capable of killing millions of people. And let's face it: that **is** a possibility. The genie is out of the bottle. Modern technology gives even very small countries the ability to build very destructive weapons. It is a real danger.

But if we want to combat that danger, Iraq is not the place to start. Israel has developed chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons of mass destruction, and that's something that **really** should worry the world. After all, Saddam may be a dictator, but he's never given any evidence of having the frighteningly dangerous combination of hair-trigger paranoia and delusions of grandeur that afflicts Israeli leaders. He hasn't been caught sending Iraqi agents into other countries to assassinate religious or political leaders with exotic biological or chemical weapons. But Israel's current prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, has been caught sending Israeli agents to do exactly that.

I don't know whether Mr. Netanyahu is a religious man or not, but all too many of his fellow Israelis are. Orthodox Jews wield the balance of power in Israel, and their religion teaches them explicitly that they are a "chosen people," that their tribal god chose them to rule over all the other peoples of the earth, that all the wealth of the Gentiles really belongs to the Jews, and that anyone who refuses to submit to Jewish rule should be killed. If you never learned that in Sunday School, find yourself a Bible and read the Book of Isaiah. I mean, **really** read it. Read it

carefully. Think about its meaning. And then remind yourself that whacked-out, nutcase religious Jews who believe Isaiah's bloodthirsty, chauvinistic ravings -- **believe them literally** -- are in control of one of the world's largest arsenals of chemical and biological weapons.

If there's any situation which calls for a massive, preemptive military strike to safeguard the world from a madman using weapons of mass destruction, it's the situation in Israel today.

When was the last time you heard Mr. Clinton insisting that Israel should permit a UN inspection team to check for biological and chemical weapons in that country?

And certainly one cannot fall back on the excuse that it's only little countries which must not be permitted to have such weapons. Iraq has four times the population of Israel.

Let's review this conflict with Iraq objectively for a moment. America has no good reason to pick a fight with Iraq. Iraq poses no threat to us. Iraq wants nothing from us but to be left alone. Unlike Israel, Iraq has never even asked us for a handout.

In 1991 we bombed Baghdad and slaughtered more than 100,000 Iraqis because they had invaded Kuwait -- which in fact used to belong to them before it had been taken away during the colonial period. And then we imposed a crippling economic embargo on the defeated Iraqis -- an embargo which has caused the deaths of an estimated half-million Iraqi infants and children during the past six years and which is maintained because of Israeli insistence. So the Iraqis have plenty of reason to hate us now, but no reason to try to hurt us if we would just leave them alone. Iraqi interests lie in the Middle East and only in the Middle East.

The reason we are headed toward another war with Iraq is solely because of the influence of Jews on the government of the United States. It certainly isn't because we are concerned about Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction. If we were serious about that sort of thing we would have stopped Israel from developing its chemical, biological, and nuclear arsenal. The reason it's all right with our government for the Jews to have weapons of mass destruction but not all right for the Iraqis to have them is that the Jews control the news and entertainment media in the United States -- and thus wield effective control over the political process here -- and the Iraqis don't. And that's the **only** reason.

So let's cut out the baloney about the "rule of law" in international affairs or about the need to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of dangerous and unpredictable people. Weapons of mass destruction already are in the hands of dangerous and unpredictable people, and a lot more dangerous and unpredictable people will have them in the future.

And why is that? Why is the world faced with the very real threat that truly horrendous chemical or biological weapons will be used in the future?

Well, in the case of the Middle East, the reason is the policy that the United States government has had imposed on it by the Jewish minority here. Israel is the continuing sore point in that part of the world. It is Israel which first introduced weapons of mass destruction into the Middle East. And it is Israel's aggression, supported by the United States, which has put pressure on countries

like Iraq to develop their own weapons of mass destruction. Any country which can develop them, any country which has the ability to develop them, **will** develop them if it feels threatened, because whether or not it's obvious to Americans, it's obvious to the rest of the world that there is no such thing as justice or a rule of law in international affairs. They've seen the way things have worked in the Middle East for the past 50 years. So let's not fool ourselves with the pretense that Saddam Hussein is some sort of crazy, power-mad gangster and we're the good guys working to maintain international security and prevent a catastrophe. We are the ones who brought about the introduction of weapons of mass destruction into the Middle East through our support of Israel. And we are the ones who caused the present crisis in the Middle East, again through our support of Israel.

And the solution to the present crisis is not to bomb Baghdad again or to try again to assassinate Iraq's president or to starve more Iraqi children by maintaining the embargo against Iraq. That's the policy that Mr. Clinton's secretary of state, Madeleine Albright, is trying to persuade Iraq's neighbors to go along with, but fortunately they're not buying it. They're saying, "Listen, we want peace and stability in this region. We don't want weapons of mass destruction used here by anybody. And we'll support an effort to police Iraq -- if the United Nations at the same time will police Israel and force that country to surrender its weapons of mass destruction and to abide by UN resolutions."

That, of course, is completely unacceptable to the Jews, to the "chosen people," and so Madeleine Albright has been waddling from one Middle Eastern meeting to another during the past two weeks twisting the arms of everyone she can get her hooks into. She and her fellow Jews are determined to get rid of Saddam Hussein and cripple Iraq by any means necessary. As their hope of lining up the United Nations to do the job for them fades, they'll certainly be developing a scheme to get the United States to do it alone.

We can expect some sort of manufactured excuse for a U.S. assault on Iraq. Don't be surprised to hear on the news any day now about some sort of "provocation" by Iraq to justify the United States starting a new war. Perhaps the CIA will stir up some sort of insurrection in a part of Iraq where the U.S. government has told Saddam Hussein he's not permitted to send his troops, and when he moves to put down the insurrection the Clinton government will use that as its pretext for attacking.

As I mentioned, I predicted this 11 months ago. Of course, I didn't know what the details would be, but it was clear that the Jewish power structure was planning a new war. And of course, I don't know just how the present situation will develop. It is even possible that the lack of cooperation they are getting from other countries will persuade the Jews to back off temporarily, until they can apply more diplomatic and economic pressure to other UN members. But I doubt it. I'm expecting the war sooner rather than later, despite Mr. Clinton's big pretense of reluctance, his big pretense of wanting to bully Iraq into line by diplomacy rather than by military force. I don't know when it will come. I don't know how it will come. But I know that it's coming.

I'll make another prediction. We'll see the use of weapons of mass destruction sooner than anyone would like. All of the horror stories about the terrorist use of chemical and biological weapons the Jews have been publishing in the controlled mass media recently in an effort to

drum up public support for a preemptive strike against Iraq will start coming true -- especially if the Clinton government does what the Jews are demanding and attacks Iraq.

Put yourself in the position of a patriotic Iraqi, or a religious Muslim, or any non-Jewish patriot in the Middle East. You hesitate to use chemical or biological weapons as long as there is any hope that justice will prevail without their use. But when you have given up all hope for justice, then you will do whatever you can. The suicide bombers who have been blowing themselves up in Israel to protest the lack of justice for Palestinians will be showing up in New York, Washington, Los Angeles, and Chicago. But they won't be using old-fashioned explosives. And the Muslim suicide teams who have been shooting up buses of tourists in Egypt to protest the Egyptian government's collaboration with the Great Satan will move their operations into the Great Satan itself, and they'll be using more than rifles and submachine guns.

It is coming, and many, many innocent people will die. It is coming because our government has let itself be controlled by Jews, because our government's policies have been based on what's good for the Jews and what's good for Israel rather than on what's good for Americans. And the Jews always, throughout history, have overreached themselves. They never have been content to mind their own business and take their own share and leave other people alone. Too may Jews really believe the ravings of Isaiah. They really believe that they can have it all, that they deserve it all, and that whatever they do in their greed to get it all is justified. That's why Mr. Clinton's horrid, little Jewess, Madeleine Albright, is continuing to try to pressure Iraq's neighbors into acquiescing in another war against that country.

In a way, perhaps it's a good thing that all of this is coming to a head now, like a boil that has been festering. We Americans have become far too complacent, far too comfortable, far too credulous, far too tolerant of evil and injustice and of encroachments against us by everyone else. When someone from the Middle East who has given up all hope of justice for his people pops a biological grenade in a New York subway tunnel or on the grounds of the Washington Monument or somewhere else in the United States, and thousands of our people start dying, some of those who have been too complacent and too tolerant will begin to change their attitudes.

Our task -- mine and yours -- is to do everything we can to ensure that our people also become less credulous, that they stop believing the lies of the mass media, that they begin understanding who is responsible for the catastrophe which is looming before them. Because certainly the Jews and their puppets in the Clinton government will try to place the blame elsewhere. Just as they blamed the Oklahoma City bombing on the militias and on patriots generally rather than on the government's atrocious behavior in the Waco massacre two years earlier, so they will blame the coming use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists on the enemies of the Jews instead of on the Jews themselves, whose policies caused the desperation which led to the terrorism.

Brainwashing Our Children

Last week a member of the organization I head, the National Alliance, sent me something his nine-year-old daughter had brought home from school. He lives in Macon, Georgia, and his daughter is a fourth grader at a private school there. Last week her class went on a field trip to visit a Black museum in Macon and learn a bit about Black history. The museum is the federally funded Tubman African American Museum. It's supported by our tax dollars.

It is named after Harriet Tubman, a Black slave who was employed by Abolitionist organizations in the North during the period just before the Civil War to induce other slaves in the South to leave their plantations and head north along the so-called "Underground Railroad." Sometimes she used a revolver to coax those who weren't sure they wanted to go. The White fourth graders visiting the museum got a little sermon about the wickedness of slavery and of White people for having imposed it on Blacks. They also had a lecture on the history and accomplishments of Negroes, and each was handed a sheet headed "African American Inventor's" (sic) listing 120 or so things supposedly invented by Blacks.

Here are the first six items on the list of Black inventions: the pyramids, paper, chess, the alphabet, medicine, and civilization.

After this start the rest of the list is a bit anticlimactic, with such items as the doorknob, the mop, the curtain rod, peanut butter, and the helicopter.

With the exception of peanut butter, which is generally credited to Black agricultural technician George Washington Carver, this list is so fantastic that most of us get a good chuckle when we read it.

But the really tragic part of this story is that, although these wild pipedreams about Blacks designing and architecting the pyramids, inventing the alphabet and the helicopter, and so on may be funny to us, they're not funny to White fourth graders. When a museum guide, even a Black guide, or their teacher tells them that Blacks invented paper, the alphabet, and civilization, they take it all very seriously. They believe it. My member's nine-year-old daughter believed it. She came home from school after the field trip and told her parents quite seriously that she had learned that Blacks had done just about everything worth doing in the development of our civilization, and she wondered why Whites hadn't done anything.

Now, that was not why my member was paying to send his daughter to a private school, and he was pretty steamed about this effort to brainwash her against her own race. And I'm steamed too. We all ought to be mad as hell. We all ought to be in the mood for getting out our rifles and beginning a general cleanup in America. Which, of course, is why the Jews, feminists, and liberals promoting this sort of brainwashing are so hot to get our guns away from us.

Before I talk further about the brainwashing campaign directed at our children, I want to make a few distinctions among the people involved in the campaign.

First, it should be noted that the Blacks are as much victims of this campaign as Whites are -- even though many Blacks are involved in it. The childishly naive list of supposed Black inventions distributed by the Tubman African American Museum in Macon, Georgia, for example, is obviously a Black creation. One can understand the fascination this sort of thing has for most Blacks. Since they never developed an alphabet or writing when they were in Africa (contrary to the claims of the Tubman Museum), they had no written history at all before being brought to the White world as slaves. And the history they have acquired since then is a rather inglorious one. Many Blacks feel this shortcoming. Despite all of the assurances of White liberals that they are "equal," they don't really believe it. Deep inside them there is a nagging certainty of their inferiority, and they have clutched at straws in an effort to quell that nagging. Their fictitious Black history, with all its imagined great Black intellectual accomplishments, is one of those straws. Such straws would not be necessary if they were living in a society of their own. It is only when they try to become the "equals" of Whites in a White society that they feel inferior.

Anyone who encourages them to clutch such straws only postpones their coming to grips with the fact that they need their own society as much as we need ours. Thus, these people do them a disservice. And of course, the White schoolteacher of my member's nine-year-old daughter who did nothing to refute the Tubman Museum's claims also is one who does such a disservice. I do not know this schoolteacher myself, but it's a pretty good bet that, like most of her colleagues, she is simply going with the flow of Political Correctness. She understands that Blacks didn't invent writing or the helicopter or even the doorknob, but she feels that it would not be polite to say so. It might even be considered -- heaven forbid -- **racist,** so she keeps her mouth shut and lets her students be brainwashed.

She is not consciously malevolent. She doesn't really want to misinform her students or rob them of their culture and racial pride. But she is so deficient in her understanding of her responsibility as a teacher that she would be better fitted to cleaning latrines for a living than teaching our children. And unfortunately that is true of most White teachers today. They go with the flow rather than teaching the truth. They fail to speak out against lies whenever the Politically Correct thing to do is keep their mouths shut instead. They are no worse than the average White American -- but also no better.

The people that we really ought to be looking for when we get our guns out are the people who **consciously and deliberately** promote the brainwashing, the people who **want** to make White schoolchildren feel guilty because their White ancestors enslaved the wonderfully inventive and creative Black race. These are people who consciously and deliberately **aim** at making Whites feel that they owe something to Blacks, people who **aim** at making Whites feel that they are bad if they identify with other Whites and don't want to associate with Blacks, intermarry with Blacks, or have their children go to school with Blacks.

One of the people with such aims is the current President of the United States, who is running around the country holding meetings and telling White people that they must overcome their natural racial instincts and mix more with Blacks and not object to the government giving special advantages to Blacks. I saw this piece of filth at a carefully staged "town meeting" in Akron, Ohio. White members of the audience were being encouraged to confess their racial sins in

public. One young White man arose and confessed that he felt uneasy when he encountered a Black on the street who was "poorly dressed." Mr. Clinton congratulated the young White man for having the courage to make this confession and implied that all Whites needed to suppress their feelings of uneasiness around Blacks, that it is sinful of us to have such feelings, and that we ought to regard Blacks just the way we do our fellow Whites.

Another of these people who consciously wish to harm Whites is one of the richest Jews in Hollywood, Steven Spielberg.

Spielberg has just produced a new film, *Amistad*, which purports to tell the historical story of a group of Black slaves who managed to get the drop on the White crew of a ship which was transporting them from Havana, Cuba, in 1839. After the Blacks had taken over the ship they cut the throats of all but two of their White prisoners. Then they were captured by the U.S. Coast Guard and put on trial. Abolitionist groups hired some high-powered lawyers to defend the Blacks, and eventually they were freed after a New York trial in which North-South politics played a much larger role than law and justice.

Any historical incident, of course, may be a suitable subject for a movie. History, however, is not Mr. Spielberg's interest. His interest is in portraying Blacks as noble and heroic and unjustly treated by Whites. His aim is the same as that of the other media bosses in Hollywood and New York. It is to brainwash White people and undermine their resistance to racial mixing in America. It is to instill a subconscious feeling of guilt in White people who see his film, a feeling that they are evil if they resist giving Blacks whatever they want. Spielberg's *Amistad* is trying to do, in its glitzy, Jewish, Hollywood way what Mr. Clinton is doing in his phony-folksy way with his interracial town meetings and public confessions.

And while Mr. Spielberg and Mr. Clinton carry on their brainwashing campaign, many of Mr. Spielberg's kinsmen in the media are subtly pushing the idea that White America should issue a collective apology to Blacks and offer them monetary compensation because their ancestors were slaves. Mr. Clinton has said that he hasn't yet made up his mind about an apology. He may want to give the Jewish media bosses a little more time to brainwash his White constituents into going along with the idea.

If any apology is owed, it is an apology to White Americans today from the very small percentage of our ancestors who were in the business of running plantations in the pre-Civil War South and whose desire for slave labor inflicted the Black presence on us. It really is a shame that all of the original North American colonies didn't have the sort of geography and climate which existed in New England, where giant cotton, sugar cane, and tobacco plantations just weren't feasible, and the farms were worked by the families which owned them instead of by Black slaves.

Most of the Southern plantation owners were decent people; they just weren't foresighted enough. They let immediate economic necessities dictate their behavior rather than long-range considerations of what was good for their people and for America. For their plantations to be prosperous, they needed slave labor. But if they could have looked two or three centuries into the future and seen the havoc wreaked on our cities and on American society by the descendants of

their slaves, I think many of them would have sent their slaves back to Africa, given up the plantation business, and gone into another line of work.

I've said this before, but I'll say it again now: Whites didn't enslave Blacks -- ever. What Whites did was make the mistake buying Black slaves from other Blacks who had enslaved them and then bringing their merchandise to this country. That was a terrible mistake, and we should rectify it at once by sending back to Africa all of the descendants of those slaves we bought. We shouldn't even charge them for the time they spent here, which was a much more pleasant time than they would have spent in Africa, and which has been a very expensive time indeed for us.

And I think we should send Mr. Clinton and Mr. Spielberg with them. The Blacks voted for Mr. Clinton here; maybe they'd like to vote for him in Africa. He can run around making campaign speeches at the dedication of all sorts of new Harriet Tubman Museums, which will be able to do a lot less damage with their imaginative lists of Black inventions over there than over here.

And maybe they will appreciate Mr. Spielberg making propaganda films in Africa. He can make a film about the African invention of the doorknob, for example. He can depict brilliant Black scientists laboring in their laboratories to develop the doorknob while vicious, scheming Whites plot to steal this invention from them. That film ought to be a big hit in Senegal, Guinea, and the Ivory Coast.

Really, this is no joking matter. The brainwashing of our children is a fighting matter. White children in public and private schools all over America are being indoctrinated and lied to about racial matters. Most of the lies are not as naively concocted as those distributed by the Tubman African American Museum, but they are all the more dangerous for being more sophisticated. The lies come in many forms. Some of them are in the form of Politically Correct textbooks and Politically Correct history lessons. Others are in the form of popular entertainment, such as Steven Spielberg's *Amistad,* and just about any TV show you can name. Some are in the form of folksy posturing and pretended concern and compassion of the sort the whole country is being subjected to in Mr. Clinton's racial-togetherness program.

This is a fighting matter, because the aim of this brainwashing is nothing less than our physical destruction as a people, nothing less than our annihilation as a race. It is designed to sap our will to resist the racially destructive programs which have been imposed on us during the past 50 years. It is designed to make us feel guilty if we hesitate to go along with our own destruction. It is designed to rob us of our racial consciousness, our culture, our racial roots. It is designed to make racial suicide and racial treason trendy and fashionable.

And it is working. It is having the intended effect. Being anti-White is the Politically Correct attitude in most of our universities today. Welcoming the impending demise of Whites everywhere and the inheritance of the earth by the colored hordes of the Third World is fashionable among White students. Supporting this fashion are the sort of erroneous ideas being promoted in Black history courses and mass entertainment a la Spielberg: ideas that all races are essentially equal intellectually and morally, that they all have equal civilization building potential.

The fact that the Blacks have never built a civilization is only proof that they have been held down by White racism. The fact that the Black crime rate is about ten times the White rate and the fact that Blacks do so poorly on IQ tests are also due to White racism. When the Whites are gone -- or at least so outnumbered that they can't run the show -- all the races will get along fine, they all will be able to show their full potential, and everyone will live happily ever after.

This is the kind of muddled thinking that Mr. Clinton is encouraging with his current campaign for racial togetherness. And anyone who raises his voice against this brainwashing campaign or the lethally fashionable attitudes on race it has fostered is routinely denounced by Mr. Spielberg's Jewish media colleagues as a "hater." That's the way they talk about me. Mr. Clinton then calls for new legislation to outlaw hate. And the trendy airheads at our universities applaud.

"Yes, yes, let's outlaw the hate. Let's have love and brotherhood and peace. Peace between the races," they cry. But there is no peace. Look at our cities and our schools today. There is no peace. If there were peace Mr. Clinton would not have an excuse for his present campaign of chicanery and fraud about racial togetherness.

And is it my fault that there is no peace? I did not make the policies which have brought about the present situation. I have not sponsored the policies which have brought us the crime, disorder, fear, and hatred which characterize racial relations in the United States today. Those policies are the work of Mr. Spielberg's kinsmen and of the corrupt politicians like Mr. Clinton who have adopted those policies in return for media support. They are the ones who have brought so much hatred and unhappiness to our society.

The one thing that will quell that hatred and disorder and give people hope again is racial separation. And racial separation is what we will have. We will put an end to the brainwashing and the lies. We will have an America in which no little White girl is ever again taught the destructive lies my member's nine-year-old daughter was taught in Macon, Georgia. And Mr. Clinton and Mr. Spielberg be damned.

What Is a Patriot to Do?

Perhaps you have heard about the decision of the New Orleans school board last month to change the name of one of the city's schools, George Washington Elementary School, to Charles Richard Drew Elementary School: a decision which has been applauded by all the usual suspects.

Charles Drew was a man of mixed race -- slightly mixed anyway, approximately an octoroon, judging by his appearance -- who, working under the direction of a White professor at Columbia University just before the Second World War, helped in the development of new methods for preserving and storing blood and blood components. In 1940 he was appointed the head of a "Blood for Britain" program to ship dried blood from the United States to Britain. Although Drew certainly deserves credit for his work in the blood-bank field, groups searching desperately for non-White achievers to hold up as "proofs" of racial equality have made a bit **too** much of his accomplishments and a bit **too** much of his supposed Blackness. They have unabashedly proclaimed him a "Black man," when he actually was seven-eighths or more White.

Changing the name of that elementary school in New Orleans last month wasn't based on a decision that Drew's accomplishments were more deserving of recognition than Washington's, of course. It was based on the fact that Charles Drew has been represented in "Black history" curricula as Black, and George Washington was indisputably White. Actually, the specific reason given for the name change was that George Washington owned Black slaves, and that makes him an unsuitable person to hold up as a role model for elementary school students. You see, the fact that Washington owned Black slaves means that he wasn't an egalitarian; he didn't believe in racial equality. He was, therefore, a -- dare I say it -- **a racist.** So certainly we don't want schools named after him. That might make the kiddies think that we **approve** of racism.

Now, people with a democratic turn of mind might try to excuse Washington's racism by pointing out that in his day everyone was a racist. One could be a racist and still belong to the country club. Indeed, one could hardly belong to the country club without being a racist. Everyone of quality, of intelligence, of accomplishment was a racist. So, you see, Washington wasn't such a bad person after all, if he was just going with the flow.

But that democratic excuse doesn't hold any water for today's egalitarian zealots, who otherwise are such great admirers of everything democratic. Their response is: Yes, yes. They **all** were racists! The memory of **all** of them should be blotted out!

And that's what they have been doing these past few decades. They have been rewriting the history books and revising the school curricula to put these racist ancestors of ours in their proper place, as the moral inferiors of Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, and as the intellectual inferiors of Charles Drew and George Washington Carver, the great Black inventor of peanut butter (despite his parents' lack of sensitivity in choosing his name).

And now the time has come to wipe out the last visible symbols of these wicked ancestors of ours. The time has come to make it perfectly clear to everyone that we **definitely** do not approve

of them, and so they must be stripped of their honors. Their names and images must be removed from public sight. The zealots have been changing the names of boulevards, schools, and buildings during the past few years. And doing it rather quietly for the most part, trying not to rouse any opposition. Patrick Henry Boulevard has become Martin Luther King Boulevard. Robert E. Lee High School has become Frederick Douglass High School. Twenty-two schools in New Orleans alone have had their names changed during the past five years for reasons of Political Correctness. And now George Washington Elementary School has become Charles Richard Drew Elementary School.

And where is the opposition? Where **is** it? Of course, the mass media have not been making too much noise about this business of changing names, and so the couch potatoes have not even looked up from their ball games and situation comedies. There has been a little twittering among some conservative Americans. One or two newspaper columnists who cater to conservative readers have expressed a whiff of polite indignation: not too much, of course; they don't want anyone to think that they are **racists.**

That must have been the thinking of the White members of the New Orleans school board. It's true that they were outnumbered by the Black majority on the school board. Blacks are becoming the majorities on the school boards of all too many of our cities. But the vote to scrap the memory of George Washington because he was a racist was unanimous. The White school board members, good democrats all, voted with the Black members. Certainly, they didn't want to vote against the Blacks and let people suspect **them** of being racists. They remind me of the Whites on the O.J. Simpson jury.

And so now the zealots may proceed with their campaign, considerably emboldened by the lack of resistance. They may proceed with the destruction of our past. We have tacitly given them our permission. And the **real** aim of their campaign is the destruction of our **future.** When we no longer honor our great and noble ancestors, when we no longer care about them, when we no longer even remember them, then we have no future. Then our race will become extinct, and other races will inherit the earth.

That is the **real** aim behind this campaign to rename our schools and other institutions. And how long do you think it will be before most White kids have no idea who George Washington was, or Patrick Henry?

The feminists, the homosexuals, the Jews, and their collaborators can hardly wait. They **hate** our great and noble ancestors, because those ancestors rejected them and everything that they stand for.

Do you think that George Washington would have smiled politely if he had encountered a couple of homosexuals holding hands and kissing each other in his favorite tavern? Do you think he would have remained politely silent if feminists and Jews were openly pushing the sort of socially destructive programs in his day that they have been pushing in ours? Do you think he would have socialized with someone like Bill Clinton? And of course, on top of all that he was a racist, and so they can enlist the support of the Blacks in their campaign to blot out our past and our future.

Do you think that I make too much of this Clintonista program to rename our public schools? Am I justified in seeing a serious plan on the part of our enemies to destroy our children's memory of their ancestors, just because they're renaming all the schools and other public places which now carry the names of White racists? Is this really something we ought to take seriously, something which merits our contemplating serious action in response?

Yes, it **is** something we must take seriously. It is part of a larger plan to destroy our people. It is a plan which has been going on for decades now, but has been greatly speeded up in the Clinton era. It is a plan with many separate programs, and the changing of the names of schools is only one of those programs. The overall plan is to destroy everything in our society which ties us to our history, to our traditions, to our values, to our racial identity. Our concepts of personal honor, of propriety, of right and wrong also are under attack. And the people who are behind this plan, the Jews and their collaborators, have never had a better opportunity to push it forward than now, when they have a piece of filth in the White House who respects nothing, who honors nothing, who values nothing beyond himself, a true child of the 1960s, a genuine narcissist, a real smart-ass who believes that he can get away with anything and is willing to try anything as long as the media Jews will cover for him.

Clinton's unrelenting attacks on America's armed forces ever since he came into office are based in large part on the tradition of honor associated with the military. That's what makes them so hateful to the Clintonistas. Clinton first tried to force the armed forces to accept homosexuals. He then appointed anti-military bureaucrats to oversee the armed forces and implement every program they could to destroy military morale and spirit.

Just a few days ago one of those bureaucrats, a feminist lawyer he appointed to the post of assistant secretary of the Army, Sara Lister, publicly denounced the U.S. Marines as "extremists," because their concepts of honor and tradition are a bit stronger than those of the other armed forces. She sneeringly referred to the Marines' "checkerboard fancy uniforms and stuff" as one of the things which makes them "extremists," one of the things which has to go in order to make good, Politically Correct democrats out of the Marines.

Pardon my language, but how much of this kind of crap does it take to accomplish what these filthy animals are trying to accomplish? Sara Lister got the boot when her denunciation of the Marines evoked an angry response from too many people, but thousands of people like her remain in the Clinton government and what they are doing is corrosive. It is destructive. Any nation, any people, which puts up with it is on the way out.

Ms. Lister, by the way, was the one Bill Clinton had in charge of doling out burial lots at Arlington National Cemetery to people with the right connections.

What is a patriot to do about this situation? What is a member of the small minority of White Americans who are perceptive and able to think for themselves -- a member of the small minority still able to entertain an undemocratic thought -- what is he to do when he understands what the enemies of his people are up to and when he contemplates the timidity of most of his fellows and the opportunistic collaboration of many others with those enemies?

It is a discouraging prospect, indeed. One can sympathize with those who lash out violently against this situation. One can understand and sympathize with their anger and frustration, even if one does not agree with their tactics. One can even understand the Islamic fundamentalists who denounce America as the "Great Satan" and regard this country as a danger to the whole world. We don't have to accept Islam to agree with them that American society has become dangerously pathological. A self-destructive society which has aircraft carriers and nuclear weapons is a danger to everyone.

Many people have written to me and have told me that they agree with my analysis of the situation in America and that they share my values and my concerns. But they also have been much more pessimistic than I am. They tell me, "We have waited too long to take action. It is too late to save this country now. Just look at the numbers. Look at how many Blacks there are in our cities. Look at how many Mexicans and Asians already are in our country, and millions more are coming in every year. If we try to straighten things out it will become a bloody mess, and millions of our own people will be killed. Besides, there's no way we can unite our people for such a struggle, because the Jewish grip on the media is too strong." And so they do nothing.

The people who tell me these things are not stupid. I cannot dispute their facts. I cannot dispute their numbers. I am sure that they are correct about things becoming a bloody mess in America. I agree with them that it will be very difficult to organize our people while the Jews still have almost a total monopoly on the media of communication. I agree with them that the hour is very late indeed. But I do not believe that it is too late to do anything. I do not believe that we must sit on our hands and watch our enemies destroy our future.

Try to look at our situation from a historical perspective. Think of what's at stake here. It's not a question of either preserving the peace or causing bloody chaos. It is a question of existence or non-existence.

Think of the long course of development of our civilization, from the ancient Greeks and Romans up to the present. More than that, think of the uncounted millennia of prehistoric development of our people, the millions of years of separate evolution, through Ice Age after Ice Age, that made us what we are. Think of all of the great and noble souls that have belonged to our people, the great poets and philosophers and leaders that we know about as well as all the ones we can't know about because they lived during the prehistoric era. Think about all of their aspirations through the ages. Think about their struggles and sacrifices, so that their generation could survive and give birth to the next.

Think about the horrors and suffering that they endured over the millennia. Think about the invasions of the Huns, the Avars, the Moors, and the Mongols. Think about the Indian Wars and the scalping parties our American ancestors endured. We owe everything we have to them. It is our responsibility to pass on to the next generation what these earlier generations have given to us, no matter what it takes, not to wring our hands and moan that it is too late.

Certainly, there may be bloody chaos if we resist the Jews and their collaborators. Certainly, millions of our own people may die in the chaos, but it hardly can be worse than what our ancestors already have endured. It hardly can be worse than the bloody chaos our Celtic

ancestors endured when Caesar's army, acting for an already decadent Rome, devastated their homeland, destroyed their cities and villages, butchered their men, and carried their women off into slavery. It hardly can be worse than the bloody chaos our Germanic ancestors endured when the Huns invaded Europe more than 1500 years ago. It hardly can be worse than the bloody chaos the Russian and Ukrainian people suffered during the Mongol invasions of the Middle Ages. It hardly can be worse than the bloody chaos that Jewish Bolshevism inflicted on our people in Europe in this century, a chaos in which millions of our best people were murdered or worked to death in forced-labor camps simply because they **were** the best and therefore the most hated by the enemies of our people.

Yes, the great cleansing which must come may destroy millions of our own people, the innocent along with the guilty, the good along with the bad. And the longer we wait, the more it will destroy. But eventually it must come, because otherwise our whole people will die, and everything that has gone before as well as everything that might come in the future will be lost forever. The great cleansing must come, and we must do whatever it takes to ensure that it does, so that our people will live.

And we should not flinch from this. We should not focus on the fact that it will be horrible and bloody, but on the fact that it is necessary, and because it is necessary it is good. And because it is something which should come soon, it should be looked upon as a great challenge and a great opportunity for those of our people who are in their twenties or their thirties now.

They will have a greater opportunity to serve their people, to serve the future with great and noble deeds, than almost any generation which has come before. There will be many heroes, many who will be remembered as the saviors of their people to the ending of the world.

The White Farmers of Zimbabwe

A year ago, just after Mr. Clinton had rented out the bedrooms in the White House often enough, had sold enough cemetery plots in Arlington National Cemetery, and had raked in enough well-laundered cash from Buddhist nuns and Chinese gangsters to get himself re-elected, he appointed an all-Jewish national security and foreign policy team to his cabinet. One member of this team claimed to have discovered that she is a Jewess only after she had been appointed secretary of state. Perhaps the idea behind that little ploy was to convince the American public that Mr. Clinton hadn't realized he was appointing all Jews to the most important positions in his cabinet. Perhaps it was intended to fool the voters into believing that the President was free to appoint a Gentile to the top foreign policy position if he wanted to, and that he thought he had appointed a Gentile as secretary of state.

Madeleine Albright's Jewishness would have become public knowledge anyway, because everyone but the voters already knew she was a Jewess, so why not make it seem like a big surprise to Mr. Clinton and throw the public off the scent?

Now the Jewish foreign policy of the United States is out in the open for everyone to see. That policy, in brief, is to bully the whole world into line with Jewish interests, to make the whole world subservient to Jewish desires. It is to destroy national sovereignty wherever it exists and subordinate national wills to the United Nations, to the New World Order.

More specifically, the Jewish policy in the Middle East has been to cripple or destroy any country which might stand up to Israel and block that country's continued expansion. That's why Iraqi children continue to die from malnutrition and lack of medicine as the United Nations continues the embargo against Iraq. The policy elsewhere in the world is to force democracy on every country, because democratic governments are more easily manipulated and controlled. They are subject to whoever controls the mass media and thereby the attitudes and opinions of the voters.

Unless Iraq needs her further ministrations, Mrs. Albright will be off to Africa this month to bully and bribe the various Black-ruled countries there into line. She will tell them that unless they want to receive the Iraq treatment they had better become more democratic. She will be taking this message to Ethiopia, Rwanda, Uganda, the Congo, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. There will be much blather about human rights for the sake of the gullible TV-watching public back in the United States.

One group whose human rights Mrs. Albright certainly will **not** be making much noise about when she is in Zimbabwe, however, will be the White farmers of Zimbabwe. Their land is scheduled to be seized by the government and given to Blacks. If you remember, Zimbabwe used to be Rhodesia, and Rhodesia and South Africa were the only two civilized countries, the only two White countries, in sub-Saharan Africa. When the former British Empire, during its period of crazed self-dismemberment after the Second World War, tried to turn what had been the self-ruling colony of Southern Rhodesia over to Black rule, the White colonists who had built the colony out of the jungle declared their independence and called their new country Rhodesia.

That was 32 years ago, in 1965. The United Nations, prompted by Britain and the United States, immediately applied pressure to force the White Rhodesians to submit themselves to Black rule. The White Rhodesians, outnumbered by more than 20 to one by Black savages, held out against Black terrorist attacks and a United Nations embargo and continued to flourish. The Jews in the United States and Britain used their control of the mass media to pour a torrent of unremitting hatred on the White Rhodesians. It became absolutely the trendiest thing on university campuses for students and faculty to express their commitment to feel-good egalitarianism by demonstrating against White Rhodesians and White South Africans and calling for their universities to sell any investments in companies still doing business in those countries.

Christian organizations followed the lead and sent money to Black terrorist groups fighting to overthrow the Rhodesian government. This led to an ironic sort of justice, when the Black terrorists began butchering the White volunteers in the numerous mission schools the churches had set up in Rhodesia earlier, simply because these mission schools were the easiest and safest White targets for the Black terrorists. Eventually, in 1976, a treacherous government in South Africa tried to gain favor with the Jews and take some of the international pressure off itself by throwing Rhodesia to the wolves.

South Africa had been Rhodesia's principal trading partner and her only source of new arms, especially helicopters, since the UN embargo effectively cut her off from the rest of the world. Even after the South African government cut off the supply of arms, Rhodesians kept up the fight to maintain their independence and hold the Black terrorists at bay, however.

What finally destroyed Rhodesia was the same thing which later destroyed South Africa, and that was moral failure on the part of the White population. White Rhodesians were under unremitting attack by the controlled media everywhere, and to a lesser extent by the Christian churches. But the Rhodesians failed to come to grips with this. White Rhodesians needed to make a complete mental and spiritual break with the world of their enemies. They needed to set themselves against everything their enemies stood for.

But they never dealt with the Jews and with the most treacherous elements in the Christian churches as enemies. Instead they kept trying to ingratiate themselves with their enemies. They wanted to be accepted by their enemies. They wanted to be treated as "good people" by the Jewish media instead of as evil White racists. They were desperate to be fashionable again. They wanted to be loved by their enemies. They **believed** much of their enemies' propaganda against them. They accepted, or felt obligated to pretend to accept, the ideological premises of racial equality and democracy. They denied that they were "racists." And eventually, in 1979, their morale completely undermined by the enemies' propaganda, they voted to turn their country over to the Black terrorists against whom they had been fighting quite successfully.

With the blessings of the United Nations, the Jewish media, and the churches, the rule of the country was taken over by one of the Black terrorist leaders, Robert Mugabe, in 1980. The presidency was formally given to a Black cleric named, believe it or not, Canaan Banana. Later terrorist leader Mugabe decided he could dispense with this formality and had the powers of the presidency vested in himself, after Banana had disgraced himself by his flagrant homosexual

behavior, which included the homosexual rape of one of the policemen assigned to guard the presidential palace.

And for the last 17 years the Whites of Rhodesia, which was renamed "Zimbabwe," tried to go on about their business of running their farms and hoping that the promises of the Black government to respect their rights could be trusted. Now they've found out that their hopes were in vain. Mugabe has designated approximately half of all the farmland in Zimbabwe owned by White farmers for seizure by his government without compensation. The White farms then will be divided up and given to former members of his terrorist army in return for their continued political support. The Whites, of course, are quite distressed by this. Most of them have lived in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe all their lives, and everything they have is in their farms. They will be financially ruined by Mugabe's planned "ethnic cleansing" of Zimbabwe's farmland and will have nowhere to go. Their laments have been largely ignored by the rest of the world, because they are members of a Politically Incorrect race. And, of course, the controlled media in Britain and the United States have been conspicuously quiet about this mass confiscation.

About the only concern in the West seems to be over the likelihood that in taking the White farms Mugabe will hurt Black Zimbabweans even more than he is hurting the White farmers. Mugabe's move is very popular among Blacks, of course, who have long resented the fact that Zimbabwe's tiny White minority owns half of all the good farmland in the country. But the White-owned farms have been producing virtually all of Zimbabwe's agricultural output and keeping a substantial portion of the country's Blacks employed as farm workers. The half of the country's farmland currently owned by Blacks is used only for subsistence farming and contributes nothing to the national economy. By taking half of the White farmland and giving it to Blacks, Mugabe will be effectively cutting the gross national product of Zimbabwe in half and putting about 200,000 Black farm workers out of work, amounting to about one out of every eight Blacks currently holding a paying job of any sort in Zimbabwe.

Furthermore, the prospects for foreign investment in Zimbabwe will be considerably dimmed by the confiscation. The prospects for the 1500 or so White farmers allowed to keep their farms (temporarily) are also not good. Many of them will also leave the country. The present confiscation should teach them what they should have understood from the first: namely, that in the long run it is not feasible for Whites to lead a normal, healthy, productive life under Black rule.

The dilemma for the White liberals in Britain and America is that they want very much for countries like Zimbabwe to be successful and prosperous. They want Zimbabwe to be a proof to the world that a Black-ruled country can be stable and viable. They need this to prop up their claims of racial equality. And they understand that if Mugabe kicks out his tiny minority of White farmers, Zimbabwe's economy will collapse. They understand it, but they can't admit it publicly. I mean, how does that look: a country of 11 million Blacks being propped up by the activity of just 3,000 White farmers? The liberals and the Jews know that if the land of those White farmers is given to Blacks, the land no longer will be productive, and the country's economy will collapse. They know that the Blacks simply will not be able to run the farms efficiently and productively. They know it, but they dare not admit it.

So this is what Mrs. Albright will do: she will try to persuade Mugabe, quietly and privately, to hold off on his confiscation of White farms. She probably won't succeed in that because Mugabe is already fully committed to the confiscation, and if he changed his mind now he might face a revolution from his disappointed followers. So next Mrs. Albright will promise to bail out the Zimbabwean economy with U.S. foreign aid. The U.S. taxpayers will keep Mugabe propped up after the White farmers of Zimbabwe have been kicked out. But Mugabe will have to promise Mrs. Albright that in return for the U.S. aid he will allow his government to be a little more democratic and a little more responsive to directives from the United Nations.

That's the way things were done back during the Cold War, when American taxpayers supported dozens of non-viable little Third World outfits posing as "countries" in order to keep them from collaborating with the Soviet Union. Now the same racket is being used to bribe into line with the New World Order those countries which can't be bullied into line.

The really clever thing about Mrs. Albright's racket is that it compels us to finance our own destruction. Most of the American taxpayers who will be taxed to keep Mugabe's Zimbabwe afloat with U.S. foreign aid will believe that, much as they dislike paying taxes, foreign aid is a necessary thing, because it makes the world safer and more stable. The United Nations, they believe, is a good thing, because it helps prevent wars. They don't stop to think that it was United Nations policy which **caused** the present situation in Zimbabwe. It was United Nations pressure and hostility, it was the United Nations embargo, which helped persuade the White Rhodesians to surrender their country to Mugabe and his terrorists in 1979. No matter how much United Nations spokesmen may protest that they didn't intend for things to work out this way, it was United Nations policy which has led to the dispossession of the White farmers of Zimbabwe and the resultant need to prop that country up economically. White Rhodesia never needed a handout from anyone.

Now the Whites of Rhodesia are being destroyed, and we, the White taxpayers of America will pay for the consequences of this. And Mrs. Albright and her devious clan will continue their manipulations, **supposedly** to make the world a safer place for democracy, but **actually** to make a basket case out of the world so that it can be more easily controlled.

Let me give you an important hint: When trying to understand what the Jews are up to, you look at what they are doing and what they have done; you don't listen to what they tell you they plan to do. You don't let yourself be distracted by the patter and the hand-waving; you keep your eye on the shell which has the pea under it. You don't let yourself be fooled by all of the blather about "democracy" and "human rights" and "international security." You just keep your mind on the fact that United Nations policies always have resulted in **our** people being killed or dispossessed, with the Rhodesians being merely one example of this. Also remember that when a country like Iraq ignores United Nations directives, we go to war to make it obey, and to punish it for its independence we enforce embargoes which result in hundreds of thousands of its children dying. But when Israel ignores United Nations directives, nothing happens. Absolutely nothing. Understand?

And I'll give you another hint: the Jews aren't able to get away with leading the world around by the nose because they're better looking than we are, or because they can talk faster. It's not even

because they're smarter than we are -- and they are fairly smart, on the average. No, the reason they were able to persuade Mr. Clinton to choose an all-Jewish foreign policy team is because they are better **organized** than we are; they know how to act as a **group.** The reason they are able to use the United Nations for their own ends is that they know what those ends are. They know what they want as **a people** and they are organized as a people for getting it. They are able to use their control of the mass media to promote their interests as a people because they are able to subordinate their private interests as individual businessmen to their group interests as Jews.

Keep that in mind as the news reports come in from Africa about Mrs. Albright's diplomatic mission there.

There is only one way we can beat this racket, and that's for us to begin thinking about our **own interests** as a people and putting those collective interests, those racial interests, ahead of our private interests. We must learn to be as concerned about the interests of our people in Rhodesia as anywhere else in the world. And we must discipline ourselves as a people, so that when the Jews begin using their media to persuade the trendy airheads among us to demonstrate against any segment of our people, as they organized them against the White Rhodesians and the White South Africans, we have the means to knock some sense into the airheads. We must have the discipline to act as a people and to keep any selfish or foolish segment of our people from collaborating with our enemies with impunity.

And finally, we must use our collective strength to build our own mass media, our own means for communicating with our own people, instead of permitting the Jews to maintain their virtual monopoly of the media and to continue to mislead and confuse our people.

That's what ***Free Speech*** is all about. It is a start toward getting our media back into our hands.

The Criminal in the White House

In my broadcast three weeks ago I referred briefly to Mr. Clinton's sale of plots in Arlington National Cemetery to his friends and supporters. I didn't go into detail, because I hoped that the controlled media would cover this particular scandal. I've always considered my job to be covering the subjects that the controlled media refuse to cover.

Well, I've waited three weeks, and although there has been a little news released on this subject, it's been nowhere near enough. They briefly mentioned the especially shocking case of Larry Lawrence, and now it looks as if they're going to drop the subject and hope that the public forgets about it. So let me remind you of the details of the Larry Lawrence case. He was a filthy-rich Jewish real estate developer, with $300 million in the bank, who died of cancer in January 1996, at the age of 69. During the Second World War Lawrence had dodged the draft, just as Bill Clinton did during the Vietnam war. Much of Lawrence's real estate was in San Diego, however. And San Diego -- at least White, non-Mexican, San Diego -- is a military town.

Lawrence was rankled by the fact that he could not break into San Diego's good society, no matter how much money he accumulated. The reason was undoubtedly Lawrence's extraordinarily loud and pushy Jewishness. Even his best friends describe him as exceptionally obnoxious. But Lawrence thought that the problem was his lack of military service, so he invented a war record for himself. He claimed he had served in the merchant marine during the Second World War and had been seriously wounded when his ship was torpedoed. He also gave lots of money to the Democratic Party: $10 million altogether. He gave $200,000 specifically to get Bill Clinton elected in 1992.

That got him all the invitations to the White House he wanted. And he reciprocated by inviting the Clintons to lavish parties at his San Diego mansion. He and Bill Clinton became bosom buddies. And when the end began approaching in 1995, Lawrence decided that he deserved to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery, alongside America's military heroes. His donations to the Clinton campaign entitled him to it. That, he thought, would show those stuffy admirals in San Diego who had never accepted him socially.

Mr. Clinton agreed that his fellow draft-dodger had paid enough to his election campaign to earn himself a place in Arlington National Cemetery. Now, the Army, which has charge of the cemetery, checks the credentials of people who want to be buried there. They checked Lawrence's claims of World War Two service and found no record of him at all. They told that to the State Department, but the State Department is very heavily staffed with Larry Lawrence's fellow tribesmen, and they told the Army to try again to find some grounds for burying Lawrence in Arlington National Cemetery. The Army, which just didn't get it, checked all of Lawrence's claims again and reported to Lawrence's kinsmen in the State Department a second time that they could find no record of military service for Lawrence. Exasperated at the Army's obtuseness and lack of sensitivity in the matter, Lawrence's Jewish kinsman Richard Holbrooke, who was assistant secretary of state at the time, wrote a letter to the White House praising Lawrence and saying that a burial for him at Arlington National Cemetery would be appropriate.

That was what Bill Clinton was waiting to hear, and he presided over Lawrence's burial at Arlington National Cemetery himself and delivered the eulogy personally. And the matter would have rested there, like so many other pieces of official crookedness, had not a few Republicans in the Congress got wind of the matter, dug up the facts, and begun publicizing them. Since then a few newspapers have reported the Lawrence affair, but they have been quite restrained in their comments. They seem to be a bit embarrassed about it, and one gets the impression that they are hoping that the public interest in it will fade soon. And Lawrence's family and the government have quietly, but very hastily, yanked his remains and his elaborate tombstone, complete with its Star of David, from the cemetery. The Jews, perhaps realizing the potential for causing themselves real damage, have been uncharacteristically discreet in this matter, carefully avoiding the usual screeching about "anti-Semitism."

Mr. Clinton, naturally, professes both ignorance and innocence in the matter. He **didn't know** his Jewish friend and financial supporter was a draft-dodger who had invented a war record for himself, he says. Mr. Clinton also has professed complete ignorance of the organized crime connections of another of his rich Jewish supporters, Vadim Rabinovich. Rabinovich, who is a member of the Jewish mafia in the former Soviet Union, is supposed to be excluded from entry to the United States because of his criminal connections. **Somehow** the State Department failed to keep him out, and in 1995 he was photographed shaking hands with Clinton at a Democratic Party fundraiser in Miami. When the matter was brought to the attention of the news media this month, Rabinovich was described by the media as "a Ukrainian businessman." No mention at all was made of his Jewishness.

Why don't you ask some of your Ukrainian friends whether or not Rabinovich is a typical Ukrainian name? The same deceit and crookedness are at work here which lead the controlled media always to refer to "the Russian mafia" or "Russian mobsters" and never to mention the word "Jew" in connection with the growing presence of Jewish organized crime both here and in the former Soviet Union.

Anyway, as I said, Mr. Clinton now claims he didn't **know** his Jewish supporter Rabinovich is a gangster who wasn't even supposed to be in the United States. Nobody told him, he says. Mr. Clinton also claims not to have known that his closest friend and biggest supporter in Arkansas, Dan Lasater, was a cocaine dealer, a gangster, and a pimp. He also claims not to have known that his own brother Roger was dealing cocaine right out of the governor's mansion in Little Rock when Clinton was the governor of Arkansas.

We would not have known about the activities of either Lasater or Clinton's brother, had they not both been convicted of drug dealing and sent to prison. And **we** would not have known about Larry Lawrence's fraud or Mr. Clinton's support by the Jewish mafia in Ukraine and Russia, had not a few of Clinton's Republican opponents, with the resources as well as the motive to dig out the facts, exposed them. The **media** certainly weren't too eager to tell us about any of these things.

You remember the way the controlled media dealt with the allegations that Bill Clinton had used illegal drugs? They had him laughingly admit that, yes, he had tried marijuana once, back during his reckless youth in the 1960s -- but he hadn't inhaled, he said. That's the media image of

Clinton presented to the public: not quite perfect, not a saint, but a man honest enough to admit to us his essentially harmless, youthful indiscretions.

Let me tell you about Bill Clinton and illegal drugs: In the 1980s, when he was the governor of Arkansas, not in the 1960s, but just 10 years ago, Bill Clinton was a regular user of cocaine. Dozens of witnesses have given sworn depositions about Clinton's cocaine use. But the controlled media have kept this covered up. Furthermore, Clinton, unlike his brother and many of his friends, never has been prosecuted for his illegal use of drugs.

And this Clinton drug usage is not an innocent, recreational sort of thing. It is a criminal activity, it is an immoral activity, it is a socially destructive activity, and it is a profoundly unpatriotic activity. The drug trade corrupts our society and our government, and it destroys people's lives. The cocaine that Governor Bill Clinton snorted in Little Rock, Arkansas, had been smuggled into this country. Public officials had been bribed. Law enforcement had been corrupted. People had been murdered to protect the profits of the smugglers, and some of these smugglers were Clinton's personal friends and associates. Bill Clinton knew all of this. And he knew it was illegal; the man is a lawyer. He also understood the moral significance of his participation in the cocaine trade just as he understood that his brother Roger was a cocaine dealer and his good Jewish friend Larry Lawrence was no war hero.

Bill Clinton is a criminal -- not in a loose, figurative sort of way, but in a very precise and definite way. He is a man who ought to be in prison.

In fact, prison is too good for him. But he's not in prison. He's in the White House. He's running around the country giving speeches about reducing hatred and violence in America, and the controlled news media are treating this activity all very seriously, quoting from his speeches -- while keeping very quiet about things like his sale of cemetery plots and his connections with Jewish gangsters. They are helping to maintain the pretense that he deserves respect, as the President of the United States.

How did this happen to us? How did this happen to America?

The complete answer to that question is a long, sad story. I've answered parts of the question in several of these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts, and I'll answer other parts in future broadcasts. For now I'll just say that American society has been undergoing a process of decay for a long time. Our ancestors who came over here from England, Scotland, Sweden, Germany, and other European countries and took this continent away from the Indians were serious, upright, self-respecting people. They believed in individual responsibility, the rule of law, and fair play. They believed that the government ought to leave a man alone as much as possible, and that men ought to behave themselves decently and honestly. If they didn't, they ought to be dealt with quickly and sternly, but fairly. People who went into government service were respected, but they were held to a strict code of conduct.

Lawyers were perhaps never really trusted, but judges were. Judges were expected to be fair and honest. So were policemen. There are a few areas of the United States today where one can still witness these old attitudes, standards, and ways of doing things: perhaps in the Dakotas and the

nearby states, where nearly all of the settlers were Scandinavians or Germans and where immigration hasn't destroyed what the settlers and their descendents have built.

But with changing immigration, and with a more numerous population, most of our country has changed. It has developed more of a Latin flavor. Instead of respect for individual sovereignty and the rule of law, there was a shift toward patronage, networking, and "good ol' boy" personal relationships.

Gradually things moved toward a situation where what a man could get away with depended more on his connections than on the law. Judges, sheriffs, and police commissioners became as corrupt as other politicians. The amount of attention that the police paid to a complaint depended more than anything else on who was making the complaint and against whom it was being made. The outward forms were maintained -- the outward appearance of law and justice and propriety remained -- but inside things became rotten.

This is pretty much the way things had become in the state of Arkansas when Bill Clinton began his political career. There were still a lot of decent folks in Arkansas, but the political system had fallen into the hands of a network of good ol' boys and a few rich Jews. And unfortunately that's also the way it has become throughout large areas of the United States.

And that's the way it is everywhere in Latin America -- and throughout the Third World. American politics and American government had become enough like those of a banana republic by the time Bill Clinton appeared on the scene that there was almost a perfect match between the man and the system.

Bill Clinton is an intelligent man, and he is a consummate actor: very, very slick. If he hadn't gone into politics, he could have had a successful career in Hollywood. I personally believe that what tilted him toward politics is his fundamental crookedness. In some people there's a perverse streak which gives them pleasure in deceiving others, in putting something over on other people. Now, one can do that in a sense as an actor, but it's not real; it's only make-believe.

In politics the deception is real: it has real consequences and is therefore more satisfying to its practitioners. In any event, the good ol' boys running the system in Arkansas liked what they saw in Clinton, and Clinton liked the drugs, women, partying, and money that the good ol' boys in Arkansas made available to him. Furthermore, Clinton had learned very early in life about the power of the Jews, and he was determined to turn this power to his advantage. Jews aren't really noticeable in Arkansas politics like they are in New York politics or California politics, but Clinton noticed them, and from his earliest days in politics he tried to make himself especially useful to Jews, and in turn he began accumulating a circle of Jewish supporters and advisers. Today his administration reflects this support. It is more heavily Jewish than that of any other President in U.S. history.

Despite the exceptionally strong Jewish flavor of the Clinton administration, what has happened to America is not tied uniquely to Bill Clinton or to Arkansas politics or even to the Democratic Party. The whole country is infected, both major parties are infected, and every major politician

is infected, to a greater or lesser extent. The infection has spread to the extent that the system can no longer cure itself but will require an outside force.

This may sound like a pessimistic analysis, but there are several bright spots in the picture. First, the system is not really monolithic. A lot of individual politicians -- and others -- are drawing their sustenance from the system, and there is fierce competition for a good spot at the feeding trough. It is the competition between Democrats and Republicans which led to the exposure of the Arlington National Cemetery scandal and to the exposure of Clinton's ties to the Jewish mafia.

This competition may very well bring down the Clinton government during the next couple of years. That doesn't mean, of course, that we can expect a fundamentally better government with a Republican in the White House. The one thing which holds the whole system together and plays a big role in giving it its enduring odor, is the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media. It is the role of the media, in fact, which is the key to our whole problem in trying to cure our society and make it healthy again.

Another bright spot is that in order to maintain itself, the system must continue to deceive the public, because there is still a very substantial part of the American public which would not approve of the crookedness if they understood it. This is the one feature which makes our situation better than that of a banana republic. In a banana republic, the general population accepts the crookedness of the system. Everyone understands that what counts is whom you know and how big a bribe you can afford to pay. The crookedness is much more open. In the United States these things still have to be concealed. The difference is in the nature of the populations -- which is essentially why the Jews and the other people who want the system to stay crooked are so strongly in favor of maintaining the flow of Third World immigrants into the United States.

Looking at our situation in the light of this banana republic analogy, one can almost appreciate Bill Clinton.

We must have a public understanding of the nature of our problem before we can cure it. The crookedness must be exposed to public view. The Jewish media certainly don't want to do that for us, but with someone like Bill Clinton in the White House they may not be able to help themselves. Clinton is such an extremist in his crookedness, he overreaches himself to such an extent, that it's pretty hard for even his most Politically Correct admirers to fail to see the basic rottenness of the man. He's gotten away with so much for so long, with his Jewish friends in the media covering for him, that he's lost all sense of caution, all sense of limits. Really, only a man without any sense of limits could have gotten himself into the Paula Jones mess. And I think it will not be too long before all Americans realize that it is the Paula Jones affair which sets the tone for all of Bill Clinton's activities, whether selling burial rights in Arlington National Cemetery or soliciting donations from Chinese and Jewish organized crime figures.

Jews and the White Slave Trade

Steven Spielberg's pseudo-historical film about a 19th-century mutiny and massacre aboard a Spanish slave ship, *Amistad,* and the subsequent trial of the Black mutineers is being praised by the reviewers. Spielberg, one of the wealthiest and most successful of Hollywood's Jewish film makers, is also being praised by his kinsmen in various so-called "human rights" organizations for using his propaganda skills to sensitize White, Gentile audiences to the horrors of slavery and make them feel just a little more guilty for treating non-Whites so badly in the past. What the film doesn't mention, of course, is that Spielberg's Jewish kinsmen owned many, though not all, of the ships involved in the 18th- and 19th-century Atlantic trade in Black slaves and, in fact, played a very prominent role in bringing Black slaves to America.

The film tends to steer one away from blaming anyone for slavery **except** White Gentiles. This bit of misdirection is interesting in light of the fact that Jews have been dominant in the slave trade since at least Roman times -- especially the trade in White slaves. Jewish slave dealers followed Caesar's armies everywhere -- into Gaul, into Germany, and into other northern lands -- eager to buy as slaves all of the captives of the Romans -- especially the female captives.

Jews have remained dominant in the White slave trade until the present day -- although during the Middle Ages the Christian Church tried unsuccessfully a number of times to stop them, beginning in the fifth century with an edict by the emperor Theodosius II against Jews owning Christian slaves. After being banned from owning or dealing in slaves by one emperor, the Jews would wait until the next emperor came along, then they would buy a charter giving them a monopoly in the slave trade. Then public outrage against the Jews would grow until another emperor would ban their slave-dealing again. Most of the time, however, the Jews were the undisputed masters of the White slave trade, and that is still the case today.

Interestingly enough, this fact was revealed in a recent news report in the Jewish newspaper the *New York Times,* of all places. The January 11 issue has a major article titled "Contraband Women" and written by a Jewish reporter in Israel. The article deals specifically with the Jewish trade in Ukrainian and Russian women -- although it doesn't label the trade as "Jewish." What the report does say is this:

Centered in Moscow and the Ukrainian capital Kiev, the networks trafficking women run east to Japan and Thailand, where thousands of young Slavic women now work against their will as prostitutes, and west to the Adriatic coast and beyond. The routes are controlled by Russian crime gangs based in Moscow.

What the reader must understand is that these crime gangs don't have a real Russian in them. They are entirely Jewish, but the agreed-upon subterfuge used by the newspapers in this country is to refer to them as "Russian" rather than as Jewish. Thus one reads in various news organs about the recent takeover of organized crime in many areas of America -- especially the East Coast and Los Angeles -- by "Russian gangs" and of the viciousness and cleverness of these "Russian" gangsters, but there is never any mention of the fact that they are not Russians at all, but Jews from the former Soviet Union: Jews like Mr. Clinton's supporter Vadim Rabinovich,

photographed shaking hands with Clinton at a Miami fundraiser when he was illegally in the United States, as I mentioned in my broadcast of December 27, 1997.

The story of the exploitation of eastern Europe by the Jews is a fascinating and infuriating story. Throughout the Middle Ages and into the modern era they focused on profiting from the weaknesses and vices of the Gentile populations of Poles, Russians, Ukrainians and others among whom they lived as a barely tolerated minority. In addition to being the moneylenders, they controlled the liquor business and owned the drinking establishments, the gambling dens, and the brothels. A number of 19th-century Russian writers, among them Dostoievski and Gogol, have described their destructive effects on Slavic peasant society and the perpetual condition of mutual hostility which existed between the Jews and the Slavs.

During the 19th and early 20th centuries the Jewish trade in White slaves from these lands expanded enormously. It has been described by the Jewish historian Edward Bristow in his 1982 book *Prostitution and Prejudice*, published by Oxford University Press and Schocken Books in New York. Although Bristow's book is written from the viewpoint of one opposed to this Jewish trade in women, it is nevertheless enormously revealing. The Jews recruited peasant girls in Polish and Russian villages, usually under false pretenses, and transported them to brothels in Turkey, Egypt, and other parts of the Middle East; to Vienna, Budapest, and other major cities in the Austro-Hungarian Empire; and as far away as New York, New Orleans, and Buenos Aires. This Jewish trade in Slavic women naturally caused a great deal of hatred against the Jews by the Slavs, and this hatred broke out in pogroms and other popular actions against the Jews over and over again.

One would believe from the works of Mr. Spielberg and other Jewish propagandists that the hatred the Slavs bore against the Jews was based only on religious bigotry and that the Jews were completely innocent and inoffensive. One fascinating fact which Bristow's book reveals is that the center of the Jewish trade in Polish girls was in a little town called Oswiecim. The German name for this town was Auschwitz.

I don't mean to imply that the Jews were the only ones at fault in the White slave trade. Gentile politicians and police officials gladly accepted bribes from the Jews and in return allowed them to carry on their dirty business. And in the United States non-Jewish criminal elements such as the Mafia collaborated with the Jews or ran their own White slave operations. But the trade in White slaves from eastern Europe has been an exclusively Jewish activity for the last 200 years.

It is ironic that another Jewish enterprise, organized Marxism, put a temporary crimp in the Jewish trade in Slavic women. When the Jewish Bolsheviks seized control of Russia and Ukraine after the First World War, and of Poland and other Slavic lands after the Second World War, they clamped down on all capitalist activity, including that of their Jewish brethren in the White slave business. What they did instead was establish a huge empire of slave-labor camps, of which Alexander Solzhenitsyn has written so eloquently. Jewish slave dealers became commissars and slave camp bosses. And of course, they butchered their Gentile opponents by the millions. The time of communism was the Jews' time for getting rid of all of the Russian and Ukrainian patriots, who had hated them for so long.

Actually, some capitalist activity did survive throughout the communist years in the form of organized crime. Two excellent books on the subject were published in the United States, both written by Soviet Jews thoroughly familiar with organized crime in the Soviet Union. In fact, one of the authors, Yuri Brokhin, was a former member of a Jewish organized crime gang in Russia, where he worked as a pimp. His book, *Hustling on Gorky Street,* was published in 1975 by Dial Press.

The other author, Konstantin Simis, was a Jewish defense lawyer for organized Jewish criminals. His book, *USSR: The Corrupt Society,* was published in 1982 by Simon and Schuster. Both of these Jewish authors write quite frankly about the Jewish domination of organized crime during the communist years. Brokhin brags about it, in fact. He says Russians and other Slavs can only be ordinary criminals, depending on guns and strong-arm tactics, but they aren't smart enough for successful, large-scale organized crime; only Jews are smart enough for that.

A factor neither author mentions which was more important than smartness was the connections Jewish criminals had with Jewish communists in the Soviet bureaucracy. When Abe, who ran a prostitution and drug racket in Moscow, could count on his cousin Hymie in the prosecutor's office to keep him informed about police plans for raids, as well as a little covert assistance if matters ever came to court, he had a distinct advantage over his Russian competitors.

Eventually communism bled eastern Europe dry, and with the economies of the countries under their control on the verge of collapse the communists switched hats, declared themselves "democrats" instead of communists, and announced a return to capitalism. The Jewish slave dealers went back into business, and business was good for them. Other Jewish communists went into business too. As the economies were "privatized" -- that is, as state-owned factories and businesses were sold to private entrepreneurs at bargain-basement prices -- Jews used their connections with their now-"democratic" kinsmen in the bureaucracies to snap them up. Other Jews, who had monopolized organized crime during the communist years, remained as organized crime bosses but greatly expanded the scope of their operations. Often, the new entrepreneurs and the new crime bosses are the same people.

The richest man in Russia today is Boris Berezovsky, who since the collapse of communism has become a multi-billionaire by buying up banks, television networks, and newspapers from the government, with the aid of his fellow Jews still in the bureaucracy. Berezovsky speeds around Moscow in a bulletproof vest and an armored limousine, and anyone who gets in the way of his business interests has a tendency to get shot or simply to disappear. Second only to Berezovsky in wealth is another Jewish media mogul, Vladimir Gusinsky. Between them, Berezovsky and Gusinsky control most of the mass media in Russia. They also exercise pretty thorough control of Boris Yeltsin, Russia's alcoholic president, who is sort of a Slavic version of Bill Clinton, plus vodka. It was only through the support of Berezovsky's and Gusinsky's media that Yeltsin won his last election.

If you remember, Clinton and all of the Jewish media in the United States also were rooting enthusiastically for Yeltsin during that election. They all were afraid that a genuine Russian patriot might beat Yeltsin, in which case the Jewish control of Russia would have been finished.

After the election, Yeltsin appointed Berezovsky to Russia's national security council, but when some of the few media in Russia which still are independent publicized Berezovsky's connections to Jewish organized crime gangs, Yeltsin was forced to fire him. Yeltsin has made up for that, however, by appointing another Jew, Boris Nemtsov, to the position of deputy prime minister, one of the most powerful positions in the government. One thing Yeltsin never has done, however, is make any move to curtail the operations of Russia's organized Jewish crime gangs, which are running rampant through the country and displaying their wealth and power, while ordinary Russians struggle to feed themselves and keep their homes warm this winter.

And tens of thousands of pretty but naive young Russian and Ukrainian women are being swept up by the Jewish gangs -- called "Russian" gangs by the *New York Times* -- and shipped off to a life of misery and degradation in Turkey, Pakistan, Thailand, and Israel, as well as to countries in western Europe, where Jews also control organized crime. The young women, unable to find work in Russia, Ukraine, or Poland and facing a bleak future in countries ravaged by decades of communism, are eager for any chance at a better life. They respond to advertisements that offer them work abroad as receptionists or secretaries and also promise free training and transportation. When the girls arrive at their destinations, however, they find something quite different -- but by then it is too late.

One of these girls, Irina, a 21-year-old, green-eyed Ukrainian blond, was interviewed in Israel. She told how her Israeli employer took her to a brothel soon after her arrival in Israel. He took her passport away from her, burned it before her eyes, and told her that she now was his property and must work in the brothel. When Irina refused, she was beaten and raped. Luckier than most of the Slavic women lured to Israel, Irina eventually was swept up in a police raid and sent to prison as an illegal alien. She was awaiting deportation, along with hundreds of other Russian and Ukrainian women, when she was interviewed. She lamented the fact that the Israeli who had raped her and forced her to work in the brothel was not even arrested. Indeed, according to Jewish law, the rape of a Gentile woman is not illegal. Nor is it illegal in Israel to buy and sell slaves, so long as the slaves are not Jewish. Amazingly, the *New York Times* article reveals this fact.

The White slave trade is big business in Israel. Ukrainian authorities estimate that as many as 40,000 Ukrainian women under the age of 30 are taken from Ukraine each year. Some of these women respond to advertisements promising employment abroad, like Irina did, and some are simply kidnapped and smuggled out of the country. Those who try to escape from their Jewish captors are treated brutally. Often they are butchered in front of other captive women to keep the others terrified into doing whatever they are told. At slave markets operated by the Jewish gangs in Italy young Slavic women are stripped, put on blocks, and auctioned off to brothel owners.

The most astounding thing about this whole, filthy business is that most people are forced to learn about it from a Jewish newspaper like the *New York Times.* And really, you should read for yourself the article to which I referred. It was in the January 11, 1998, issue, and the news is not likely to be repeated.

Ask yourself, why doesn't Interpol, the international police agency, do something to put a stop to this White slave trade? Why don't the governments of the countries from which the women are

being abducted do something? Why don't the mass media raise a hue and cry? Why don't powerful feminist organizations demand the eradication of White slavery?

And the answer to all of these questions is easy: they dare not do or say anything because it is a Jewish business. In places like Germany, where the Jews have almost total control of organized crime, anyone who announces that fact publicly will be arrested and charged with "inciting racial hatred." Germany and most other European countries have laws against what they call "hate speech." Saying anything negative about Jews, true or not, invokes these laws.

Jewish organizations -- and of course, the Clinton administration -- would like very much to have similar laws in the United States. Interpol, which has plenty of other work to keep it busy, is not eager to be charged with "anti-Semitism" by going after the Jewish White-slave gangs. Even if Interpol did arrest the gangsters, it wouldn't do much good, because the fix is in nearly everywhere. There's a huge amount of money made from selling women: enough money to pay off politicians, bureaucrats, judges, and policemen.

Jews like to say about the so-called "Holocaust" of the Second World War, "Never again." They like to talk about how it is necessary to stamp out anti-Semitism and pass laws against so-called "hate speech," so that there can never be another "Holocaust." But by their own behavior they guarantee that there will be.

While some Jews beat the drums for more reparations payments from Switzerland, Germany, France, and other countries they claim didn't treat them right or took some of their ill-gotten gold from them 55 or 60 years ago, other Jews are still bleeding countries like Poland, Ukraine, Russia, and the Baltic nations of money and of their young women. Countries which suffered for decades under the brutal rule of communist commissars are still being exploited by the same people, now calling themselves "democrats."

The Jews believe that with their deathgrip on the mass media nearly everywhere, with their puppets -- like Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin -- in positions of power in the East and in the West, with the enormous wealth they have at their disposal, and with so many Gentiles buffaloed by "Holocaust" propaganda of the sort cranked out by Steven Spielberg and a hundred others, they can keep getting away with their exploitation of us forever. But they are wrong. They themselves are building up the hatred and the resentment and the rage which will destroy them. It will destroy them all: the gang members, the media bosses, the "advisers" to Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin, the professional "Holocaust" wailers, the former commissars, and the rest, even those who are not currently involved in any of these activities. They are guaranteeing that there will be another "Holocaust." And this time it will be a real one.

Thanks for being with me again today -- and do find and read that article on the White slave trade in the January 11, 1998, *New York Times.*

A Question of Sanity

If you have been reading *Free Speech* for very long, you know that I nearly always focus on concrete facts, on hard news, on analyzing and interpreting what's happening in the world. I don't often deal with abstractions or with philosophical questions -- but sometimes I do. I hope you'll forgive me if I do so again.

In fact, I will get into some concrete, factual matters, but first I want to pose an abstract question. When a person observes behavior all around him that seems crazy, that seems insane, how does he know that it is not he himself who is insane rather than the people around him? When other people are doing and saying things which seem wholly unreasonable, how does he know that he is not the one who is unreasonable instead of the other people? Do we have any absolute standard by which to judge such matters?

Let me give a specific example of this problem. I have stated, both explicitly and implicitly, on a large number of occasions my belief that Blacks, or Negroes, or Afro-Americans, or whatever you want to call them, are inferior as a race to Whites, or European Americans, in the innate abilities involved in building and maintaining a civilization. That is, I've claimed that Whites are smarter and more creative than Blacks.

Now, in opposition to this the U.S. government, the schools, the churches, and the controlled media claim that there is no such difference in abilities between Blacks and Whites. A difference in skin color, yes, but that's all. There's no difference in problem-solving ability, in creativity, or in temperament between Blacks and Whites that gives Whites an edge at building or maintaining a civilization. That's the official dogma. Any government official, public school teacher, or minister in a mainstream church who contradicts this dogma -- or who even fails to support it with sufficient enthusiasm -- will be hounded by his more orthodox colleagues.

So who's crazy: I or all of those folks in the government, the schools, the churches, and the media? Am I like one of those poor, confused creatures who goes around with his right hand stuck inside his shirt claiming that he's Napoleon?

Or is my case more like that of an Italian teacher who, about 400 years ago, claimed that the earth revolved around the sun, while nearly everyone else in the government, the universities, and the church held the view that the sun revolved around the earth and that to say otherwise was evidence of either craziness or impiety? How do we decide?

If we go by the numbers, there certainly are a lot more crazy people who believe they're Napoleon than there are genuine Galileos. And, let's face it, most people who are totally out of step with everyone else should be suspected of being a little crazy.

Now, I don't mean to compare myself with Galileo. He was truly a great, creative genius, the sort of genius that our race produces perhaps once in a century, and he would be a historical celebrity even if he hadn't had a conflict with the authorities about his astronomical beliefs. But there are

some things to be learned from his case which can help us answer the question of how we can judge who is sane.

First, let's note that Galileo was not alone in his beliefs. It was just that most people who believed as he did had the sense to keep their mouths shut -- at least in Italy. Galileo wasn't even the originator of the idea that got him into trouble. He had just looked at Copernicus' idea of the solar system and decided that it made a lot more sense than the Ptolemaic ideas that were Politically Correct at the time. Furthermore, if Copernicus' idea about the solar system hadn't had some important theological implications, Galileo wouldn't have gotten himself into trouble for it.

Galileo already had come up with a lot of new ideas which had amazed people, but they hadn't ridiculed him as being crazy or condemned him as being impious for these other ideas -- because these other ideas had no obvious religious significance. But the Copernican idea did have some religious significance, and that made a lot of difference, even to people who didn't take religion very seriously: people who had a vested interest in the status quo, and that included a great many bureaucrats and academicians.

A difference between the cases of Galileo and the fellows who believe they're Napoleon is that **no one** else agrees with the would-be Napoleons, either publicly or privately. Many other scholars agreed privately with Galileo but were too timid to say so publicly. A second difference is that there is no religious frenzy or religious bigotry involved when people consider someone's claim to be Napoleon. They laugh and decide he's joking or he's crazy, but they don't become **indignant** about it. They don't have a sudden attack of piety, the way they did in response to Galileo.

Another thing to note about Galileo's case: The scholars who privately agreed with him and accepted the Copernican idea did not do so for religious reasons. They did so because the Copernican idea made more sense than the Ptolemaic idea. It agreed better with the facts, with the evidence.

Am I crazy for asserting that Blacks and Whites are inherently different and unequal in their civilization-building abilities, or is there something wrong with all of the people in the government, the schools, the churches, and the media who claim that I am either crazy or impious -- that is, a "hater" -- for saying so? As in Galileo's case, my assertions of racial differences are not original: they are not my idea. I have simply looked at the evidence, at the facts, and have based my conclusions on them. So have a great many other people, scholars and otherwise, many of whom, unfortunately, are too timid to say so publicly.

One other very important similarity with the case of Galileo is that the question of racial differences or racial equality has enormous theological implications. The theology involved, of course, is the modern one which has superseded Christianity, even in the churches: the theology of Political Correctness. And just as in Galileo's day, there are many people in the government, the schools, even the churches, who don't take this theology seriously -- who don't really believe it -- but who have a vested interest in maintaining it and therefore will ridicule or condemn anyone who questions it.

So again, who's crazy: I or the egalitarians? How do we judge?

Let me tell you how I judge such cases: I look at the evidence, at the facts, and I look at the people involved on each side of the issue, at what I know about their characters and their intelligence, and I look at the context, social and historical. But first and foremost I look at the evidence.

I look at the historical record -- or lack thereof -- in the Black areas of Africa. I look at the performance -- or lack thereof -- of Blacks in the other parts of the world, such as the Americas, the Caribbean, and more recently, Europe. And I look at the records of criminal activity, of illegitimacy, of drug abuse. And I look at intelligence tests and at racial biometric studies which were done back before it became Politically Incorrect to measure brain sizes and morphologies. And I see a consistency in all of these things. They all fit together: the lower intelligence, the thicker skulls and smaller brains, the greater criminal activity, the historical lack of performance. And I conclude that Blacks almost certainly cannot build a civilization if left to themselves, and they almost certainly will destroy any civilization built by others if they are allowed to become a very large presence in it.

And I compare my conclusions with the conclusions of others. I note that before the Second World War virtually everyone -- scholars, bureaucrats, churchmen, even the media -- came to the same conclusion. Certainly, ordinary White people were universal in their opinion about the differences in abilities between Whites and Blacks -- although we always want to be careful about relying on public opinion.

There were a few religious bigots, a few rabid egalitarians, who even back before the war denied all of the evidence of Black inequality and insisted that their lack of performance was the consequence of White oppression and that their lower scores on intelligence tests were due to "cultural bias." But most people considered these bigots, these egalitarian zealots, to be a little crazy.

Then after the war the Jews who control the media launched an all-out campaign to persuade everyone that the bigots were right after all. With the public advent of television in the 1950s, the media bosses gained an enormously powerful tool for changing public opinion, and as they began persuading substantial numbers of the most impressionable segments of the White public with television dramas portraying Blacks as noble, intelligent, and unjustly treated -- and also portraying Whites who objected to mixing with Blacks as primitive, hateful, and repulsive -- the politicians, the churchmen, and the more ambitious academics saw which way the wind was blowing and began to side with the egalitarians too.

The 1960s were the real turning point in this postwar propaganda campaign. That's when the Jews in the media, working closely with the Jews in the universities, managed to turn American society upside down. They encouraged drugs, permissiveness, hedonism, and youthful rebellion. They ridiculed every traditional belief and standard.

The Vietnam war -- or rather the government's vacillating and pusillanimous conduct of that war -- was a great help to them. Organizations such as Students for a Democratic Society and the

Youth International Party and a hundred others, nearly all led by Jews, marched in the streets with Viet Cong flags, burned American flags, occupied and trashed university administrative offices, burned campus ROTC buildings, bombed U.S. military installations, encouraged young men to burn their draft cards, and generally raised hell, all with the approval of the mass media. All of this was in the middle of a war, in which 58,000 young Americans were being killed, and the U.S. government did nothing to stop the massive treason that was going on in this country. The consequence of this was to shake the confidence of nearly everyone. Everything that people had believed was called into question.

I don't want to recount the whole history of that period of artificial turmoil and change in American society. The point is that public opinion can be manipulated, and public opinion is not a reliable indicator of what's true and what isn't. That was the case in Galileo's day, and it's also the case today. It's important to have public opinion on your side for political reasons, but that has little or nothing to do with right or wrong.

What we should examine more carefully are the opinions of the authorities -- the people who formulate the propaganda line for the mass media and for what is taught in our schools. Is the 180-degree change in this propaganda line during the past 60 years based on facts and sound reasoning? I get a lot of hate mail from people under the influence of this propaganda: mail from people who tell me that I am crazy because I do not believe that Blacks and Whites are the same. And very often these people parrot back to me what they have been taught by the authorities. I hear the same propaganda statements parroted over and over again. For example: "You are crazy for wanting to preserve the White race. There is no such thing as a pure race. We all have ancestors of all races if we go back enough generations. So there is no pure White race for you to preserve." The unstated implication of this is that, since we're already mongrelized, there's nothing wrong with more mixing, and we shouldn't try to stop miscegenation. It's too late. There's no point in it.

How's this for an equivalent argument: "There's no point in bathing, because no matter how carefully we bathe there always are still some germs left on us: under our fingernails, perhaps, or in our ears. So let's just stop bathing, since we can't really be clean anyway."

Another of their standard arguments is this: "There's more variation within the races than between the races. The whole concept of separate races makes no sense." In plain language, what this argument says is that it's possible to find two people, both nominally "White," who differ from each other more in intelligence, skin tone, and other mental and physical characteristics than Colin Powell, say, or some other octoroon nominally classified as "Black," differs from some people classified as "White." And because this large range of characteristics among individuals who nominally belong to the same race exceeds the difference between a few selected individuals who nominally belong to different races, we should ignore the average differences between the races as a whole.

I guess this argument sounds especially good in some of our "melting pot" cities like New York, where one can find just about every shade of racial mixture imaginable, some of them classified as "White" and some as "Black," "Asian," or "Hispanic." But what this argument really tells us is that we need to do quite a bit of racial housecleaning to make up for some of the dysgenic

practices of the past few centuries. It should not convince us that there's no difference between Swedes and Haitians.

It is also good to look a little more carefully at what genetic variation means. Much of our genetic makeup goes into providing for the basic, bodily functions of life. All **mammals** have a great deal in common genetically. All warm blooded animals have cells in their body nourished by blood, and they have many of the same biochemical processes going on inside them. A lot of our genetic makeup goes to provide for these basic functions. A human being and a chimpanzee are over 90% identical in genetic makeup. When it comes to genetics small differences mean a lot.

Here's another way to look at it: everyone realizes that all dogs have more in common with each other than they do with horses. However, no one would argue that this means that there is no significant difference between a poodle and a pit bull.

The point is that these propaganda statements of the egalitarians are specious. That may not be apparent to the people who write hate letters to me, but the media bosses and the teachers who preach this line have a better grasp of logic than the public. Perhaps they do have some sound arguments on their side, but if so they're keeping them hidden; all of the ones they use to support their position publicly are full of holes -- and they know it. And this is something else I take into consideration in judging who's sane and who isn't.

Finally, there's the matter of motive. The people who turned America upside down in the 1960s did so by building a coalition of a lot of different types of people with a grievance against the traditional White male establishment: feminists, Jews, homosexuals, Blacks and other non-Whites, along with a lot of permissively raised, thoroughly spoiled young Whites. It is from this 1960s coalition that today's new establishment has come, the establishment that now dominates the government, the churches, the universities -- and especially the mass media. These people have a vested interest in maintaining the myths on which their coalition is built, and their principal myth is that of egalitarianism.

Everything I've said today amounts to this: Don't let yourself be buffaloed. Don't let yourself be persuaded to accept anything that doesn't make sense to you, just because the people trying to buffalo you are loud and well organized. Look at the facts. Analyze the arguments. Think about the motives of the people who are telling you that you're crazy if you don't accept their ideas and their policies. Have confidence in yourself. When you see the government promoting policies which seem crazy to you, and you see the media and the churches and the schools all parroting the same party line, remember Galileo.

We'll get the inmates locked back in their cells yet!

Bill and Monica

What would I do without Bill Clinton in the White House to provide me with a non-stop source of material? Unfortunately, this latest escapade of his, involving not just another bimbo romp but also perjury, suborning of perjury, obstruction of justice, and a number of other felonies, may put my source behind bars for the next few years.

When the Lewinsky story first broke and I saw the grim expressions on the faces of the newscasters, I thought, hey, they're worried that their boy is **really** in trouble this time. Bill Clinton has had the media covering for him so many times, and has gotten away with so many crimes, that he has fallen into the error of thinking he can get away with anything.

I've talked with a number of people about the significance of Clinton's latest problem, and the opinions fall into two categories. First, there are those who don't want to see him go because they figure there's no one else who could do a better job of discrediting the whole, rotten system of which he's a part. The longer Clinton stays in the White House, they figure, the more citizens there will be who become so sick and tired of him that they'll be ready to blow the whole government to hell.

Then there are those who are happy about the prospect of seeing him packed off to prison in the near future. They were beginning to be afraid that he would continue getting away with everything.

I can only speculate about the feelings of the Clintonistas. Of course, they're embarrassed that their boy got caught. But among the people more closely tied to the Democratic Party and its long-term policies than to this particular administration there seems to be relief that they may not have to make excuses for Bill Clinton much longer. Democratic Party officials aren't rooting for an impeachment like some Republicans, but I'm sure that many of them are praying that Bill Clinton gets run over by a large truck the next time he slips out of the White House for one of his late-night rendezvous -- or barring that, quietly resigns from office. Some Democrats probably believe that even starting a war -- a favorite ploy for distracting attention from domestic problems -- will not save them from injury when the Clinton administration goes down.

One group of Democrats who are especially unhappy about this latest Clinton problem are the Jews who were planning to use Clinton as a club to bludgeon Iraq to death. If Clinton is impeached and the Jews have to wait for Al Gore to start their war, there could be a delay of several months. That might give Saddam Hussein time to load up a few of his rockets with biological warfare agents and get them zeroed in on Israel. Let's hope so! On the other hand, there's a danger that Clinton, in his desperation to direct public attention elsewhere, may launch a premature attack on Iraq.

I have mixed feelings on the Clinton problem. I tend to agree in part with those who would like to see him stay in the White House. Al Gore is not nearly as colorful a politician. He may not do as noticeable a job of discrediting the system. So far as I know, he's learned how to keep his fly

closed during working hours. But he will be just as obedient to the Jewish media bosses as Clinton has been.

On the other hand, I made a prediction a year ago that Bill Clinton would be led out of the White House in handcuffs and leg-irons before the end of his second term, and it's usually nice to see one's predictions come true. Of course, if Clinton does go to prison we'll have to endure listening to all of the media apologists telling us, "See, the system works after all. It's a good system. We still have the rule of law. Not even the President of the United States can get away with breaking the law," et cetera, ad nauseam.

The fact is, of course, that politicians and bureaucrats break the law all the time and get away with it. They're just not as flagrant and careless about it as Clinton is. And they're better about keeping their flies closed around the office.

On the whole, I'd prefer to see Clinton drummed out of the White House in disgrace. I remember the Watergate scandal 25 years ago which forced Richard Nixon to resign in disgrace. That did wonders for the public's attitude toward the government. It helped many people snap out of their authoritarian trance, in which they tended to regard the government as sacred, to be obeyed without question. Nevertheless, a lot of Americans made excuses for Nixon, because it was clear that everyone in the media had hated him from the beginning, and they had hounded him from office. It would do the American people good to see a President the media always have loved and shielded go down in flames as a result of his own carelessness and lack of self-discipline.

And I have more faith than most people do in Al Gore's ability to continue discrediting the system. The Jews will force him to go ahead with the war against Iraq and with other destructive policies, and he doesn't have the Clinton charisma, the Clinton ability to keep the public charmed while peeing on their shoes.

My primary consideration in all of this is the need to build the public's distrust and dislike for the government, the public's contempt for the government. That's not because I'm against government in general. I'm no anarchist. America needs a good, strong, patriotic government to clean this country up: a government willing and able to seal our borders, to round up and get rid of illegal aliens, to get Israel permanently off our back, to get the mass media out of the hands of the natural enemies of our people, and to deal decisively with the problem of racial minorities, feminists, homosexuals, and the rest.

But we can't have a patriotic government until this one has been destroyed root and branch, until the whole system has been dismantled and all of the people associated with it have been properly disposed of, so that we can rebuild from the basement up. And we can't do that, we can't destroy the present government and get rid of its supporters, as long as a majority of decent people still believe that this government can be saved, can be reformed. We need to cure them of that false notion.

Nothing can be done with most of the people who voted for Clinton, but I'm not concerned about them. I'm concerned about the decent people, the people who despise Clinton but who still naively believe that he is merely an aberration and that the system itself is basically sound. These

people need to be illuminated, and I'm inclined to believe that the shock of seeing the President of the United States in handcuffs will do more to turn on a light in their heads than will the water-drip torture of listening to a continuing stream of stories about shady land deals back in Arkansas, campaign contributions from Chinese gangsters, and romps with bimbos on the carpet in the Oval Office for the next three years. We can't afford to wait another three years for the dead-heads to wake up. We need to get the revolution jump-started soon.

Just seeing Clinton go to jail won't do that, of course. That's just the first step. Ultimately we need for White Americans to understand that with the sort of government we have now, it's **not possible** to have an honest or patriotic President in the White House. The only sort of person who can get **near** the Presidency under the present system is someone who is fundamentally crooked, someone who is an unpatriotic criminal. He doesn't have to be as flamboyant about his criminality as Clinton is, but certainly no honest man and no patriot can be President so long as the government is subject to the mass media the way this one is. What we have now, in effect, is a government by the Jewish media bosses, and that's what we'll have if Al Gore ends up in the White House too. It's also what we would have had with Bob Dole as President, or Newt Gingrich, or any of the other major-party politicians. Dole and Gingrich are just as hot to annihilate the Iraqis or anyone else who poses a threat to Israel's ambitions in the Middle East as Clinton is.

And, really, what's more dangerous for America: a President who can't keep his pants up or a President willing to take America into wars that do not serve our country's interests?

Can you imagine Al Gore, if Clinton is impeached and convicted, getting rid of Madeleine Albright, William Cohen, Robert Rubin, and all the other Jews Clinton has put in charge of our government and then announcing that from now on Israel will have to shift for itself, that we are lifting the embargo on Iraq and recalling our Navy ships from the area? It's just not conceivable.

Al Gore would do exactly what the media bosses tell him to do, just like he has done throughout his political career. So the only real question for us is: What course of events will result in the decent segment of the public understanding this soonest? I think that seeing it with their own eyes -- at least, seeing that Al Gore jumps through the same hoops that Bill Clinton jumped through -- will be as quick a way as any.

And I think it's good for the Clinton affair to have some very concrete results now, rather than later. Permitting him to wriggle out of the Monica problem like he's wriggled out of so many other problems will simply make the cynics more cynical -- with is worth something -- but it also will reinforce the atmosphere of unreality that pervades American politics. It will reinforce the feeling that everything is inevitable -- everything has been arranged by the powerful, behind-the-scenes fixers -- and that there's nothing decent people can do to change things. Hauling a two-term President off to jail gives decent people everywhere hope that something can be done to fight evil and make a change for the better. It's the next best thing to assassinating a President.

Clinton's real crimes are not perjury, suborning of perjury, and obstruction of justice. In the sort of banana-republic atmosphere we have in Washington these days, we can almost forgive such things. Everybody does it, and Clinton was just unlucky enough to get caught. Clinton's real

crimes, the crimes which cannot be forgiven and which should result in his being strung up outside the White House as an example to others who would betray their race, is his collaboration with the Jews throughout his career. Clinton is the very epitome of the rotten, spoiled, whining, self-indulgent college boy who ran with the Jews in the 1960s. He dodged the draft, smoked dope, and assisted the Jews in turning American society upside down, without a thought for the consequences. Every Jewish slogan and cliche came easily to his lips, whether it was a chant for Ho Chi Minh to win in Vietnam or a demand for more Blacks on the campus or for more homosexuals on the faculty.

And since the 1960s he has been the epitome of the amoral politician, of the unprincipled opportunist, of the crooked lawyer and the sleazy operator -- which would have been bad enough in itself had he remained in the land development business or in state politics in Little Rock, but which was made incomparably worse by the fact that the Jews chose him to be one of their catspaws in their continuing destruction of America.

Since he came to Washington, Bill Clinton has been their obedient tool, their willing tool, their enthusiastic tool. He has promoted everything rotten, everything destructive, everything subversive -- especially everything which is harmful to White Americans and everything which strengthens the hand of the Jews. We have never before had a President who pushed so hard for bringing homosexuals into every institution in our society, or a President who did as much to promote feminism. No President before Clinton ever appointed two Jews to the Supreme Court, giving them nearly ten times the representation on that body as they have in the general population. No President before Clinton has ever appointed even **half** as many Jews to his cabinet. No President before Clinton has appointed a foreign-policy and national-defense team which is **entirely** Jewish.

It is indeed ironic that it is his sexual relationship with a Jewess which has brought him down. And I suppose we might also see some irony in the fact that it is a conspiracy he made with a Black confidant, Vernon Jordan, which has helped bring him down. And in the fact that it is another Jew, Mickey Cantor, who has been the one to whom Clinton turned for help and advice as the noose tightened on his neck.

Clinton has been so accustomed to having the Jews cover for him and get him out of scrapes -- especially the Jewish media bosses -- that it must be quite a shock to him now to realize that they could abandon him. He was a useful tool while he lasted, but now that he has become an embarrassment, even to them -- and it takes a lot to embarrass them -- they may simply discard him and use another of their tools, such as Al Gore.

The symbolism of Clinton's fall should be important for us. He symbolizes, more than any other public figure, everything that was rotten, decadent, weak, corrupt, and treasonous about the 1960s. It is fitting that his downfall be more traumatic and more disgraceful than that of any other public figure of this era. That is a symbolism that we should cherish, even though the system of which Clinton was a part still waits to be pulled down.

There is one other symbolic aspect to what has happened to Clinton. It is clear that Clinton was one of the most useful tools the Jews have ever had. They really would prefer to continue using

him, but he finally may have gotten himself into such a mess that even they cannot save him. That should be encouraging to every patriot, especially those who tend to overestimate the power of the Jews and to underestimate our ability to whip them and to free ourselves from their control.

I'll close with another observation that should be encouraging, and that is about the enormous number of jokes about Clinton which are now circulating. It is really phenomenal. And these jokes on the Internet are coming from people all over the spectrum. To me they indicate a little of the frustration which has been building up in the so-called "silent majority" during the Clinton regime. You've undoubtedly heard a few of these jokes by now, but I'll risk mentioning a few which to me express the general sentiments of the public.

Question:

How did Bill and Hillary Clinton meet?

Answer:

They were dating the same girl in high school.

Question:

If Bill and Hillary jumped together off the Washington Monument, who'd land first?

Answer:

Who cares?

Question:

How can you tell when Bill Clinton is telling a lie just by looking at his face?

Answer:

If his lips are moving, then he's lying.

And of course, a lot of the jokes are what might be called "Bill and Monica" jokes, but most of them really aren't suitable for repeating on a family program. My favorite, though, is Bill trying to wriggle out of the charge that he encouraged Monica to commit perjury. "I never told that girl to lie," he says. "Actually what I told her was, "Lie down."

I guess this sort of thing isn't very funny to the Clinton coalition. I guess the dregs of American society who combined to put Clinton into office are more chagrined than amused by what has happened. But the rest of us should have a good laugh, and then we should make up our minds to do whatever it takes to get rid of the system that allowed such a coalition of losers, perverts, and anti-American traitors to impose a piece of filth like William Jefferson Clinton on our society and on our country.

Sinking of the *Wilhelm Gustloff*

What's said to be the most expensive motion picture ever made was released a few weeks ago and has been earning record money at the box office. The film, of course, is *Titanic,* and it's about the sinking of the ocean liner S.S. *Titanic* on April 15, 1912, with the loss of 1,513 lives, after the ship struck an iceberg in the North Atlantic.

There are many superlatives in the film. The *Titanic* was the largest ship ever built at the time. It also was the most luxurious ship, intended to provide high-speed trans-Atlantic transportation in comfort for the rich and pampered. The implication of the film is that the sinking of the *Titanic* is the greatest maritime disaster of all time. I'm sure that the great majority of the American public believes that to be the case, but it isn't. Everyone has heard about the sinking of the *Titanic,* and very few have heard about the sinking of the S.S. *Wilhelm Gustloff,* which **was** the greatest maritime disaster.

It is easy to understand why everyone has heard about the *Titanic:* it was a very big, very expensive ship, claimed to be virtually "unsinkable," which went down on its maiden voyage with a record number of celebrities and tycoons aboard. The irony of the sinking helped generate public interest and an enormous media coverage. When the *Wilhelm Gustloff* went down, on the other hand, with the loss of more than **7,000** lives, the controlled media adopted the deliberate policy that it was a non-event, not to be commented on or even reported. The *Wilhelm Gustloff,* like the *Titanic,* was a big passenger liner and was reasonably new and luxurious. But it was a **German** passenger liner. It was sunk in the Baltic Sea on the night of January 30, 1945, by a Soviet submarine. It was packed with nearly 8,000 Germans, most of them women and children escaping from the advancing Soviet Army.

Many of these German refugees lived in East Prussia, a part of Germany that the Communist and democratic Allies had agreed would be taken from Germany and given to the Soviet Union at the end of the Second World War. Others lived in Danzig and the surrounding area, which the democrats and Communists had decided would be taken from Germany and given to Poland. All of these refugees were fleeing in terror from the Reds, who already had demonstrated in East Prussia what was in store for any German unfortunate enough to fall into their hands.

As Soviet military units overtook columns of German civilian refugees fleeing to the west, they behaved in a way which has not been seen in Europe since the Mongol invasions of the Middle Ages. Often the men, most of them farmers or Germans who had been engaged in other essential occupations and thus exempted from military service, were simply murdered on the spot. The women were, almost without exception, gang-raped. This was the fate of girls as young as eight years old and old women in their eighties, as well as women in the advanced stages of pregnancy. Women who resisted rape had their throats cut or were shot. Very often women were murdered after being gang-raped. Many women and girls were raped so often and so brutally that they died from this abuse alone.

Sometimes Soviet tank columns simply rolled right over the fleeing refugees, grinding them into the mud with their tank treads. When Soviet Army units occupied East Prussian villages, they

engaged in orgies of torture, rape, and murder so bestial that they cannot be described fully on this program. Sometimes they castrated the men and boys before killing them. Sometimes they gouged their eyes out. Sometimes they burned them alive. Some women after being gang-raped were crucified by being nailed to barn doors while still alive and then used for target practice.

This atrocious behavior on the part of the Communist troops was due in part to the nature of the Communist system, which had succeeded in overthrowing Russian society and the Russian government in the first place by organizing the scum of Russian society -- the losers and ne'er-do-wells, the criminals, the resentful and the envious -- under the Jews and setting them against the successful, the accomplished, the refined, and the prosperous, promising the rabble that if they pulled down their betters then they could take the place of the latter: the first shall be last, and the last shall be first.

It was the members of this rabble, this scum of Russian society, who became the bosses of local soviets and collectives and workers' councils -- when the positions had not already been taken by Jews. The Soviet soldiers of 1945 had grown up under this system of rule by the worst; for 25 years they had lived under commissars chosen from the dregs of Russian society. Any tendency toward nobility or gentility had been weeded out ruthlessly. Stalin had ordered the butchering of 35,000 Red Army officers, half of the old Russian officers' corps, in 1937, just two years before the war, because he did not trust gentlemen. The officers who replaced those shot in the 1937 purge were not much more civilized in their behavior than the commissars.

An even more specific and immediate cause of the atrocities committed against the German population of East Prussia was the Soviet hate propaganda which deliberately incited the Soviet troops to rape and murder -- even to murder German infants. The chief of the Soviet propaganda commissars was a hate-filled Jew named Ilya Ehrenburg. One of his directives to the Soviet troops read:

"Kill! Kill! In the German race there is nothing but evil; not one among the living, not one among the yet unborn but is evil! Follow the precepts of Comrade Stalin. Stamp out the fascist beast once and for all in its lair! Use force and break the racial pride of these German women. Take them as your lawful booty. Kill! As you storm onward, kill, you gallant soldiers of the Red Army."

Not every Russian soldier was a butcher or a rapist, of course: just most of them. A few of them still had a sense of morality and decency which even Jewish Communism had not destroyed. Alexander Solzhenitsyn was one of these. He was a young captain in the Red Army when it entered East Prussia in January 1945. He wrote later in his *Gulag Archipelago:*

All of us knew very well that if the girls were German they could be raped and then shot. This was almost a combat distinction.

In one of his poems, "Prussian Nights," he describes a scene he witnessed in a house in the East Prussian town of Neidenburg:

Twenty-two Hoeringstrasse. It's not been burned, just looted, rifled. A moaning by the walls, half muffled: the mother's wounded, half alive. The little daughter's on the mattress, dead. How many have been on it? A platoon, a company perhaps? A girl's been turned into a woman, a woman turned into a corpse. . . . The mother begs, "Soldier, kill me!"

For his failure to take Comrade Ehrenburg's directive to heart, Solzhenitsyn was reported by the political commissar in his unit as not being Politically Correct and was packed off to the *gulag:* that is, to a Soviet concentration camp.

And so, German civilians were fleeing in terror from East Prussia, and for many of them the only route of escape was across the icy Baltic Sea. They packed the port of Gotenhafen, near Danzig, hoping to find passage to the west. Hitler ordered all available civilian ships into the rescue effort. The *Wilhelm Gustloff* was one of these. A 25,000-ton passenger liner, it had been used before the war by the "Strength through Joy" organization to take German workers on low-cost vacation excursions. On January 30, 1945, when it steamed out of Gotenhafen it carried a crew of just under 1,100 officers and men, 73 critically wounded soldiers, 373 young women of the Women's Naval Auxiliary, equivalent to our WAVES, and more than 6,000 desperate refugees, most of them women and children.

Soviet submarines and aircraft were a constant menace to this rescue effort. They regarded the refugee ships in the light of Ehrenburg's genocidal propaganda: the more Germans they could kill the better, and it didn't make any difference to them whether their victims were soldiers or women and children. At just after 9:00 PM, when the *Wilhelm Gustloff* was 13 miles off the coast of Pomerania, three torpedoes from the Soviet submarine *S-13*, under the command of Captain A.I. Marinesko, struck the ship. Ninety minutes later it sank beneath the icy waves of the Baltic. Although a heroic effort to pick up survivors was made by other German ships, barely 1,100 were saved. The rest, more than 7,000 Germans, died in the frigid water that night.

A few days later, on February 10, 1945, the same Soviet submarine sank the German hospital ship, the *General von Steuben,* and 3,500 wounded soldiers aboard the ship, who were being evacuated from East Prussia, drowned. To the Soviets, inflamed by Jewish hate propaganda, the sign of the Red Cross meant nothing. On May 6, 1945, the German freighter *Goya,* also part of the rescue fleet, was torpedoed by another Soviet submarine, and more than 6,000 refugees fleeing from East Prussia died.

The lack of knowledge in the United States about any of these terrible maritime disasters of 1945 is profound, even among people who consider themselves knowledgeable on naval matters. And this ignorance stems from the **deliberate** policy of the controlled media, a policy which has relegated these disasters to the category of non-events. The reason for this media policy originally was the same reason which led the Jewish media bosses to blame the slaughter of 15,000 Polish officers and intellectuals in the Katyn woods in 1940 on the Germans. They knew that the Soviets had done it, as part of their effort to "proletarianize" Poland and make the Poles more amenable to Communist rule, but they didn't want to tarnish the image of our "gallant Soviet ally," as the Reds were called by the controlled U.S. media during the war. They wanted Americans to think that the Germans were the bad guys and the Soviets were the good guys, so they simply lied about the Katyn massacre.

Likewise, even in the last months of the war, they didn't want Americans alerted to the fact that our "gallant Soviet ally" was butchering and raping the civilian population of East Prussia and deliberately sinking the civilian refugee ships which were helping the East Prussians escape across the Baltic Sea. That might damage America's enthusiasm for continuing the destruction of Germany with the help of our "gallant Soviet ally." So the controlled media simply didn't report these things.

After the triumph of the democratic and Communist Allies and the unconditional surrender of Germany this reason no longer was valid, of course. But by then another motive had taken its place. The Jews were beginning to build their "Holocaust" story and were demanding sympathy from the world -- and reparations money from anyone they could get it from. As they began wailing about the supposed extermination of six million of their kinsmen in "gas ovens" by the wicked Germans and portraying themselves as the innocent and inoffensive victims of the greatest crime in history, they didn't want any **facts** getting in the way -- and they certainly didn't want Americans to see both sides of the conflict; they didn't want the Germans seen as victims too. All Germans were evil, just like Comrade Ehrenburg had said; all Jews were good; and that was it. The Jews suffered, and the Germans didn't, and so now the world owed the Jews a living for not stopping the "Holocaust."

It really wouldn't help their "Holocaust" propaganda at all to have the American public learn about what had happened in East Prussia or in the Baltic Sea -- or to learn that our "gallant Soviet ally" had deliberately murdered the leadership stratum of the Polish nation in the Katyn woods, and that some of the murderers involved in that horrendous act were Jews. And so there has been a conspiracy of silence in America on the part of the Jewish media bosses. That's why Hollywood was willing to spend $200 million producing the film *Titanic* but would never consider any film dealing with the sinking of the *Wilhelm Gustloff*. It's not that such a film couldn't make money -- I think that a film about East Prussia and the *Wilhelm Gustloff* could be a real blockbuster -- it's that there must be no sympathy for the Germans. There must be no rethinking of America's reasons for waging war against Germany, no questioning of whether or not we did the right thing in allying ourselves with Communism on behalf of the Jews. And beside these considerations, the truth simply doesn't count -- at least, not to the Jews who control our mass media.

This bit of history -- America's motivations for engaging in the war in Europe, which really was something altogether separate from the war in the Pacific, despite the alliance between Germany and Japan -- this bit of history always has fascinated me. And one of the interesting aspects about it is the unwillingness of so many Americans to examine it. I understand the sentiments of the Clintonista elements. To the kind of people who voted for Clinton, the Soviets were the good guys and the Germans were the bad guys on **ideological** grounds. Gang-rape, mass murder, and the sinking of refugee ships are not really crimes in the eyes of the Bill-and-Hillary types when they're done by Communists against "Nazis."

But there also were a lot of decent Americans who fought in the war in Europe, anti-Communist Americans, and many of them don't want to think about the fact that they fought on the wrong side. These American Legion and VFW types don't want to hear about who really killed all of those Polish intellectuals and leaders in the Katyn woods. They don't want to know what

happened in East Prussia in 1945. They hate it when I ask them, why did we fight Germany in the name of freedom and then turn half of Europe over to Communist slavery at the end of the war? They become angry when I suggest that perhaps Franklin Roosevelt was the same sort of lying, Jew-collaborating traitor that Bill Clinton is, and that in return for media support he lied us into the war on behalf of the Jews, just the way Clinton is lying us into a war in the Middle East on behalf of the Jews.

I was far too young for military service in the Second World War, but I am sure that if I had fought in that war, I'd be even more interested in understanding what was behind it. I believe that knowing the truth about these things is far more important than protecting our carefully nurtured belief that we were on the side of righteousness. I believe that understanding how we were deceived in the past is necessary, if we are to avoid being deceived in the future.

Bill, Monica, and Saddam

As we all watch the U.S. government deliberately move closer day by day to the war I predicted a year ago -- when Clinton appointed his all-Jewish foreign policy, national security, and defense team -- the question must come to many minds: Why do the American people permit this? Why do they vote for a government which clearly doesn't care at all about American interests? Why do they tolerate a government which plunges them into unnecessary wars?

Well, of course, we already know part of the answer. An electorate which will put a creature like Bill Clinton into the White House twice clearly doesn't care much about American interests. All most of them care about is the size of their welfare checks. But there's more to the war mania in Washington than an irresponsible *lumpen* electorate. There is the conviction on the part of those pushing for war against Iraq that they can get away with it, that no one will call them to account for it, because the controlled media will cover for them. In fact, the controlled media are at the forefront of those insisting on a war. Which is why virtually every political prostitute in Washington, Republican as well as Democrat, is beating the war drums and calling for the bombing of Iraq to begin.

But the American people -- the decent, level-headed, responsible portion of the electorate that didn't vote for Clinton -- what about them? Why are so few of them speaking out against the government's warmongering? I mean, when our government goes in and tears up another country and massacres thousands of its citizens for no good reason, it reflects on all of us. Why do we not at least speak out against it?

For an answer we must examine in more detail the role of the controlled mass media in this affair. They are not just telling the politicians of both parties that if they want media support at the next election they had better rattle their sabers at Saddam Hussein; they also are deceiving the American people about all of the issues involved.

The situation is almost as bad as it was back in the days before the Second World War, when the controlled media were trying to work up a war fever against Germany by telling the American people that Hitler intended to invade and conquer the United States, that our government had discovered a secret plan Hitler had to conquer Brazil first and then to send his *Panzers* up through Central America and across the Rio Grande. As crazy as that story sounds, I've met American Legion and VFW types who still cite that as a justification for having gone to war against Germany. We had to do it to keep Germany from invading us by way of Brazil.

The media can get away with peddling such whoppers to the public because they have almost no competition. There's almost no one to contradict them and point out their lies to the public, almost no one to challenge their claims of secret plans for invasions by way of Brazil and explain to the public why that doesn't make sense. And in 1940 and 1941 no prominent politician wanted to anger the Jews by pointing out to the public that the idea of a German invasion of the United States by way of Brazil was simply ridiculous. Even then the Jews had a virtual deathgrip on the flow of information to the general public, and with that deathgrip they lied us into the bloodiest and cruelest war in history, in which we not only killed millions of the best people of our own

race but then turned half of Europe over to Communist slavery at the end of the war. But of course, it gained for the Jews what they wanted, which was the destruction of the one man in the whole world with both the will and the ability to free Europe from their grip. And if they got what they wanted, nothing else mattered.

Today the official media line is that Saddam Hussein is the new Hitler. He is a menace to the world, they say, because he has chemical and biological weapons and wants to produce nuclear weapons as well, and the United Nations hasn't given him permission to do so.

Actually, Saddam Hussein is no menace at all to the world, but he is a threat to Israel's ambitions in the Middle East, because a strong Iraq under a strong leader could make it too costly for Israel to continue bullying and robbing her Arab neighbors. So the Jews would like to have us get rid of Saddam Hussein and cripple Iraq for them. It's better for us to take the losses involved, they figure, than to risk Jewish casualties. So Saddam Hussein's refusal to take orders from the United Nations is portrayed by the media as an intolerable affront to us. I mean, who does he think he is, refusing to abide by United Nations resolutions and thumbing his nose at Mr. Clinton's all-Jewish defense and foreign policy team? Let's teach him a lesson! Let's punch him in the nose!

Of course, no one in the mass media portrays as intolerable Israel's flaunting of United Nations resolutions. No one in the media urges a military strike against Israel to take out that country's nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons facilities. The United Nations has never given Israel permission to develop any of those weapons, but it went ahead and developed them anyway. Should we condemn Iraq for wanting to develop equivalent weapons when it has a paranoid, megalomaniac neighbor like Israel? Clearly all of the media talk about the need to control weapons of mass destruction and to enforce the rule of law in international affairs is crooked. It is sham and pretense. It is aimed solely at deceiving the American people so that the Jews can get what they want, which is a war to destroy Iraq, with us taking the casualties instead of Israel. The Jewish mass media, with their treatment of the Middle East situation in general and the U.S. government's war plans against Iraq in particular, are doing for the rule of law in international affairs what Bill Clinton is doing for morality in government.

Let me emphasize my point about the utter crookedness and treason of the mass media in America by backing off from the Iraq situation for a minute and talking about a quite different media topic. I spoke in an earlier broadcast about Steven Spielberg's new Hollywood film, *Amistad*, but since then I've looked into the subject further and learned a few more interesting things about the way in which the American public is being deceived.

Steven Spielberg, everyone must admit, is certainly one of the most influential of the Jewish media bosses. He's not some eccentric taking a course separate from that of the other media bosses, but is a mainstream figure respected and praised by his fellow media tycoons -- and by the whole Jewish community, in fact. He's made two very important propaganda films which have had a large impact on the consciousness of the American public and have been heavily promoted and praised by the other media bosses. Those two films are *Schindler's List* and *Amistad*. The first is about how the Jews were mistreated by White people -- specifically by Germans -- and the second is about how Blacks were mistreated by White people -- specifically by 19th-century White Americans who were insufficiently sympathetic to the Abolitionist

position. And both films are filled with lies, distortions, and pure invention masquerading as historical truth. They are propaganda films, with no regard for the truth: films which were designed purely as psychological weapons for keeping White people off balance and feeling guilty, so that Jews can manipulate and exploit them more easily.

Schindler's List left the theaters long ago, but *Amistad* is still being shown and reviewed, and it is being treated by the controlled media as almost a historical documentary, just like *Schindler's List* was. The fact of the matter is that all of the dialogue in *Amistad*, several of the characters, and much of the plot were invented by Spielberg's scriptwriters and have no basis in fact. Yet Spielberg's Hollywood production company actually has had the brass to produce a so-called "film study guide and learning kit" which has been mailed out to thousands of high school teachers and principals with the suggestion that it be used to bring the so-called "lessons" of *Amistad* into their school curricula. Nowhere in Spielberg's material for high school students is there any hint that the film is not historically accurate.

What his "learning kit" for students does contain, however, is a statement by one of his associates in the production of the film, Debbie Allen. She condemns the history texts used in American schools as "racist," because they fail to give an account of the achievements of Blacks, and she blames this "racism" on Whites' refusing to acknowledge "the contributions of a culture that was far beyond and centuries ahead."

Spielberg's *Amistad* associate wants White high school students to be taught that Black African culture is "far beyond and centuries ahead" of European culture, of White culture. Now that is brassy, even for a Jewess. But how many White teachers and principals who receive Spielberg's "learning kit" do you believe will have the courage to point out to students that her statement is sheer nonsense -- and risk being called "racists" for their honesty? How many, in this age of cowardice, official lies, and Political Correctness?

Let me tell you something about the hero of Spielberg's film, the Black leader named Cinqué. He is portrayed as a person of noble character who has been terribly wronged by being enslaved, as a person who is morally offended by the notion of slavery and therefore is morally superior to the Whites who are not offended.

Well, in the 19th century there actually was a mutinous Black slave named Cinqué who instigated a mutiny and the murder of the White captain and crew of a Spanish ship, was captured by the U.S. Navy, was tried and acquitted -- for political rather than legal reasons -- by a U.S. court, and then was sent back to Africa. This all really happened. And here's something else that really happened: when Cinqué got back to Africa, back to Sierra Leone where his home was, he went into business -- as a slave dealer, buying and selling his fellow Blacks.

Oh, did Mr. Spielberg forget to tell you that? Did his colleague Debbie fail to mention that? Did all of those film reviewers writing so learnedly about Cinqué and his adventures in the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post,* and other Jewish mass media not have enough room for that little detail?

Well you can read about it in some of those "racist" history books Debbie was complaining about. For example, there is *The Oxford History of the American People* by the late Samuel Eliot Morison, a very distinguished author and historian -- probably the most distinguished American historian -- who taught American history for many years at Harvard. The information about Cinqué's slave-dealing will be found on page 520 of the 1965 edition of Morison's book. You'll find it in many college libraries or larger public libraries.

So what does Steven Spielberg's crookedness have to do with Mr. Clinton's campaign to drag America into another war in the Middle East? I'll tell you. The connection is the media. The same Jewish media bosses who gave us *Amistad* and who reviewed it without telling us about its deceptions and lies and misrepresentations and who now are trying to convince White high school students that African culture was and is centuries ahead of European culture, and we should feel guilty for not having acknowledged that -- these same Jewish media bosses who warned us that Germany was planning to invade the United States by way of Brazil -- more recently have been explaining to us why we must go to war to destroy Saddam Hussein. Should we trust them? Should we believe them when they tell us that Iraq is our enemy and Saddam Hussein is a threat to the United States? Well, about as much as we should believe them when they tell us what a high-minded fellow Cinqué was and how much further advanced Black culture is than ours.

What can we believe from the bunch of liars who control our news and entertainment media? I'll tell you what news from them we cannot believe, what news we dare not take at face value, and that is any news that has a bearing on Jewish interests or concerns -- which means that reading a newspaper or listening to a newscast has become a very tricky business these days. You really have to be able to read between the lines, you have to know about hidden motives, you have to understand a lot of things they don't tell you in order to interpret what they do tell you.

Take as an example the Bill and Monica story we've been getting so much of recently. They're really doing a good job of tearing up their former best pal Bill Clinton, of exposing every sordid bit of his thoroughly rotten private life to public scrutiny. The *New York Times* and other big Jewish newspapers even reported the comments of Clinton's Jewish buddy and former White House adviser Dick Morris, when he suggested during a radio interview a few days ago that the reason Clinton drops his trousers for various female government employees so often is that Hillary "isn't into regular sex with men." Wow! That must have really hurt.

Now, Dick Morris, as a former Clinton intimate and confidant, was in a position to know things like that, but the interesting aspect of this is that the Jewish media are now reporting such details. Why? After all, they've spent years covering for Clinton, protecting him, and suppressing unfavorable news about him. Have they suddenly decided to go straight, to become honest and tell us the truth about Clinton?

No. In fact, they tried at the beginning of the current scandal to cover it up. *Newsweek* magazine, which is owned by the Jewish Washington Post Company, was sitting on the story and hoping it would go away, but an independent reporter put the story on the Internet, and eventually *Newsweek* realized that the news about Bill and Monica was just too hot to be suppressed. And then at some point early in this affair the collective decision was made by the Jewish media

bosses to stop protecting Clinton, to abandon him to the fate he so richly deserves. He had screwed up so many times that he had become a liability for them. They had enjoyed the luxury of having a totally subservient, totally corrupt President who would do whatever they told him to do -- but the jerk just couldn't keep his zipper up. Why keep embarrassing themselves with Clinton when Al Gore would do what he was told just as eagerly as Clinton would?

Now as one reads the *Newsweek* stories about Bill and Monica, one can sense the underlying sarcasm and the exasperation of the reporters and editors. The February 16, 1998, issue of *Newsweek* reported: ". . . there is an unmistakable sense in Washington that the protective wall around Clinton is beginning to crack." Indeed it is. That sentence from the February 16 *Newsweek* is just an understated way of saying, the insiders have decided that the bum is finished, despite his approval by the rabble.

So, yes, if one is able to distinguish truth from falsehood, one can sometimes find truth in the controlled media -- but not because the media bosses have any honesty in them; it's just because they sometimes change their minds about what suits their interests; they sometimes change their strategy. Sometimes they decide to stop protecting people that they had been protecting earlier, and then you may be able to learn something about a person that you couldn't learn the truth about earlier. And that's where we are with Bill Clinton now.

In this regard, I was in Germany a few days ago, and the Germans were really curious about the Clinton situation. It didn't seem real to them. They thought there must be some trick to it. They just couldn't believe that the most powerful and dangerous country on earth is being led by an irresponsible clown like Clinton. I assured them that it isn't: that the United States is a democracy, and therefore it is led by the people who control the mass media.

Now, this is the sort of thing that's embarrassing to the media bosses. They like to maintain the illusion that the puppets they put up for public office in the United States are the ones who are really in control. Clinton has completely blown their cover -- at least in places like Germany, where the average citizen is a bit more alert than over here. So that's why they've decided to abandon Clinton and let him stew in his own juice.

But the Jewish media bosses still believe that destroying Iraq's ability to wage war against their kinsmen in Israel suits their interests. Forcing America to go to war against Iraq on their behalf is still very much a part of their strategy. Remember that when our military people start killing Iraqi women and children with their "smart" bombs and missiles, and the media bosses try to make you feel heroic about it and tell you that we had to do it, because Saddam was a threat to the American way of life.

Jewish Policy Against Iraq

It used to be that before we would wage war against another country, we had to believe that we had some moral justification for doing so. And it used to be that the only moral justification which we considered sufficient was self-defense.

No matter how much we disliked another country or its policies, we would not attack them with our armed forces -- we would not wage war against them -- unless they attacked us or one of our allies first. We used to put a lot of stock in never being an aggressor, but acting only in self-defense. We had to wait until we were hit before we would hit back.

Even the Second World War, in which all of the media Jews -- and therefore their boy Franklin Roosevelt -- wanted the participation of the United States in the worst way, had to wait until our government could maneuver Japan into attacking us at Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt and his Jews had been trying for more than a year before Pearl Harbor to provoke Germany into doing something which we could use as a pretext for declaring war. Our Navy had been firing on German ships at sea and doing everything else it could to provoke a military response from the Germans, but the last thing Hitler wanted was a war with America, and so the German Navy was under orders not to shoot back. Roosevelt secretly had told Churchill and others that he would bring the United States into the war as soon as he could, but first he needed something which he could hold up to the American public as moral justification for a declaration of war against Germany.

Well, Mr. Clinton went on television about 10 days ago to present to Americans his moral justification for waging war against Iraq. I figured beforehand that he and Mr. Cohen would have cooked up some phony "incident," some Tonkin Gulf affair, they could use to claim that the United States was acting in self-defense. But Mr. Clinton didn't even have such a pretext! His sole excuse for an attack on Iraq was that Iraq wouldn't follow orders. Saddam Hussein wouldn't permit the UN inspection teams to poke around in his palace bedroom and in other places Mr. Clinton said they must be permitted to inspect. For that Mr. Clinton proposed to launch a massive military assault on Iraq, which certainly would kill many Iraqis and would put us into a state of war with a country which has done nothing against us. He proposed to kill Iraqis on a large scale in order to enforce a policy. That's moving warfare onto quite new moral grounds for America, and it's something about which we ought to be quite concerned.

Do you remember when Mr. Clinton was explaining to the American people why we had to wage war against Iraq? He said that if we don't attack Iraq now and bomb the hell out of the Iraqis they'll develop weapons of mass destruction. And then, with that boyish little grin he puts on whenever he wants one of his lies to be especially convincing, he said that if we permit the Iraqis to develop weapons of mass destruction, then someday they'll use them. "You can be sure of that," he said.

That's a justification for a massive military attack on another country? An unsubstantiated assurance by a habitual liar that if we don't attack another country now, then they'll develop weapons we don't want them to have, and then, someday, they'll use them.

For something. Maybe for defending themselves from Israel? That, of course, is the key to this whole, sordid business -- Iraq may defend itself from Israel -- but it's something that's never admitted in public by the politicians or the media. Instead Iraq always is held up as a threat to us, to America, to the world: we must get the Iraqis before they get us. And that, of course, is nonsense: **total** nonsense. But Mr. Clinton is surrounded by people who parrot the same nonsense. The only people he talks with are his Jewish advisers and officials, the media, and other politicians. They all agree with him. Until Saddam Hussein's agreement just a few days ago to let the UN inspection teams into his bedroom whenever they want to come in, all of the people around Clinton agreed we should attack Iraq, and the sooner the better. Now most of them have backed off a bit until they can figure out a new reason for attacking, on which they're working.

Some Republicans are saying that we should ignore the UN agreement and attack anyway. Mr. Clinton thinks that because the Republican politicians as well as the Democrat politicians support his warmongering, he's got a lot of support. Of course, these Republican and Democrat politicians are as corrupt and as totally lacking in genuine patriotism as he is. They are men who fall to the ground and begin groveling whenever they see a Jew. And they know that the Jews are virtually 100 per cent in favor of a war against Iraq -- although they never say this in public.

It was this "bipartisan support" from the corrupt crowd in Washington which led Clinton to make the disastrous mistake of sending his all-Jewish defense and foreign-policy team to Ohio State University last week to stage one of his "town meeting" propaganda stunts that he thought would help persuade ordinary Americans to support his war against Iraq. The Clintonistas were **surprised** when a substantial portion of the audience rejected Clinton's war. Albright, Cohen, and Berger were expecting the same sort of groveling acquiescence to their policies that they are accustomed to from the Washington crowd, and they really didn't like it when people in Ohio asked them why America supported Israel and proposed to bomb Iraq, when Israel is by far the more flagrant flouter of UN resolutions.

I hate to keep reminding everybody of this, but what the Clinton government was trying to do -- and what some of their people are still trying to figure out an excuse for doing -- is exactly what I predicted more than a year ago. In my broadcast of December 21, 1996, right after Mr. Clinton had appointed his new, all-Jewish foreign policy, national security, and defense team. I said:

"I am convinced that there will be a strong effort to involve America in another major war during the next four years. This effort will be disguised, of course. It will be cloaked in deceit, as such efforts always are. While the warmongers are scheming for war, they will tell us how much they want peace."

I explained my reasons for believing that the Clinton team would try to start a war. I explained in detail why the Jews need a war and why they need it before the end of Clinton's second term. Those reasons still hold. And that's why the Jews around Clinton will push ahead with their war plans despite the obvious reluctance of most non-Jewish Americans to go to war for them and despite the new agreement between Iraq and the UN.

The situation in Washington today is really bizarre. We've never before had anything quite like it. Clinton has a few of his old cronies from Arkansas with him in the White House, people like

lawyer Bruce Lindsay, who used to get him out of problems with drugs back in Arkansas and who now helps him with problems like Paula Jones and Monica Lewinsky, but nearly everyone else is a Jew -- especially everyone who has anything to do with foreign policy or national defense.

One of Clinton's top advisers in the White House is the Jew Rahm Emanuel. During the 1991 war against Iraq Emanuel joined the army: the **Israeli** army, that is.

He's a dual citizen and one of the key advisers who sets policies for Clinton. Madeleine Albright, the Jewess Clinton chose to handle America's foreign affairs, has had very little foreign policy experience, but she has surrounded herself in the State Department with experienced people, and they're all Jews too. The Jew she chose to head the State Department's Middle Eastern section, Martin Indyk, wasn't even a U.S. citizen when Clinton was first elected President. His **whole life** has been spent working for Israel in one capacity or another, and now he's the man in charge of "our" policy in the Middle East.

These people aren't concerned about what's good for the United States. They're concerned about what's good for Israel, what's good for the Jews. We might as well have the Israeli Knesset conducting our affairs of state for us. They're all hot to blast Iraq back into the Stone Age, and they want us to do it for them. I don't think it even occurred to them before they staged that town meeting in Ohio that not all Americans are eager to do that for them.

Unfortunately, however, some Americans are -- and not just the Washington politicians, who are always eager to do whatever the Jews want. I saw a television interview with one of our military pilots in the Persian Gulf, and he was obviously eager to begin the war. We have all of these hot, new weapons, he said, and he wants to see what they'll really do. He's been trained to use these weapons, he said, and he's eager to try out the things he's learned. He's eager to try out his new bombs and missiles on live targets. The TV interviewer seemed to think that this was a normal, healthy sentiment: the sentiment of a real patriot.

I remember a time when I was a kid and I had just bought a new rifle, and I was hot to go out in the woods and try it out on live targets. I wanted to see what my bullets would do to live animals. I'm really ashamed now that I ever thought like that: that I was so indifferent to the destruction of wildlife and the suffering of animals. But apparently the Jewish media bosses aren't ashamed to broadcast interviews with our military people who are eager to start blowing Iraqis to bits with their new weapons so they can see how well these weapons work, people who are hot for some live targets.

During the past seven years we've killed five per cent of the population of Iraq with the embargo that Jews like Madeleine Albright are so determined to maintain. Five per cent of the population. What do you call that? Genocide?

I am not a pacifist. I am not against war, when war serves **our** purposes, rather than someone else's purposes. I'm not even against genocide, if we're killing people who need to be killed, people who are our natural enemies. But I don't like being tricked into going to war or waging genocide against someone **else's** enemies.

We were told -- and I'm convinced that we will be told again -- that we must go to war against Iraq because it's bad for Iraq to have weapons of mass destruction. And what about Israel's weapons of mass destruction? You ask that question of one of Mr. Clinton's Jews and you'll be told that we're more concerned about Iraq than about Israel because Iraq has a record of aggression, a record of attacking her neighbors. As if Israel doesn't attack her neighbors!

Over the past 50 years Israel has attacked her neighbors more often than any other country in the Middle East. Israel has grabbed the territory of her neighbors in one war after another, and every time has been armed and supported by the United States government in this aggression. The United Nations has condemned Israel's aggression and has passed a number of resolutions demanding that Israel give back the land stolen from her neighbors, but **those resolutions** are ignored with impunity.

If we want to compare the relative aggressiveness of Israel and Iraq, let us not forget that it was Israel who first attacked Iraq. All we hear from the controlled media is that Iraq fired some SCUD missiles at Israel during the Gulf War. What we are never reminded of is Israel's military strike against Iraq in 1981. That Israeli strike, by the way, was a sneak attack. Iraq had done nothing to Israel to provoke it. When Iraq fired its SCUD missiles at Israel in 1991, Iraq was under massive military attack by the United States and its allies, and I think that we cannot blame Saddam Hussein for regarding that as an attack on his country by Israel. Then as now we were being used as an instrument of Jewish policy, and the world understood that, even if few world leaders had the honesty to say so.

I predicted this war effort against Iraq because I understood the underlying forces at work. I cannot predict what the eventual outcome of the war will be after it begins. There are too many variables. But one outcome I think we should be prepared for is the commencement of terrorism on a significant scale in the United States. I know that if I were Saddam Hussein I would have spent the last seven years quietly putting agents into place in the United States: agents equipped with biological and chemical weapons. The U.S. military machine is capable of completely destroying Iraq. There's no way that Iraq can oppose the United States by conventional means. We can, of course, threaten horrible retaliation against Iraq if biological or chemical terrorists strike in the United States. Still, if I were Saddam Hussein, as a last resort I would use my terrorists. I would turn them loose against the Great Satan to do as much damage as possible. I wouldn't go down without a fight. I would teach the world a lesson about the limits of the Great Satan's power.

The Jews, of course, are willing to take that chance with the lives of **our** people. They've got **their** borders under a lot tighter control than we have. It may be difficult for Arab terrorists to smuggle biological weapons into Israel, but it's not difficult at all to smuggle them into the United States. Illegal aliens enter the United States by the hundreds every day. And a few may have really potent terrorist weapons. Perhaps we'll find out what some of those weapons are capable of doing to our civilian population.

In fact, I'd not be surprised if **Israel** is thinking right now about popping an anthrax bomb in some place without many Jews -- some place like Des Moines, say, or Sioux Falls -- if the Israelis think that's the only way they can get their war against Iraq started. Israel can do this

knowing that Iraq will be the one blamed by the media and the government and the one that our military will flatten in retaliation. That is the sort of thing Israel has done before. That is what Israel had in mind back during its 1967 war against its neighbors when it tried to sink our electronic intelligence ship the USS *Liberty*. If the Israeli attack on the *Liberty* had been successful, the sinking would have been blamed on Egypt.

In any case, if Mr. Clinton's advisers figure out a way to get around the UN agreement with Iraq and proceed with their planned war it will be perceived by the world -- and most especially by the Islamic world -- as an attack carried out for the benefit of, and at the behest of, the Jews. And an attack against Iraq will greatly increase the likelihood of terrorist activity in the United States, whether that activity begins immediately or later. There's one interesting thing about biological and chemical terrorism: they don't require much in the way of resources. Anyone with a little graduate training in microbiology or chemistry can figure out how to produce extremely lethal substances. The equipment required is minimal. One country wanting to wipe out another country with chemical or biological weapons delivered in a military way might need big factories and warehouses for the equipment and materials, but an educated terrorist aiming to build a biological or chemical bomb to kill 100,000 people can do it in his basement. All that's required is the will. Mr. Clinton and the gang of Jews around him are providing that will to a lot of people around the world.

When the first such terrorist attack hits the United States -- not if, but when -- the media and the government will be yapping about "extremism" and "hate" and "anti-Semitism" and all of their familiar devils. But you and I will know whom to blame. We will understand who brought it on.

You know, there are many people, in Washington and out of Washington, who already know everything I've told you today. The Jewishness of the Clinton gang and the Clinton government's policies is just too obvious to miss. Unfortunately, most of these people are too polite, too cautious, or just too timid to talk about the Jewishness of America's affliction. They are afraid that they will be condemned as "racists" or "anti-Semites" if they attribute the Clinton government's policy against Iraq specifically to the Jews. And so they talk all around the problem. They talk about the government's policy being a bad policy, an unwise policy, a policy which is harmful to America, but they refuse to tie that policy to Madeleine Albright's Jewishness, Samuel Berger's Jewishness, William Cohen's Jewishness, Rahm Emanuel's Jewishness, Martin Indyk's Jewishness, or the Jewishness of the whole Clinton gang. They will try to find other explanations for the policy: any explanation except the explanation that those behind the policy are Jews, and the policy was formulated to benefit Jews at the expense of the rest of us.

The Wrecking of Our Schools

In October 1997 the Clintonistas celebrated the 40th anniversary of one of the proudest moments in the history of America's march toward the New World Order, a moment whose memory makes every Clintonista misty-eyed and brings a lump to his throat. That was the moment in 1957 when the Federal government sent troops into Little Rock, Arkansas, to force, at bayonet point, the racial integration of Little Rock's all-White Central High School, and the White citizens of Little Rock did not revolt. The Clintonistas still like to give their clenched-fist salute when they gloat with each other about this easy victory over the hated White racists who wanted to keep Blacks out of Central High School. Bill Clinton made a special trip back to Little Rock a few weeks ago to lead the gloating.

Today the enrollment at Central High School is 60 per cent Black, and conditions there have changed accordingly. Two of the members of my organization, the National Alliance, are high school teachers in Arkansas, and they wrote to me with comments about their own experiences in Arkansas schools today, along with comments by some of their colleagues which had been published in local newspapers. You won't find any of this in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*, of course, because it's news which doesn't fit. One teacher wrote to me that while the 40th-anniversary hoopla was still going on in Central High there was a gang fight in the school involving approximately 40 Black students. It took six policemen using pepper spray to break it up. That's pretty routine stuff at Central High these days. Other teachers report about school plays being broken up by rowdy Blacks in the audience and about the teachers' frustration over the fact that they're not permitted to do anything to control the Black students. The school administrators are afraid to have records of suspensions and expulsions which show a disproportionately large number of Black troublemakers.

Little Rock schools are still operating under various court orders, and court-appointed Clintonistas monitor very closely everything in the schools regarding race. One teacher writes: "When the deseg monitors come to my classroom, they don't ask me anything about the curriculum or the success of the students. They count the Black and White faces and check to be sure that I have posters of African-Americans on the walls. Never mind that I teach British literature." "Deseg monitors" in the classrooms: doesn't that sound Orwellian, like something right out of George Orwell's novel *1984?* Actually, it's Clintonian. It is a real shame that we are permitting it to happen in America.

The real shame for us is not that Black students are having gang fights and otherwise behaving the way they always do; it is that nearly 40 per cent of the students at Central High are still White and are subjected to this environment. The Little Rock school board is able to keep a minority of White students in the formerly all-White Central High by making it a so-called "magnet" school, with many advanced courses that are not available at other high schools. The Clintonistas want to keep the schools racially integrated, and so they are forced to employ such stratagems as magnet schools, but they really don't like the way these things work out in detail. What has happened at Central High is that the students have resegregated themselves: the Whites are 39 per cent of the general enrollment, but make up nearly 90 per cent of the enrollment in the courses for gifted students and 87 per cent of the advanced classes. There was a major article in *U.S. News &*

World Report a few weeks ago lamenting this fact and asking what can be done to achieve complete racial mixing at Central High and other public schools across the country. The Clintonistas always have looked on schools which separate students into different classes on the basis of ability as "undemocratic." In the case of racially mixed schools, ability tracking also has the embarrassing result of exposing the differences in ability between Blacks and Whites.

Now, race, unfortunately, isn't the only problem in America's schools -- although it's a big problem, especially in the cities. It's the racial integration of our schools which has brought drugs, gang fights, schoolroom rapes, assaults on teachers, and a general atmosphere of indiscipline to the education of our children. But the same people who pushed so hard for the racial integration of the schools 40 years ago have been pushing for other changes too, and in the long run these other changes may prove to be at least as destructive.

I'll give you an example based on my own experience. I receive a great deal of correspondence from people all over the United States, and one of the things which impresses me is the inability of a relatively large percentage of our adult population to use the English language effectively or correctly. Spelling, punctuation, and grammar are very often abysmal. These people who write to me are virtually all high school graduates, and many of them also are university graduates, some with advanced degrees, but they have failed to learn how to use the English language at what used to be a grammar school level.

As a child I attended schools in five different districts from Virginia to Texas, and I believe that the standards in these schools were only average. But the standards were such that a substantial portion of the people from whom I receive letters today would not have been permitted to graduate with the low level of proficiency in English manifested by their letters. And it's not that these people are unintelligent; I've spoken personally with many of them who are quite intelligent. They just didn't learn English, and I've worried for a long time about why this is so.

We all understand, of course, that the schools have been dumbed down in order to make it possible for Blacks to cope with them. But this shouldn't have made it impossible for Whites to learn who really wanted to learn. I was discussing this problem with a professor of education at a major American university just last week, and he explained to me that it's not just the racial integrationists and egalitarians who have been changing the nature of our schools in recent decades. The feminists also have had a major role in the wrecking of our educational system. Feminists are solidly entrenched in the education departments which train our teachers and design our school curricula. They have gained a virtual stranglehold on many facets of our educational system. And let me tell you, if there is any bunch of people in this country with wackier and more destructive ideas than the racial egalitarians, it is the feminists. They have been busy feminizing the education of our children, and it shows up in the inability of an increasing number of Americans to use English effectively. The key to understanding why this is so is the fact that the feminists not only promote the teaching of feminist propaganda in the schools -- denying any essential differences between men and women, among other things -- but they also are changing the way in which children are taught, in order to bring it into conformity with their own ideas.

Feminists, for example, always have been against competition. They regard competitiveness as a masculine trait, and they try to discourage it in every way they can. They are in league with the racial egalitarians in pushing for an end to the grading of students. Setting precise standards and then grading students numerically according to their performance relative to those standards is anathema to them. They see it as psychologically damaging to the students -- especially to those who make low scores. They much prefer a warm and fuzzy approach to evaluating students. Their goal for the classroom is cooperation, as opposed to what they like to refer to as "cutthroat" competition. They love committees and work groups and consensus. They want to see the students deal with learning as a group, with the brighter students helping the duller students. They like to see problems talked to death in a group. It's really not stretching their ideas very far to say that whenever the members of a student group disagree about the answer to a question or a problem, the feminists would like to see the students vote on the correct answer. They really do have a different view of the nature of reality.

The feminists also don't like to see a strong emphasis on rules. It destroys creativity, they believe. Rules and details should be relegated to a secondary position, and students should be given the "big picture" instead. They should be able to talk about a subject in broad terms without worrying too much about the details. And the feminists don't much care for an analytical approach to any subject. Analysis is too masculine.

What all of this means when it comes to the teaching of English to students is that the rules of grammar, punctuation, and style are de-emphasized, and the students instead are given a "feeling" for what constitutes standard English.

Here's a specific example of the way in which the feminist influence in education has affected Americans' mastery of their language. When I was a student back in the fifth or sixth grade, one of the most important tools I learned for understanding grammar was the diagramming of sentences. This involved breaking down a sentence into its constituent structural components and analyzing their relationships to each other: subjects, predicates, conjunctions, direct objects, objects of prepositions, modifying phrases and clauses, and so on. I had to fit every word in the sentence into a structural diagram which emphasized the role of the word in relation to the other words. It seems as if every night for a couple of years I was diagramming sentences. And I was called to the blackboard hundreds of times to diagram sentences. I didn't enjoy it, but it taught me to look at language analytically. It gave me the habit of building sentences the way an architect designs buildings: a very useful habit, I believe.

But most high school graduates today -- not all, but most -- have never diagrammed a sentence. The concept is completely unfamiliar to them. Instead, they have been taught to see the "big picture" in English, to get a "feeling" for it. The feminists regard diagramming with distaste: too analytical, too masculine. They have succeeded in having it phased out of most curricula. The consequence is that most high school graduates are not able to use English with a reasonable degree of precision. They have not really mastered the language. Of course, they usually can say approximately what they mean when they write a letter, and that's good enough to get by for most purposes. The decline in the degree of precision with which the average American uses English more or less matches the general decline in the level of civilization in our society.

This decline is sufficient that most Americans are no longer bothered by the dropping of the old, sexist rule that a pronoun must agree in number with its antecedent, and so the language can be made more nearly Politically Correct without alarming too many people. For example, in the bad, old days of grammatical rules a teacher might have announced to a class: "Any student who wishes to graduate with his classmates must do all of his homework." Today the Politically Correct teacher would announce instead: "Any student who wishes to graduate with **their** classmates must do all of **their** homework." A bit less precise, a bit more open to misunderstanding, you must admit -- although a reasonable person could guess what the teacher probably meant. The important thing, though, is that it keeps the feminists happy.

Perhaps it seems foolish to worry about such matters as the gradual loss of facility with English by the average American at a time when our entire society is under attack by those who are determined to destroy us. Why should we even think about the diagramming of sentences or the agreement of pronouns with their antecedents when we have a growing flood of non-White immigrants pouring into our country, when we have a rising tide of racial intermarriage, and when Bill Clinton is in the White House? Why should we even concern ourselves with the gradual dumbing down of our schools when we have a government of traitors and criminals who are hell-bent on suppressing our freedom as individuals and our sovereignty as a nation and dragging us into the New World Order?

Certainly, if we could in any quick, direct, and simple way halt non-White immigration, halt racial intermarriage, get Bill Clinton out of the White House, get rid of the other traitors and criminals in Washington, and restore our government to health and honesty, that's what we should be doing, instead of worrying about the details of what's been done to our schools. The fact is, however, that it all hangs together. In order to solve the big problems, we must first understand them, and to understand them we must look at the details, at all of the little specifics.

What's been done to our schools is one of those details. Understanding this detail, understanding who did it, what their motivations are, and how they did it is important to us -- really, essential to us -- if we are to understand how to deal with the big problems. It's important to understand that the damage done by feminism in our schools is more than teaching some Politically Correct nonsense about there being no difference between the sexes, because this helps us to understand that the damage done by feminism in our armed forces is more than merely putting women into formerly all-male combat units. We need to understand that wherever feminism gains a dominant influence, it brings with it a different way of looking at the world and of dealing with reality. And this different view of reality has profound consequences -- ultimately lethal consequences -- for our whole society.

Everything hangs together: our schools, our armed forces, our government. Understanding the problems in one area helps us understand the problems everywhere else. For example, thinking about the way in which feminists have de-emphasized competition in our schools and discouraged the competitive spirit of American children gives us insight into the growing softness, the growing wimpishness, that we see in so many young men these days.

And learning about the role of the feminists in the destruction of our society leads us to a better understanding of other destructive influences. We can understand better, for example, why the

Jews, whose own traditions are anything but feminist, have so enthusiastically promoted feminism in our society. We can understand better why the media of news and entertainment, which are so largely under Jewish control, have worked so hard and for so long to ram feminist propaganda down our throats.

Understanding is essential. It doesn't do us much good to become angry and wave our arms and shout about the evils of the New World Order in general terms. If we want other people to agree with us and join forces with us, then we must be credible and we must help them understand what's going on and why. We must be specific. We must explain the details as well as the big picture. And we need a lot more people to join forces with us if we are to be able to compete effectively with the Jews and their many allies.

More than that, we need understanding -- a thorough, detailed understanding -- of what has happened to our society if we are to have any reasonable chance of building a sane and healthy society in its place someday, a society in which our children and grandchildren can live and learn and grow strong again, free of the destructive influences which have afflicted this society so grievously. And a sound educational system will be a very important part of that new society. We must know in detail what is wrong with the present educational system if we are to be able to build a better one someday.

And listen: if you'd like to participate with me in learning what we must do to build a better society and in helping other people understand these things too, I'd like to hear from you.

Judicial Insanity and Schoolyard Massacres

Clinton's sexual escapades, his lying about them, and his attempts to get witnesses to lie, show us what sort of person he is. These things help us to understand what a degenerate piece of White trash we have in the White House. But they are not the really important things about the Clinton administration. They are more like a sideshow, more like comic relief from the real damage Clinton and his controllers are doing to us and to our country.

Consider, for example, Mr. Clinton's appointments to the Federal courts. He has done more than any other President in history to increase the number of Jews in the Federal judiciary. His most notable moves in that direction have been his appointments of two Jews to the nine-justice Supreme Court, but nearly all of his judicial appointments have been aimed at increasing so-called "diversity" in the courts. In most cases when his appointees haven't been Jews they've been Blacks or other non-Whites. The rule seems to be, anybody but a heterosexual White male.

One Clinton judicial appointment was in the news in the Philadelphia area in late March when the appointee, Frederica Massiah-Jackson, withdrew her nomination after it became clear during Senate Judiciary Committee hearings that she would not be approved. Now, that's really something, for the Politically Correct U.S. Senate to balk at approving a judge who is not only female but also Black.

Actually, the Senate already had approved her appointment last fall, shortly after Clinton nominated her. In the recent Senate hearings her appointment was being reconsidered. How did that come about? Let me tell you.

For the past 15 years Massiah-Jackson has been a judge on Philadelphia's Court of Common Pleas, and she's made quite a reputation for herself as a Black racist who always sides with Black defendants -- and in Philadelphia that means most criminal defendants. She curses and swears at White prosecutors and lawyers in the courtroom, but that's not the reason they persuaded the Senate to reconsider its approval of her nomination and then showed up at the Senate hearings to testify against her; what motivated them is her habit of refusing to convict or to punish Black career criminals. Philadelphia prosecutors cited case after case in which her behavior in the courtroom was so outrageous as to be almost beyond belief.

For example, there was the 1990 case of the Black homosexual rapist who grabbed a 13-year-old boy walking on the grounds of the Albert Einstein Medical Center in North Philadelphia, dragged him into some bushes, and sodomized him. When the child cried during the ordeal, the rapist slashed his face and head with a razor-knife, the kind with a retractable blade used to open boxes. When the Black rapist had finished with him, the boy crawled out of the bushes and was seen by two hospital employees, who came to his aid. The naked, bleeding child told them that the rapist was still in the bushes. Then they saw a Black man come out of the bushes and rearrange his clothes. They summoned police, who seized the man and found the razor knife and a bloody rag in his belt pouch.

When the case came before Judge Massiah-Jackson, she would not admit into evidence the testimony of the two eyewitnesses who saw the rapist coming from the bushes, saying that they had seen him under what she called "unduly suggestive" circumstances. She also threw out the evidence of the razor-knife and the bloody rag, saying that the police hadn't had probable cause to seize the items.

In two other cases where Blacks were charged with assault involving serious injury to the victims, Judge Massiah-Jackson ruled that the two victims, who had been shot in the abdomen, suffered severe internal damage, and subsequently underwent colostomies, had not had "serious injury" inflicted on them. By so ruling she was able to downgrade the seriousness of the charges against the Black assailants.

Now, this doesn't mean that Judge Massiah-Jackson is without feelings, however. When, despite her efforts, a jury returned a guilty verdict against a Black who had raped a 10-year-old child and she was obliged to impose a mandatory minimum five-year sentence on the rapist, she wept in the courtroom. She cried. She told reporters and spectators, "it's not that I think the rape didn't occur, but five years is a lot of time." After serving his sentence, the rapist was freed and promptly raped a nine-year-old child.

Judge Massiah-Jackson **is** capable of being tough on crime. When a **White** criminal was unfortunate enough to come before her she imposed an especially harsh sentence on him, explaining that one of the aggravating circumstances in his crime was that he was a "Caucasian." That's what the woman said in her written opinion: the aggravating circumstance which justified a maximum sentence was that the defendant was a "Caucasian."

When the details of her courtroom behavior were presented to the Senate, even that thoroughly corrupt body began backing away from confirming her. Massiah-Jackson wailed that her record was being "distorted." She was being subjected "to an unrelenting campaign of vilification and distortion."

One of the witnesses against her, Pennsylvania's Northampton County District Attorney John Morganelli, replied to this charge of distortion: "We don't make up the words that appear in court documents. Those are taken down by stenographers."

Judge Massiah-Jackson has her supporters as well as her critics, of course. President Clinton, who had recommended her to the Senate as a "highly qualified" judge and urged her confirmation, was angry when Morganelli and others opposed her. He sent her a letter, in which he wrote: "Sadly, in recent weeks your nomination became a target for baseless attacks that mischaracterized your record without affording you a reasonable opportunity to respond." Baseless attacks!

And Massiah-Jackson also has other supporters. The Jewish mayor of Philadelphia, Edward Rendell, responded to her withdrawal of her nomination by saying: "I view this result with a great amount of sadness. . . . I'm disappointed because a basically decent individual has been subjected to a level of intensity that I've never seen any other judge subjected to."

The Jewish chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, Mark Aronchik, was bitter when many of his fellow lawyers opposed Massiah-Jackson. He said: "Only weeks before her nomination was to go to the Senate for confirmation . . . we see this tactic of selective distortion of a record . . . ."

The Jewish editorial page editor of the *Philadelphia Inquirer,* Jane Eisner, wrote on March 17, the day after Massiah-Jackson's withdrawal:

"Judge Frederica Massiah-Jackson's lamentable withdrawal yesterday from her quest for a Federal judgeship leaves the nation's judiciary a poorer place. The Federal bench desperately needs qualified candidates from all America's communities, and as the first African-American woman nominated from this district, she would have brought a welcome and necessary diversity to the court."

Massiah-Jackson also had enthusiastic supporters in the Senate. The leader of her Senate support was Pennsylvania's Republican Senator Arlen Specter. Specter, of course, is not only a Republican; he also is a Jew.

Jane Eisner spoke for all of Massiah-Jackson's Jewish supporters when she accused those who testified against her of "McCarthyite tactics." Wrote Eisner with obvious bitterness in her *Philadelphia Inquirer* editorial: "Once the charge was 'soft on communism.' Now it's 'soft on crime.'"

Well, the diversity-mongers lost this round of the fight. Massiah-Jackson went down in flames. But that was only one round. Make no mistake about it: the bad guys are winning most of the other rounds, and they're winning the war. Most of Clinton's appointees **have** been approved, and although they're not as **obvious** in their anti-White malice as Massiah-Jackson is, they're all the more dangerous because of that. The Jews and their collaborators are winning the war against White America on all fronts, and they'll continue to win as long as they retain their control of the mass media and are able to keep the White public hypnotized.

The Massiah-Jackson spectacle only received substantial media coverage in the Philadelphia area, so perhaps the rest of the country should not be blamed for sleeping through it. But there are other signs of what Jewish media control has done to America which are seen by everyone, and I hope that at least a few White Americans are being awakened by these signs.

An especially tragic sign was the killing of four White schoolchildren and a White teacher in Jonesboro, Arkansas, a few days ago. This is the third mass killing of schoolchildren by other children in the past five months. The media bosses put on a pretense of being mystified. "How could this happen?" they ask. And then they supply the answer to their question. The reason for all of the killings is the easy availability of guns, they tell us.

But that explanation is nonsense, and they know it. Fifty years ago, when I was in school, kids had even more access to guns than they do now, but they didn't massacre their classmates. When I was in school there were virtually no gun-control laws or other restrictions, and more of the population was rural than now -- which meant that using guns regularly was a part of the lives of

more schoolchildren. So it's certainly not easier access to guns which has made the climate in America's schools murderous. Guns haven't caused the change which has taken place in America.

You know what has caused the change, but let me tell you anyway. Actually, there have been two changes. One is the consequence of the loss of racial and cultural homogeneity in our schools. It used to be that a school was like a big extended family. The teachers were all White, and so were the kids. There was a sense of community. But that sense of community is long gone. Even in areas which are still mostly White, such as Jonesboro, the alienation caused by the diversity-mongers has become a major factor in the antisocial actions of many children. One of the young killers, Mitchell Johnson, idolized Black culture and often pretended to be a member of the Bloods gang.

The other factor is the influence of television on children's lives, on their behavior, on their attitudes. And I'm not talking simply about television violence. I'm talking about the pervasive influence, the pervasive effect of television altogether. It distorts a child's grip on reality. The child exposed to five or six hours of television every day, all of his life -- and that's most American children today -- loses his ability to distinguish between the real world and the imaginary world he sees on the television screen. The connection between the child's actions and the consequences of his actions becomes fuzzy in his mind. The child fails to develop a normal sense of responsibility.

Of course, I'm generalizing. The effect of television is much stronger on some children than on others. Some children do maintain a fairly good grip on reality and do grow up to be more or less responsible adults. But the average effects of television are still there, and they manifest themselves in the sort of tragedy we had in Jonesboro a few days ago. This never happened before we had racial integration and television, but it will happen more and more often in the future as so-called "diversity" and its consequent alienation continue to grow, and the influence of television remains with us.

Probably it already has occurred to you, but the Clinton attempt to make a Federal judge out of this Massiah-Jackson creature in Philadelphia and the tragedy in Jonesboro are not unrelated. Both are things which couldn't have happened when we had a sane country. The corruption of the political system and the judicial system on the one hand and the alienation of our children on the other hand, their loss of their sense of community and their sense of responsibility, go together. We fell victim to both of these afflictions as a consequence of losing control of our society, of letting things get entirely out of hand, of abdicating our responsibility to maintain control over our own destiny. And in order to have a sane and healthy society again we must take charge of our own affairs again.

That is easy to say, "we must take charge of our own affairs," but how do we actually do it?

Well, it's always been my belief that in order to do anything successfully -- especially if it's a difficult or complex thing -- we ought to try to understand it first. And if we want to get ourselves out of a mess, part of what we need to understand is how we got into the mess in the

first place: how did we lose control of our affairs? I've explored various aspects of that question in the past. I'll restate briefly one of my most important conclusions.

We failed to understand the absolutely essential role of the mass media, the media of news and entertainment, in the development of our modern society until we had lost control of those media. We failed to understand that as a society grows and becomes more complex and more centralized, the mass media become the principal organs in the society for shaping public opinion; they take the place of the direct person-to-person communication which characterizes simple and non-centralized societies.

By shaping public opinion the media are able to play a decisive role in formulating public policy and in determining the makeup of the government. We didn't understand that -- or at least we didn't understand it fully -- until, during the course of this century, a small and alien minority had insinuated itself into a position of dominance over the media. That small and alien minority, of course, is the Jews.

And in that one fact lies the explanation of why policies which are destructive of everything that we hold dear, policies which are morally abhorrent to us, policies which have brought our whole civilization to the brink of ruin, have been promoted by the mass media and enforced by the government in Washington. In that fact is the reason why so-called "diversity" has become a new government-enforced religion: a religion in which Massiah-Jackson's being a Black female excuses the sort of African tribal "justice" she has been dispensing in Philadelphia and qualifies her for the Federal judiciary.

After we let the control of public policy slip out of the hands of our people and into the hands of the media bosses, we began feeling impotent; we began feeling that we no longer had control over our lives or the lives of our children. And so we just sat back and became spectators. We let events take their course. We let the television raise our children and teach them their values. And then what happened in Jonesboro happened.

What this tells us is that if we really want to regain control of our lives again, regain control of our society and our civilization, we must first regain control of our mass media. As long as the media of news and entertainment remain in the hands of the people who control them now, most White Americans will continue to be confused and misled. When the next schoolyard massacre takes place, Americans will hear another call for gun control from the media, but they will not hear any true explanation of why we are seeing more and more of this sort of tragedy.

And when the next national election takes place, we will get another President who is beholden to the media bosses instead of to the American people and who will appoint more judges of the sort Bill Clinton has been appointing.

My broadcasts, of course, cannot overcome the much greater influence of the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the television networks -- but they are a start, and your support in making it possible for our influence to grow is appreciated.

The Theft of Our Freedom

I want to talk with you about freedom. Freedom! That seems simple enough, but it is a word with profoundly different meanings for different people. Some of the people whom I most despise and whom I consider the greatest threat to freedom have, in fact, represented themselves as champions of freedom. I'm talking about liberals. The name "liberal" comes from the Roman word meaning "free." How ironic! -- although I am sure that most liberals don't see the irony. Their concept of freedom is radically different from mine.

For me freedom is a fairly simple thing: it is closely tied to my idea of independence. I am free when no man can claim the right to force me to do his will rather than mine. This definition is a definition relative to society, to government, and to the law. I said, "when no man can claim the right . . . ." Thus, I don't consider myself unfree when a robber points a gun at me and tells me to give him my wallet. He's telling me what to do, but he doesn't claim any right to do so. I consider myself unfree if I am not able to entertain the possibility of drawing my own pistol and contesting his request for my wallet because the government previously has disarmed me with a gun-control law.

I also consider myself unfree when I cannot say whatever I want to say on any subject whatsoever, because the government has forbidden me to speak.

Freedom or lack of freedom is a function of my relationship to society and to the government. It is not a function of how much money I have, how popular I am, or how happy I am with my life. A lot of people talk about things like "freedom from hunger," "freedom from fear," or "freedom from want," but they're not using the word "freedom" the way I use it. Hunger and fear are serious things and unpleasant things, but they don't have anything to do with freedom as I've defined it here.

We all make conscious decisions to impose certain limits on our own freedom. When we marry, for example, we consciously give up some of our freedom. When we choose to be a member of any community or any society, we enter into a social contract: in return for receiving the benefits of being a member of the society, we agree to obey the society's rules. But these things are a matter of choice for us. They are voluntarily accepted limitations. The man with a strong sense of self-worth and independence, the man who loves freedom, will be cautious about accepting such limitations, and he will want to keep them to a minimum. He will be eternally vigilant to prevent other men from changing the terms of his social contract in such a way as to diminish his freedom.

Weaker, more dependent men, on the other hand, may gladly accept more limitations in return for the promise of more social benefits or more security. And that's all right, so long as we don't let their weakness encroach on our freedom.

Liberals have an entirely different concept of freedom. For the liberal the idea of freedom is mixed up with the ideas of happiness and comfort. That's why one always hears liberals talking about things like "freedom from want." To liberals, a hungry man is not a free man. And of

course, in a certain sense of the word that is true. A hungry man is encouraged by the pain in his belly to do something to get food. His options are more limited -- at least temporarily -- than those of a man who is not hungry. But that's not the sense in which we use the word "free." Whether a man is hungry or not, whether he is poor or not, he is free as long as he not prevented by the government from seeking food for himself or seeking to alleviate his poverty.

That's where we and the liberals differ. To us a poor man is unfree only if the government prevents him by law from bettering his condition. To us a man can be poor and hungry and still be free. To the liberals a poor man lacks freedom even if he is poor solely because of his own laziness or stupidity. What counts to the liberals is that he is **poor,** regardless of the **reason,** and therefore cannot have everything he wants. So the liberals campaign to free him from his wants, not to free him from laws which prevent him from taking care of his own wants. The liberals in their campaign for "freedom from want" very often seek solutions in the form of more laws: laws which take away our freedom in order to satisfy the wants of those who have an entirely different concept of freedom.

A big thing with the liberals these days is "freedom from oppression." By "oppression" the liberals mean anything which makes them feel bad or keeps them from having what they want. To the liberals poverty is a form of oppression. So is feeling bad because they are ugly, stupid, awkward, ill-bred, or unpopular. The liberals consider a person is "oppressed" when he is reminded of his inferiority by something another person writes or says. Feminists, in particular, are fond of complaining about this sort of "oppression." They believe that they are free from oppression only when they are feeling good about themselves, and this "freedom to feel good," as they see it, is threatened by people who say "insensitive" things.

The liberals believe that they are fighting for freedom from oppression when they campaign for laws designed to protect the feelings of people who could be offended by the comments or actions of other people. These laws are often called "hate laws." The liberals sometimes speak of "freedom from hate" and believe that they are achieving that with their "hate laws."

In fact, to hear a liberal or a Jew talk about it, you would believe that "freedom from hate" and "freedom to feel good" were what the Founding Fathers really had in mind when they drafted the Bill of Rights. To the liberals the so-called "freedom" of a homosexual not to be offended by the remarks of someone who considers him a freak ranks right up there beside freedom of speech and freedom to keep and bear arms -- in fact, a bit **above** freedom of speech and **way** above the freedom to keep and bear arms.

These new "freedoms" that the liberals have invented -- freedom from oppression, freedom from "bad vibes," freedom from hate, freedom from being offended -- have been given an enormous promotion during the past decade or so. Several large and well-funded Jewish organizations -- Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center -- have been working together with the controlled media and bought politicians to push so-called "hate laws" through state legislatures.

These laws attempt to protect people -- especially those considered "disadvantaged" by the liberals, and that means non-male, non-White, non-heterosexual, or non-Gentile people -- from

being made to feel bad by outlawing "oppressive" thought and "oppressive" expression. Some of the laws aim at punishing a person for having "oppressive" thoughts when he commits a crime. For example, if a homosexual solicits you and you punch him in the nose, it ordinarily would be a misdemeanor assault in most jurisdictions. But if you say, "Take that, you filthy pervert!" when you punch him, it becomes a felony in those areas where a "hate" law is in effect. Instead of being fined a few hundred dollars, you can be sent to prison for five years.

Other laws, based on the same "freedom from oppression" theory, criminalize any speech or other expression which might "oppress" a "disadvantaged" person -- that is, it criminalizes so-called "hate speech." Jewish and liberal groups have succeeded in pushing such speech-limitation laws through several state legislatures. They also have succeeded in convincing a substantial portion of the public that "hate," "racism," and "discrimination" are **illegal,** even in those states where they have not yet succeeded in enacting "hate" laws. Thus, they have intimidated many people into limiting their own speech, in the belief that to say something Politically Incorrect might result in a prosecution. I am sorry to say, in many cases they have gotten away with these infringements on the freedom of other Americans: infringements committed in the name of "freedom from oppression." It is infuriating, but it is also ironic.

Florida is a state with lots of liberals and even more Jews, and in order to protect "disadvantaged" people in the state from "oppression" they have enacted several "hate crime" and "hate speech" laws. These laws are unconstitutional, and they are intended primarily to intimidate the citizens of Florida to conform their speech and behavior to liberal norms -- although the liberal and Jewish elements in the state certainly would **like** to see the Constitution actually changed to favor their concept of "freedom" over ours.

In late February, nine students at Killian High School, in the Miami suburb of Kendall, Florida, were arrested and hauled off to jail after they published a pamphlet satirizing their school's administration. They were charged under two of Florida's "hate" laws, because the principal of Killian High School is Black, and he was treated unkindly in the pamphlet, which even included cartoons depicting the Black principal engaged in sexual intercourse. The principal called the police and requested that the students be arrested. One of the charges against the students carries a penalty of five years imprisonment.

The Jewish Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith joined the Black principal, feminists, eager-beaver politicians and bureaucrats, and others in praising the action against the students, who range in age from 16 to 18 years. One of the more eager members of the lynch mob who praised the arrests was Henry Fraind, deputy superintendent of schools. He told reporters, "Free speech doesn't give anyone the right to use a word that would inflame. They do not have the right to incite the feelings of outward racism."

Unfortunately, Henry Fraind is all too typical of the sort of vicious, Politically Correct bigots we have put in charge of the education of America's children. I don't know whether or not he really **believes** that Americans don't have the right to use words which inflame or which incite feelings of racism, but it's clear that he would **like** for the use of such words to be illegal -- and I'll bet he also would like to see people go to prison for using words which incite Politically Incorrect feelings about sex, sexual orientation, religion, and a number of other things.

Even if Mr. Fraind understands that the Bill of Rights is still a bar to the type of "hate speech" laws he favors, he seems pleased that the laws, unconstitutional though they are, are on the books and serve to stifle the ignorant and the timid. And there are, I'm afraid, far too many other people, who are not activist bigots like Fraind and not even especially liberal, who would vaguely go along with him.

These people have gradually been persuaded by two generations of television propaganda that people are entitled to "freedom from oppression" and that there should be some sort of penalty for saying or writing things that "disadvantaged" people find "oppressive." They believe that the government has -- or **should** have -- the authority to compel us all to write or say only "nice" things. That shouldn't be surprising in this feminized age. The feminine spirit gives priority to niceness and getting along with everybody and not hurting anyone's feelings. The masculine spirit gives priority to freedom and to truth and to saying what needs to be said, offensive or not -- but masculine priorities have become Politically Incorrect in this age.

It is interesting to note that of the nine students thrown into jail for producing and distributing their "insensitive" and "oppressive" pamphlet, five are girls. One of the students is Asian, and three of them have Hispanic surnames. Most of them are honors students. This "diversity" didn't stop the prosecutor from charging them, and it didn't stop the police from leaving them locked up overnight in the Dade County jail with murderers and rapists. Four days after they were charged and arrested the state reluctantly dropped the charges against them. The feminist prosecutor who was responsible for the arrests, Katherine Fernandez Rundle, told the Associated Press that dropping the charges against the students was "a difficult decision" for her, even though she knew the laws were unconstitutional and unenforceable. One gets the distinct impression that she and other authorities involved were sorry that they couldn't prosecute the students and felt that keeping them in jail for a night was letting them off too easy -- for exercising their constitutional freedom of speech.

The parents of the arrested students have talked about the possibility of suing, but I personally feel that a good, old-fashioned necktie party, with the Black principal, deputy superintendent of schools Henry Fraind, and Kathleen Fernandez Rundle as the guests of honor would be more appropriate! Too much of the blood of our forefathers was spilled securing the freedom which these Politically Correct bigots would like to take away from us -- too much to permit them to continue trampling on our Bill of Rights with impunity.

These arrests last month in Florida are a pretty clear-cut case of our freedom -- freedom of speech -- coming into conflict with freedom as defined by the liberals and Jews: namely "freedom from oppression," freedom to feel good. But it is by no means the only such case. This sort of thing is happening more and more frequently these days, and **our** freedom all too often is subordinated to **theirs.** Believe me, they really would like to re-write the Bill of Rights, taking away all of our freedoms and substituting theirs instead. And that's what they actually are doing, step by step.

There are three categories of people responsible for the gradually increasing loss of freedom in America. First, there are the Jews, as represented by groups such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center -- and of

course, by the masters of the mass media. These are cold-blooded, hard-headed people who know exactly what they are doing in trying to take away our freedom. I've talked at length about their activities and their motivations on earlier programs, and I'll talk more about them in the future.

In the second category are the hard-core liberals, the people who grew up in the 1960s and 1970s believing that they were "oppressed" if mommy or daddy reprimanded them for not picking up their dirty socks and underwear or if the kid next door was better looking or had more toys than they had. They built their ideas about "freedom from oppression" and "freedom from want" into a sort of nut-case religion, which has been adopted by a lot of really wacky people, people with serious problems of retarded personality development: the feminists, for example. This religion also has been adopted by a lot of amoral opportunists who don't care about freedom one way or another, but who find it profitable to go with the flow: who find that it helps them get a good press and more votes.

But it's the third category of people that we really have to worry about. Those are the people who have been too passive, too selfish, or too cowardly to stop the Jews, the retards, and the opportunists: the people who have let them get away with it and have put up virtually no opposition to the theft of our liberty.

I'm talking about **us.** I'm talking about those who really **believe** in freedom of speech and freedom of self-defense, but who are so afraid of being called an "anti-Semite" or a "racist" that they remain only silent spectators when our freedom is raped the way it was in Florida last month. Too many of us have let ourselves be buffaloed by the very clever Jewish tactic of calling their campaign against our freedom a campaign against "hate." Too many of us who see through this tactic are still afraid to stand up and denounce their "hate laws" -- and them -- because we are afraid of being thought "haters."

Let me leave you with this thought. Cowardice and freedom are not and never have been compatible. If we want to be free again, then we must find the courage to deal properly with those who are stealing our freedom.

Replacing Shakespeare With Malcolm X

Just when you thought that the people running this country already had inflicted every sick and degenerate program imaginable on us, they come up with yet another program wackier and more destructive than anything which has gone before. This time it's a program by the San Francisco Board of Education to step up the rate of "multiculturalizing" of the curriculum for San Francisco's public schools by phasing out most White influences.

For a long time, of course, the more "progressive" elements -- that is, the nuttier elements -- in America's educational establishment have been fretting about exposing young people to all of the racist, sexist, homophobic, and elitist influences inherent in the writings of White authors from generations less Politically Correct than our own. These include all of the writers whose works American schoolchildren traditionally have read: Homer, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Dickens, Tennyson, and Kipling. They are hateful people when viewed from a Politically Correct perspective. I mean, Homer and Chaucer completely ignored Blacks, as if they didn't even exist! And Shakespeare made a number of very insensitive references to Jews. Kipling was an unabashed White supremacist. And they were all elitists: not an egalitarian among them. "Progressive" educators have skirted this problem by censoring the works of White writers before presenting them to students, keeping the more objectionable works out of sight.

Now the educators have a much better plan. Instead of censoring the White writers, they will replace them with non-Whites. In the new curriculum for San Francisco's public schools 70 per cent of the reading assignments for students will consist of works by non-White writers -- or "authors of color," to use the trendy language of the new policy statement. For every three books written by White authors which students read, they must read seven books written by non-White authors. Actually, most of the school-board members would like to get rid of all of the White authors, because all of their writings are contaminated by racism, even if it isn't explicit. But they're willing to accept paring the Whites down to 30 per cent as a first step.

There have been a few protests against the San Francisco curriculum from conservative teachers around the country, but they didn't challenge the policy at its core. Rather, the critics said things like, "of course everyone supports more diversity, but quotas aren't the way to achieve it." After all, who wants to be condemned as a "racist" for speaking in favor of a mostly White curriculum? Who has the courage to go on record as saying that multiculturalizing the curriculum inevitably will debase it? Isn't that equivalent to saying that non-Whites haven't written works whose quality matches those of Shakespeare and Dickens? And so most of the more conservative educators are side-stepping the issue, while the real nut-cases proceed with their multicultural programs.

Now, lest you jump to the conclusion that this is a Black-versus-White issue, I assure you that many of the proponents of the new San Francisco curriculum are neither Blacks nor Hispanics. To be sure, most Black and Hispanic educators support the new curriculum. So do the Jews, although they're being more discreet about it. And for the sake of appearances, a few Jews are even going on record as being against the new program. But the really interesting thing about this program for "multiculturalizing" the school curriculum is that it also is supported by many

White educators. I suppose that shouldn't surprise us when we consider how many White people voted for Bill Clinton. There really are a great many very sick White folks running around these days. This is the Clinton era!

I find it difficult trying to understand what goes on inside the minds of these sick people. I'm inclined to believe that many of them simply have been exposed to too much Jewish hate propaganda: they've seen too many hate films, such as *Roots, Schindler's List,* or *Amistad,* and they've taken them to heart. They've been filled with an artificial sense of guilt and turned against their own people. They've let themselves be persuaded that White people are inherently evil, destructive, and brutal, and that our main role in history has been exploiting, dominating, and harming non-White peoples, who are all inherently good, sensitive, creative, and inoffensive.

They believe that non-Whites can do a gentler and fairer job of running the world, that non-White intellects can give us deeper insights into the nature of reality and can build a more sublime civilization for us. Many of these sick Whites really **believe** this nonsense! It has become a religion for them, this idea of the noble, gifted savage held down by the wicked White man. They can read some crock of pretentious, angst-filled, drivel written by a non-White and believe that they've read something really profound. If it had been written by a White man, they would recognize it as drivel and laugh at it, but their religion prohibits them from laughing at non-Whites, so they take it seriously. They really believe that a non-White curriculum will be better for all students, including White students. They really believe that Whites will benefit from being "multiculturalized."

And I think that there are others among the White supporters of the non-White reading program for San Francisco's schools who are not religious, but they simply have a feminine tendency to go with the flow. They look at the changing demographic statistics for the United States, California, and San Francisco, where White children now make up only 12 per cent of the public school enrollment, and they figure that there's no point in fighting the growing non-White majority. They simply can't face the prospect of possible bloodshed and destruction which may be needed to reverse current demographic trends. Above all else they want a peaceful solution to non-White unrest, non-White crime, and non-White failure, and they figure that the easiest thing to do is give the public schools a non-White curriculum. Perhaps that will make the non-Whites happy, and the Whites will get along somehow.

You may wonder why I care what sort of curriculum there is in a school system which is only 12 per cent White. Well, I care in the first place because it is still 12 per cent White. I don't want those White children subjected to any more of an anti-White brainwashing program than they already are. Second, I care because the sort of rot that is taking over the San Francisco school system is spreading, and the sooner we stamp it out the better. If we simply acquiesce to what is happening now in San Francisco, then it will happen all the sooner in other cities. San Francisco used to be a White city, and it used to have White schools. The same process that destroyed San Francisco's schools is destroying the schools in every city in America. Everywhere we are seeing the same sickness among the educators and bureaucrats, and everywhere we are seeing the same changing demographics. The sickness must be stamped out. The demographic trends must be reversed.

I understand, of course, that it may take a civil war to reverse America's demographic trends. But this war does not seem to be in the immediate future. This shouldn't excuse us from doing what we **can** do **now.** We must fight the sickness which has infected our people, and that sickness is not just in education. We should fight Clintonism wherever it has raised its ugly head. We should fight the sort of Jewish hate propaganda which has poisoned nearly every aspect of our public life in America. We should expose the lies and the malevolent motivations on which this hatred of everything White is based, and we should help our people to develop a healthier attitude toward their own kind, their own race.

We can help even the least idealistic of our people -- we can help even the most selfish and least altruistic of our people -- understand that we are headed for certain disaster if we accept the nonsensical doctrine that non-Whites have as much to contribute to our civilization as Whites do and that White children can benefit by being raised on a diet of non-White literature. We can help them to understand that "multiculturalizing" our schools and our curricula already has lowered our educational standards drastically, and that if we continue along the same path we will end up with a less literate, less well informed, and less capable population than we have now.

And we can help the more idealistic of our people -- the ones who care about things besides the gross national product -- understand that the most important thing in a child's education is the sense of identity and rootedness that he receives, his sense of peoplehood and racial belonging. That does not come from a multicultural education. It comes only from immersing him in the culture, in the ideas, in the history, in the spirituality of **his own people.** What I'm saying is that even if the 70 per cent non-White literature that the San Francisco board of education intends to impose on schoolchildren weren't mostly anti-White drivel, it would still be bad for White children because it is non-White.

What I just said is a very important point, but I am afraid that of lot of my patriotic friends miss this point, so I'll say a few more words about it. Most White Americans will agree with us that what the San Francisco board of education is doing is not a good idea. They will be cautious about condemning it because they don't want to be perceived as racists, but even many of the morally and intellectually challenged White Americans who voted for Bill Clinton would vote against throwing out Homer and Shakespeare and Dickens to make way for Eldridge Cleaver and Malcolm X -- if they could cast their votes secretly, so their liberal friends couldn't see how they voted. But their reasons for voting against the San Francisco program would have a lot more to do with the gross national product than with racial identity and rootedness.

The most common objection one would hear from White opponents to the San Francisco program would be that it is not helpful to anyone -- Black, Chicano-mestizo, or White -- to teach them in such a way that it will be more difficult for them to be assimilated into the majority culture. If Blacks want to get ahead in a predominantly White country, it will be more helpful for them to study Shakespeare than Eldridge Cleaver or Malcolm X. And of course, exactly the same argument applies to White students. Nothing racist about that. The only White people who would disagree are the hard-core, nut-case Clintonistas -- and of course, those pitiable souls I mentioned a few minutes ago who are tormented by the religion of White guilt.

Even conservatives -- even patriots -- seem to believe that the principal reasons why the San Francisco program is bad are that it substitutes inferior writers for superior ones, and it focuses on minority culture rather than on the majority culture. But to think that way is to miss the most important point. That point is that our children must be given strong roots in **our** culture, and what the Blacks, mestizos, and Asians do with their children is their business, so long as they don't do it on our turf.

I hardly need to mention that my view of this matter is a **racist** view. The point I am making is a racist point. My patriotic and conservative friends who have not grasped this point have been trained to look at the world as individuals rather than as White men and women. Individualism is the new conservative religion, and it is really as disastrously wrong-headed a religion, as lethal a religion, as the religion of White guilt which motivates the White supporters of the San Francisco program. The individualist is as concerned about what sort of education Black, mestizo, and Asian children receive as he is about the sort of education White children receive.

In my religion the first commandment is, **survive.** Be fruitful and multiply. Grow strong, and safeguard the future of your children.

And the second commandment is, **seek the future among your own kind.** Know that each race of man, each species of animal, must develop according to its own laws, according to its own nature. Understand the nature of your own people, and base your plans for the future, your plans for growing strong, your plans for a strong and healthy posterity, on that nature. Preserve your kind.

My religion is a racist religion. It does not require me to **hate** anyone of another race or to **harm** anyone of another race, so long as he does not threaten or impede my own race. But it does require me always to put the interests of my own people ahead of any other race's interests or any individual's interest, including my own.

My religion is based on doing what comes naturally, on doing what my kind always have done -- at least, what they did prior to the mass insanity which seems to have taken hold during this century. When we did what was natural for our people we grew strong, and no other people could stand against us. But when we let the religion of White guilt begin setting our policies for us, we began getting the sort of lunacy we have in San Francisco -- and everywhere else, in different forms. The religion of White guilt gave us Bill Clinton in the White House. It gave us affirmative action, racial integration in our schools, and the immigration policy which is flooding our country with non-Whites.

I think that my conservative and patriotic friends agree with me on this. Having Bill Clinton in the White House is a disaster. It is not only a national embarrassment, but it is a grave national danger: it threatens the whole future of our country. And they agree with me that open borders, affirmative action, the new San Francisco curriculum, and the rest of the Clinton program are disasters for America, whether Clinton remains in the White House or not.

But I part company with many of my conservative and patriotic friends when it comes to understanding why these disasters have been inflicted on us and what we should do about them. I

hope that as our situation in this country worsens, some of them will come to understand that their religion of individualism cannot save us, cannot even slow the pace at which disaster is overwhelming our people on all fronts. I hope that they will understand that a religion based only on individual interests, based only on selfishness, not only cannot save our people, but it cannot even protect their own, personal interests in the face of the disaster which is overtaking all of us.

The Blacks, Asians, and mestizos who want to base the education of children in San Francisco on Malcolm X instead of on Shakespeare understand what the individualists don't understand. They understand that together they are strong. They understand that as long as the White man remains befuddled by his religion of White guilt or disengaged because of his belief in individualism, they will continue having their way. They understand that the country as a whole is moving toward a non-White majority in the next century, and that if the White man remains unable to look out for the interests of his own people, we actually will have that non-White majority, and then the non-Whites will be able to do whatever they want to do -- and there will be hell to pay for us, liberal as well as conservative.

So think about it, all of you patriotic listeners who still believe in individualism, who believe that it is wrong to judge others by their race, who believe that racism is wicked: think about the direction in which our country is headed now and how you will act to change that direction as an individualist. And if you don't come up with any really good ideas, perhaps you will consider the possibility that we ought to work **together** for a better future on the only realistic basis, and that basis is our common race, our common roots, and our common culture. You might consider the possibility that doing what comes naturally, doing what our ancestors for the last ten thousand generations have done may not be such a bad idea after all.

Perhaps you are still terrified of being thought a racist. So don't call yourself a racist, if you prefer. But do understand that we must do whatever is required of us to survive first, to survive as a people. Understand that if we permit the sort of madness we can see in San Francisco and in Washington to continue spreading -- as it is spreading now -- we have no future as a people. Our children have no future. The Clintonistas will win. Our country will sink into barbarism. Our culture will be replaced by the culture of the Black African, the Mexican mestizo, and the slave-like Chinese. Our race will become extinct.

And all it takes to avoid that end and to have a healthy future is to work together for our people. Together we can put an end to the sort of rabble who have taken over our government. We can clean up the country and get it back on course again. Think about it. And write to me about it.

Clinton's Legacy

Bill Clinton is a psychologically defective person. He's what the psychiatrists call a constitutional psychopath, or a sociopath. He is not only amoral, but he also lacks the judgment and self-control necessary to conform his behavior to reasonable norms. Amorality, lack of any inherent morality, is not an uncommon condition among lawyers and politicians, of course, but most of them manage to curb their greed and their lust enough to conform to accepted standards of behavior. A person who wants to get ahead in politics should be a person who looks ahead and tries to understand the long-range consequences of current decisions and policies. Bill Clinton has never had that faculty. For him it's always been doing what he wants to do at the moment and figuring that later he'll be able to lie himself out of any problems which arise. He behaves as if he's been lobotomized or as if he has a substantial non-White component in his genetic makeup. He displays the type of mentality especially characteristic of Blacks: a profound lack of foresight.

When Bill Clinton was a university student during the late 1960s he organized pro-Viet Cong demonstrations. That may have been a very trendy thing to do in the pot-smoking, coke-snorting crowd to which Clinton belonged, but it wasn't a very farsighted thing to do for someone who even then had strong political ambitions. Even the most amoral and opportunistic person should have understood that publicly taking the side of your country's enemies during a war could become a serious liability for a political career in the future. Clinton figured he'd do what was trendy at the moment and lie about it later, if he figured at all.

When he was governor of Arkansas there were enough available women to satisfy any sexual appetite. All that was called for was a reasonable degree of discretion, but Bill Clinton lacked even that. His womanizing exceeded all reasonable bounds. Like a Third World potentate making the rounds of his subjects, he would spot a woman in a crowd who appealed to him and point her out to a member of his state police bodyguard, who then would approach the woman and escort her to Clinton's bedroom for a "quickie." The technique used with Paula Jones was standard operating procedure in Bill Clinton's Little Rock, as several of his former bodyguards have testified. Any prudent man, no matter how lustful, could have guessed that this sort of behavior eventually would lead to serious problems. But not Bill Clinton.

And Clinton was as reckless in his financial dealings and in his use of illegal drugs while he was in Arkansas as he was in his bimbo hunting. A number of witnesses have testified to his use of cocaine at Little Rock parties while he was governor of Arkansas. For the governor of a state to behave in such a manner, regardless of his lack of respect for the law, indicates a shocking deficit of judgment.

As for finances, let me remind you that one of his Arkansas friends, Susan McDougal, a former officer of the failed Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan, has been sitting in prison for more than six months now on a contempt charge because she refuses to tell a grand jury what she knows about Bill Clinton's involvement in Madison Guaranty's illegal operations. She has been granted immunity from prosecution in return for her testimony, but she refuses to talk. One can

only suspect that someone in the Clinton crowd is making it worth her while to keep her mouth shut and stay in prison.

And there is the matter of the box of old bank records which turned up in the back of a former bank employee's car: a box of records everyone thought had been destroyed. Among the records was a $27,000 check from Madison Guaranty to Bill Clinton, which Clinton claims he doesn't remember receiving.

As with Susan McDougal, suspicions of "hush money" payments are associated with several other former Clinton associates: Webster Hubbell, an old Arkansas pal appointed associate attorney general by Clinton during his first term as President, later was indicted on felony fraud charges. He promised prosecutors to tell what he knew about Clinton's illegal activity in Arkansas in return for lenient treatment. But various Clinton associates, including Vernon Jordan, stepped in and arranged for Hubbell to receive $500,000 in so-called "consulting fees." After the payoff, Hubbell kept his mouth shut about Clinton and went to prison.

And there's the case of Monica Lewinsky, who traded her promise of silence in return for a high-paying job in New York, arranged by Vernon Jordan.

Well, the list goes on and on and on. It's really astounding that one man has gotten away with so much and managed to stay out of prison -- let alone to stay in the White House! As I said, Clinton's personality matches that of what the psychiatrists call a "constitutional psychopath": a person who not only lacks all moral scruples but also lacks the judgment and self-control necessary for normal social functioning.

Clinton, of course, grew up during the 1960s, a period of artificial social upheaval when the Jews were using the mass media to encourage young people to break all the rules, cut themselves loose from their roots, and adopt a hedonistic life-style. One of the Jewish instigators of this upheaval of the 1960s was Jerry Rubin, a leader of the Youth International Party. In his book titled *Do It!*, published in 1970 by the big New York Jewish company Simon and Schuster, Rubin explicitly urged the sort of behavior manifested by Clinton. He advocated free money, free drugs, sex whenever and wherever one felt the urge, no rules, and no responsibility.

Bill Clinton, however, wasn't the only American who grew up during the 1960s, and he really can't use the so-called "counter-culture" revolution promoted by Rubin and other Jews as an excuse for himself. Constitutional psychopaths are born, not made. What the 1960s did for Bill Clinton was provide him with a milieu in which he could operate without the social disapproval that ordinarily would be directed at a person like himself. It provided him with a constituency of people who had grown up with the notion that responsibility and discipline are "fascist" concepts. These are the sort of people he has surrounded himself with in Washington.

Gary Aldrich, the FBI agent who was assigned to the Clinton White House to do security checks on Clinton's staffers, has described these people in detail in his 1996 book, *Unlimited Access.* Aldrich tells of drug usage and semi-public homosexual activity encountered in the corridors and restrooms of the Clinton White House and of the shocking information uncovered in his background investigations of Clinton staffers. Not a 1960s person himself, Aldrich was

distressed by the absence of moral and behavioral standards he observed among Clinton's associates. In *Unlimited Access* he relates a conversation he had with two other FBI agents. One of them asks him, "What the hell is going on at the White House, Gary?"

Aldrich replies that he has never seen anything like it. The third agent says: "Are you **sure** you haven't seen these people before? Think about it. 'Kill the pigs. Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, the Viet Cong are gonna win.' That's who they are, Gary. They're the people we used to arrest." So you see that my conclusions about Bill Clinton are shared by others who have acquainted themselves with him. Many rank-and-file people in the news media also understand Clinton's nature, but many of these media people are 1960s-style people themselves, and they were inclined not to be critical of his recklessly self-indulgent behavior, until it exceeded even **their** limits of tolerance.

The interesting thing about all of this is not that Bill Clinton is a constitutional psychopath. There are lots of constitutional psychopaths running loose in our society these days. The interesting thing is that a constitutional psychopath has become President of the United States through the **democratic process,** and he enjoys a high degree of popularity among the electorate even **after** his nature has been revealed by the recent scandals. **That's** what's interesting.

I draw two important conclusions from this: one about the role of the mass media in the political process today, and one about the nature of the electorate and what that means for mass democracy.

How did a constitutional psychopath become President? To answer this we need to understand that Bill Clinton is not only a psychopath: he is a psychopath with charisma. He is a very manipulative psychopath. He is an intelligent psychopath. With his boyish smile and his "aw, shucks" manner, he has not only been able to charm countless women out of their panties, he also has been able to charm their husbands, fathers, and brothers into voting for him. It was perhaps forgivable for the local Democratic Party machine in Arkansas to adopt him as a candidate for governor. They saw in him a natural vote-getter. The trouble with this, of course, is that they also should have seen the constitutional psychopath in him and rejected him on that basis. Clinton's charm and his ability to win votes should not have been the only considerations.

Politics always has been a crooked business. But I believe that the people involved in it used to be a little more careful, a little more mindful of the consequences of their actions. This wasn't really indicative of any morality or patriotism on their part: just normal prudence. The standards seem to be down everywhere these days. The professional politicians always try to remain closely aware of public feeling, public attitudes, public tolerances. When they see that public standards are down, that the public will tolerate behavior today that it wouldn't have tolerated 20 or 30 years ago, then they are more likely to put forward someone like Clinton as a candidate. They won't be quite as discriminating in choosing a candidate as they were earlier.

They usually get away with this lack of discrimination. But they didn't get away with it in Clinton's case. Certainly the more prudent Democratic leaders are wishing now that they hadn't chosen Clinton as their candidate. They can see that he is still popular, but they also can see that he endangers the continued existence of the system from which all the politicians draw their sustenance. They can see that a system of constitutional democracy, of democracy with rules and

standards, has been degraded to a mobocracy. The mob doesn't care about rules and standards. The mob cares only about its hero of the moment.

Did Clinton steal money from the public in his dealings with Madison Guaranty? "Who cares?" roars the mob. Did he use cocaine while he was governor of Arkansas? Has he broken laws in accepting money from Chinese gangsters? "Leave the poor man alone. We like him!" screams the mob. Has he committed perjury and obstructed justice by arranging payoffs to Susan McDougal, Webster Hubbell, and Monica Lewinsky? "That's not important!" shouts the mob. "Let him do his job!"

Now, the mob may not understand the danger in this sort of situation, but others do understand. There are many thoughtful and responsible Americans who accepted democracy only because of the safeguards designed to keep it from becoming a mobocracy: safeguards which obviously have failed. Until now democracy has been sort of a secular religion in the United States, but the intelligent and independent-minded segment of the public is becoming cynical about that religion. They are losing their faith in it. They will withdraw their consent to be governed by it. That may not worry the mob, because the mob is drunk with its own power, with its numbers. But mobs never rule for long, regardless of their numbers. There will be a revolution, and the mob will lose its power -- which is a good thing, of course, but we want to be very careful about who gets the power.

There's one more extremely important element in our situation, and that element is the power of the mass media. Before the rise of the mass media, candidates for office had more or less direct contact with the voters. The public's evaluation of candidates was guided by community standards and by local community leaders. Community leaders were usually a cut above the village idiots and the food-stamp recipients and the trendy airheads who always went chasing after the latest fad, and because they were a cut above the rabble in terms of judgment and sense of responsibility these local community leaders gave a degree of stability to democracy. As long as the voters took their lead from people in the community who were respected, democracy was not likely to become mobocracy.

During this century, however, American society has undergone profound changes. For all practical purposes, there no longer are communities or respected community leaders in most parts of America. During this century the mass media have risen to take the place of community contact and community guidance in the lives of most Americans. This has been especially the case since the Second World War and the advent of television. Now candidates for public office are presented directly to the voters through the mass media. The image of a candidate that a voter sees is the image shaped by the media, and the media are far from neutral. Of course, charisma and personal charm and likability are still important for a candidate's vote-getting ability, but the media make a big difference in the way these characteristics are perceived by the public. The types of questions that reporters ask during press conferences and interviews, the manner in which they ask questions, and the way in which the interviews are edited before being presented to the public make an enormous difference in the way the public perceives a candidate. There always are things in a candidate's background, in his past life, which are capable of influencing the public's attitude toward a candidate. The people who control the media scrutinize these things and decide which ones to present to the public and which ones to keep quiet about.

Did the candidate demonstrate on behalf of America's enemies during the Vietnam war, as Bill Clinton did? Not important, the media bosses decide. No need to remind the public of that. Did the candidate ever make a remark about limiting immigration or cutting back on welfare or eliminating affirmative action programs? Well, now, that's something the media bosses certainly will want to tell the public about; they'll want to tell the public that the candidate is a "racist," and they'll figure out the most damaging way to do it.

On top of this control of candidates' images by the mass media, there also is the more general effect that the media have on public attitudes. Two generations of Americans have been raised on television now. Television has been the baby-sitter and the teacher for two generations. And during these two generations Jews have had a vastly -- an enormously -- disproportionate role in controlling what television has taught to Americans. Jews, whether as scriptwriters, as producers, or as network bosses, have shaped much of the public's attitudes and values. And that fact is the key to understanding why Bill Clinton still has a very high public approval rating even after being exposed for what he is.

In summary: Bill Clinton did not make the political system in America what it is today. He did not change a constitutional democracy into a mobocracy. That change took place without his help, over a period of decades. Bill Clinton has simply made that change manifest -- and by making it manifest he has undermined the whole system. He has destroyed any remaining respect and support the system had among thoughtful and responsible and moral Americans. That is what history will remember Bill Clinton for.

The Mexican Menace

Around Easter thousands of young men and women from America's colleges and universities take their spring break and spend a week partying and drinking. For most of them it's also a time for romance and for socializing, and so they want to go where everyone else is going.

A few years ago the trendiest place to go was Fort Lauderdale, Florida, but now it's Cancun, Mexico. This year everyone who could afford it headed there. There were network news segments during the spring break season showing scantily clad college girls on the beaches at Cancun. The bars and discos of Mexican resorts were shown packed with American students drinking and carousing. The travel agencies do a lot of advertising aimed at luring more students to Cancun, and they make a fortune on hotel reservations and airline tickets.

One aspect of Cancun and other Mexican tourist resorts which the news media have not been featuring is the danger of assault, rape, and robbery for young Americans who go to these places. I'll tell you a few horror stories that you certainly didn't hear about in the controlled media. In late March, ten students from Salisbury State University in Maryland went to Cancun for their spring break. They had bought a package deal from one of the travel agencies promoting trips to Cancun. On their third night in Cancun, as they headed back to their hotel on foot after an evening of partying with other students, they were accosted by a group of Mexican policemen. The policemen slapped them around a bit and then robbed them at gunpoint. That's right, the **policemen** robbed them.

They should have learned something from that, but apparently one robbery wasn't enough to overcome the liberal brainwashing they had received back home, to the effect that Mexicans are the same as White Americans, except that they speak a different language. The next night they were riding a bus through downtown Cancun. They thought that would be safer than walking, after their experience the night before. Mexicans on the bus began taunting the *gringos,* then an off-duty policemen kicked one of them in the back. Two of the Americans were dragged off the bus, and a group of about 20 Mexicans, including several policemen, began beating and kicking them. Finally, the policemen in the gang of assailants handcuffed one of the Americans, 20-year-old Peter Best, and hauled him off to the city jail. There he was beaten more, until he was sure that they intended to beat him to death.

And perhaps that is what would have happened to him, except that his friends went to the police station looking for him, where the police chief agreed to release Best if his friends would pay a $500 bribe to the chief. They paid, and the police allowed Best, who by this time was suffering from a concussion, to be led away. The students complained to the U.S. Embassy, which seemed quite unconcerned. More than 1,000 American students have had similar problems in Cancun so far this year, the embassy officer told them, indicating that there was very little which could be done.

Actually, the students from Salisbury State University were very fortunate: they were robbed only twice, beaten a couple of times, and forced to pay one bribe. The week after their ordeal Carol Schlossberg, an American woman who was an art instructor at Yale on vacation at the

Mexican resort of Puerto Escondido, was grabbed by two Mexicans while walking on a nearby beach, raped repeatedly, and then drowned for sport. Her naked body was found on the beach by other American tourists. The Mexican police say they know who did it, but so far no one has been arrested. A suspicion has been expressed that the police are waiting to see who will offer them the larger bribe: the killers, or those who want the killers arrested.

A favorite tactic used against American tourists in Mexico and nearby areas of Central America is bus hijacking -- a tactic in which police and soldiers often are involved. One such hijacking which, as an exception to the rule, actually made the news in the United States involved a busload of students and teachers from St. Mary's College, also in Maryland. In January a gang armed with military rifles halted their bus on the Pacific Highway in Guatemala. They were robbed, and then five of the girls were led into the adjacent cane fields and raped repeatedly. The girls testified that they were sure that the men who raped them were either soldiers or policemen, because they were wearing military boots and parts of uniforms.

As I said, this particular robbery and gang rape of American students made the news in the United States, but five other tourist bus hijackings and gang rapes in the same area during the previous six months -- that is, since July 1997 -- didn't make the news: which is why the St. Mary's College students weren't expecting what happened to them. And a tourist bus hijacking a year earlier near Acapulco, Mexico, didn't make the headlines in the United States either. In that hijacking a bus with 27 tourists was forced off the road at night by a gang of Mexicans flashing police badges. Eight of the female passengers, including a 14-year-old girl and a Norwegian woman as well as the American women, were gang-raped over a three-hour period. As in the case of the girls from St. Mary's College, these women didn't find out until afterward, when they complained to embassy officials, that such gang rapes of White passengers aboard tourist buses have become quite common in the area around Acapulco.

Even more common are the robbery and rape of White taxicab passengers in Mexico. Vacationing college girls who have heard about the dangers of Mexican taxis believe that they will be safe if three or four of them ride together in a taxi. What often happens is that the driver takes them to an area where some of his Mexican friends are waiting, and then all of the girls are robbed and raped. Sometimes they are able to walk back to their hotel afterward. And sometimes they simply disappear and end up being forced to work as prostitutes under indescribably horrible conditions.

One of the reasons for the growing danger young Americans face in visiting Mexico is the deteriorating economy and the endemic political corruption there. Despite repeated "bailouts" by U.S. taxpayers, the Mexican economy remains in chaos. Unemployment is high, and civil servants -- especially the police -- are notoriously underpaid. They make up for this by extortion, accepting bribes, and simple thuggery. Politics in Mexico always has been completely corrupt at every level. With enough money anything can be done, and one can easily buy exemption from punishment for any crime. Judges, politicians, and police officials are all for sale -- or at least, for rent. Without money, however, one can expect no mercy and no justice in Mexico -- especially if one is a *gringo.*

Racial hatred has become an increasingly important motivation in Mexican and other Central American attacks against Whites. The population of Mexico today is about 30 per cent more or less pure-blooded Indians; about 60 per cent *mestizos,* or European-Indian mongrels; and less than 10 per cent Whites, most of Spanish origin. Social caste in Mexico is based largely on the percentage of White -- that is, Spanish -- blood a person has, with Indians at the bottom of the social hierarchy, Whites at the top, and *mestizos* distributed in between roughly on the basis of their degree of Whiteness. At least, that's the way it used to be. These days the *mestizos* are feeling their oats and flexing their muscles more than in the past.

The red-bearded Spanish *conquistador,* Hernan Cortes, taught the Indians of Mexico to respect the White man. With 500 Spanish soldiers and 16 horses he landed in 1519 at what later became Veracruz, burned his ships behind him to discourage desertions, and during the next two years conquered all of Mexico, which at that time had a population of more than two million Indians, and utterly destroyed the empire of the Aztecs, who were renowned as fierce and bloodthirsty warriors. All of that, however, was nearly 500 years ago, and things have gone downhill since.

In contrast to the English settlers to the north, who came seeking land and brought their own women with them from England, the Spanish came seeking gold and brought no women. Instead they mated with the Indian women -- a practice encouraged by the priests accompanying them, who were eager to convert the Indians to Christianity. Thus began the growth of the *mestizo* element in Central America.

This process of racial mixture did not bring about the peaceful amalgamation of the races that the priests claimed it would. Instead, the history of Mexico has been a series of bloody revolutions and racial warfare, mostly of *mestizos* and Indians against Whites, but also of Indians against *mestizos,* as in the case of the recent civil war in Mexico's southernmost province of Chiapas.

Since the Second World War there has been a very noticeable growth in Mexican nationalist sentiment among the *mestizo* element in the southwestern United States, and a similar sentiment is found throughout Mexico. It expresses itself in a smoldering hatred of *gringos:* a hatred which often bursts into open flame.

The freely expressed rationale for this hatred is simple revanchism: the *gringos* took the American Southwest away from the Mexicans by force of arms, and now the Mexicans will take it back, through immigration and by outbreeding and outvoting the *gringos.* During some of the debate over curbing illegal immigration which led to California's Proposition 187, which would have taken some welfare benefits away from illegal immigrants, Mexican activists screamed at White proponents of the proposition: "If anybody is going to be deported, it's you!"

Illegal Mexican immigrants in the U.S. Southwest regard themselves as legally in territory that belongs to them, and many members of the Clinton government encourage this attitude, which helps to explain the Clinton Justice Department's opposition to Proposition 187 and a Federal judge's recent ruling that it cannot be enforced. Clinton's point man in California, Art Torres, is chairman of the California Democratic Party. He told his fellow Democrats: "Remember, 187 is the last gasp of White America in California." Yes, that's what a leader of the party which is in power in Washington now told his cheering Mexican followers in California.

Underneath this Mexican nationalism is genuine racial hatred and racial resentment. The *mestizo* compensates for his deeply felt racial inferiority by raping a blonde *gringa* and forcing her to submit to every indignity he can inflict on her, or by beating and robbing a *gringo.*

Actually, the rape of *gringas* has been a *mestizo* sport in the Mexican border towns for a number of years. Groups of college girls go into these border towns as tourists, naively believing that they can walk into a bar and drink with as much impunity as they can in a White bar in the United States. The common practice is for the bartender to slip a "mickey" into a girl's drink, and then when she becomes confused and disoriented, a group of *mestizos* will escort her into a back room and gang-rape her. The favorite "mickey" used today is a powerful sedative with the trade name Rohypnol. Illegal in the United States, it is readily available across the border. Complaining to the Mexican police after one of these drug-assisted rapes is fruitless, as hundreds of White college girls and their parents have discovered.

The revanchist sentiment of Mexicans is so strong that Mexican officials routinely refuse to punish Mexican criminals for offenses against White Americans in Mexico or to extradite Mexican criminals who are sought for crimes committed in the United States. A Mexican can rape, rob, or murder a White American, flee across the border, and not worry about being extradited. Even Mexican officials of essentially pure Spanish blood dare not openly oppose the widespread prejudice against *gringos.* Among *mestizos,* both in Mexico and in the United States, criminals who prey on *gringos* or flout *gringo* laws, are viewed as Latin Robin Hoods. Mexican drug lords, in particular, are glorified by the *mestizos,* and one of the most popular types of music among young *mestizos* in California and Texas today is the *narcocorrido,* a folk song in ballad form about the exploits of one or another drug boss.

So why do White college students flock to Mexico for their spring breaks? Mostly it's because they are kept completely in the dark about the danger until something happens to them personally. In the most expensive resort hotels, of course, they are relatively safe, as long as they stay in the hotels or on the beach immediately adjacent to the hotels. That's because there's big money involved in the tourist business, and the wealthy owners of the luxury hotels make it worth the while of the local police to maintain a reasonably safe environment for their patrons. For college kids who buy bargain excursion packages from travel agencies and are booked into second-class hotels -- as was the case of the ten students from Salisbury State University -- it's a different story. And for the White kids who believe that they can hitchhike around Mexico with a backpack or hang out in Mexican bars, it's pure suicide.

The biggest reason for this ignorance of the danger is that the controlled media are very reluctant to report crimes by *mestizos* against Whites -- and I'm talking about the controlled media in the United States. The Politically Correct view of the media people is that in any conflict between a White and a non-White, the White must be the aggressor, the bad guy, the "hate criminal;" and the non-White must be the inoffensive victim. To report an interracial crime which doesn't fit this view is tantamount to racism.

If one seeks information about the dangers for American tourists in Mexico from the U.S. State Department, one must look for it in the travel-advisory information made available to diplomats and embassy personnel. In this travel-advisory information the State Department warns that it is

very dangerous to use taxicabs in Mexico except when special precautions are exercised, that it's very dangerous to travel by bus through certain provinces, and so on. But this information is not published for the benefit of tourists or the general public. Not only would it be racist to publicize it, but it might discourage American tourists from going to Mexico and thereby hurt NAFTA and the Clinton government's program of promoting free trade with Mexico.

One thing which encourages attacks on American tourists and vacationing college kids is their all-too-obvious vulnerability. They head for Mexico chock full of notions about democracy, equality, and interracial brotherhood, and they expect the little, brown people of Mexico to be full of similar nonsense. Mexicans view White Americans as weak, foolish, and easy prey. Any respect for Whites that Cortes taught them has long since been dissipated by their experience with more recent and much softer generations of *gringos.* Whereas Cortes and his 500 Spanish soldiers cheerfully took on an army of Mexican Indians more than 100 times their size and sent them running for their lives, many American males today cannot protect either themselves or their women in a one-on-one physical confrontation with a Mexican -- and the Mexicans seldom give him such favorable odds.

An optimist might think that the misfortunes which befall many vacationing White college students in Mexico will be good educational experiences for them. Being raped, beaten up, or robbed by grinning *mestizos* who obviously hate their guts might cause the brainwashed students to reexamine the foolishness about racial equality which has been pumped into their heads by Politically Correct professors and textbooks. Seeing at first hand the corruption of the Mexican bureaucracy will make them question the wisdom of rushing headlong into Mr. Clinton's glorious New World Order, in which the United States will surrender its sovereignty and submit itself to the will of a non-White world majority not too different in character from that of the *mestizo* majority in Mexico.

An optimist might think that -- and if the media in this country would widely publicize these misfortunes, so that the lucky students could learn from the experiences of the unlucky ones, perhaps some good would come of it. But of course, the media are in the hands of people who hate our people as much as the *mestizos* do, and so every rape of a blond *gringa* on a tourist bus and every robbery and beating of a spring-breaking *gringo* who can't afford the luxury hotels in Cancun will continue to be just another individual tragedy for one of our people -- until we get our act together and straighten the whole mess out, Cortes style.

The Katyn Massacre

A background noise that seems never to go away is the constant whining and yammering of the Jews about how the world owes them a living because of their losses during the so-called "Holocaust." They do it, of course, because they make such a big profit on it. The latest flare-up of this Jewish play for a handout came more than a year ago when they began demanding that the Swiss pay them $7 billion, which "Holocaust" victims allegedly had stashed in numbered Swiss accounts before being hauled off to gas chambers during the Second World War.

With a few "bought" Gentile politicians fronting for them, the foremost among these being New York's Senator Alphonse D'Amato, the Jews threatened Switzerland with a boycott by the U.S. government if their demands were not met. Instead of laughing in their faces, telling the Jews to go to hell, and gearing up for countermeasures against Israel and other Jewish interests if the Jews tried to proceed with a boycott, the Swiss politicians tried to placate the Jews by offering to buy them off. The Jews took the Swiss response as a sign of weakness and escalated their demands.

The average Swiss citizen seems to have a little more pride than Switzerland's elected officials, however, and resentment against the Jews' extortion efforts is building in Switzerland now to the point that some of that country's richest Jews are wearing bulletproof vests whenever they must go out in public.

In general, however, this "Holocaust"-based extortion racket works quite well for the Jews, and they have expanded their demands for World War Two reparations to include a number of other countries besides Switzerland. They are even whining that the Vatican owes them because Pope Pius XII didn't do enough to save them from the Germans during the war. The Jews' brazenness in this whole business is quite breathtaking.

Their brazenness is justified, because by and large they have been getting away with it. They have been getting away with it because with their media control they have been able to distort the general public's perception of what happened during the Second World War. They have been able to portray themselves as innocent victims and everyone else as persecutors and aggressors, even the people who were fighting on the Jewish side against the Germans during the war. They have done quite a bit of whining that after the Red Army drove the Germans from Poland, the Poles took the opportunity to lynch hundreds of Jews in 1945 and 1946: Jews whom the **Germans** somehow had failed to get rid of during their wartime occupation of Poland.

Why would the Poles do something like that? Why would they lynch the poor Jews, who had been on their side during the war? If you learned about the war from watching Steven Spielberg propaganda films and other mass-media sources, you probably believe that it was because of religious anti-Semitism on the part of the Catholic Poles. Let me tell you the **real** reason why so many Poles hated Jews after the war. It's something the Jew-controlled media in America haven't said much about. Let me tell you about what happened in the Katyn Forest in 1940.

In September 1939 Poland was invaded from the west by Germany and from the east by the Soviet Union. The Germans wanted back the territory in western Poland, including the city of Danzig, which had been taken from them at the end of the First World War. The Soviets wanted eastern Poland. The Germans and the Soviets divided Poland between them, with the boundary running roughly along the River Bug.

Britain and France, both under strong Jewish pressure, declared war on Germany in September 1939, ostensibly because of Germany's invasion of Poland. They did not declare war on the Soviet Union, which also had invaded Poland. In the United States and in western Europe, where the Jews held a deathgrip on the mass media, a great deal of anti-German propaganda was based on the German grab for Polish territory -- much of which, of course, actually was historically German territory -- and nothing was said of the Soviet occupation and annexation of eastern Poland.

The reason for this anti-German and pro-Soviet bias by the Jewish media was that the Jews were riding high in the Soviet Union as commissars and communist party bosses under Stalin, while in Germany Hitler had undertaken a program since 1933 of freeing Germany from all Jewish influence. Jews had been weeded out of the media, the law, the schools, and other areas of economic and cultural life in Germany. Before Hitler became chancellor in 1933 the Jews had done in Germany what they do in every country where they gain a foothold: they had monopolized large sections of the mass media and certain professions and were doing their best to distort German culture, German society, and the German economy to suit themselves. Hitler put a stop to that, and two-thirds of the 1933 Jewish population of Germany had emigrated by the invasion of Poland in September 1939. So the Jews hated Germany and were determined to do whatever they could to destroy her.

For his part, Hitler hoped to avoid war with Britain and France. He hoped that after his quick victory in western Poland he could make peace with both countries. He was determined, however, to stamp out communism wherever he encountered it. Not only did he hate communism on ideological grounds, but he had sworn to fight communism when the communists in Germany betrayed his country at the end of the First World War. Hitler also saw the Soviet Union as a threat to all of Europe, and he was determined to break the power of that country when he could, even though there was an uneasy non-aggression pact between Germany and the Soviet Union in 1939, at the time of their partition of Poland.

In the spring of 1941 massive troop movements and other developments inside the Soviet Union convinced Hitler that Stalin was preparing to invade the west with the Red Army, and so in June 1941 Hitler made a preemptive strike. German forces smashed through the Red Army and made rapid advances, first through Soviet-occupied eastern Poland and then through Ukraine and into Russia.

A year and a half later, in February 1943, German forces near Smolensk, in western Russia, investigated reports they heard from Russian civilians to the effect that a large number of prisoners had been murdered by the Soviet secret police in the area nearly three years earlier. The German investigators were led by local Russians to a series of mounds in a wooded area known locally as Katyn Forest, about 10 miles west of Smolensk. The forest is named for a

village, Katyn, which it surrounds. The forest had been privately owned prior to the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, but after the communist takeover of Russia the area had been confiscated by the government and part of the forest had been turned over to the NKVD, the Soviet equivalent of the American FBI.

The Germans began digging in the mounds in the Katyn Forest and made a horrible discovery. They found corpse after corpse, each with its hands bound behind its back and a bullet hole in the base of its skull. They continued their excavations for more than a month, and eventually uncovered more than 4,000 corpses. Other bodies may have remained buried in other mounds, but the Germans had no time to dig up the whole forest. Instead they called in the International Red Cross and representatives of various neutral countries to examine their findings. They also brought in groups of Allied prisoners of war, including Americans, from prison camps in Germany to view the graves in the Katyn Forest. They gave these international inspectors complete freedom to examine the exhumed bodies, permitted doctors among them to conduct autopsies, even allowed them to dig up other bodies from one of the mounds which had not been completely excavated. The Germans asked only that the inspectors report back truthfully to their own governments about their observations. And in fact, most of them did.

What they reported was that the bodies were those of Polish military officers, along with a number of civilian cultural leaders, business leaders, and intellectuals -- scientists, writers, and poets -- who had been in the portion of Poland occupied by the Soviet Union in September 1939. Altogether the Soviet secret police had rounded up some 15,000 Polish leaders in 1939 -- including nearly half of the entire Polish officer's corps, the half that had the misfortune of being in eastern Poland at the time -- and put them in three concentration camps in Russia: at Starobelsk, Kozelsk, and Ostashkov. All of the bodies unearthed in the Katyn Forest were of Polish leaders who had been confined at one of these camps: Starobelsk.

Rounding up a country's leaders and killing them was standard practice for the communists. The theory was that the leaders were bourgeois oppressors of the working class and deserved to die. As egalitarians the communists did not regard the Polish officers and intellectuals as inherently better or more valuable human material than the average Polish criminal or bum; the officers had simply used their class advantage to gain a better life-style for themselves. Of course, no one really believed that theory except the criminals, bums, and other resentful losers and ne'er-do-wells who made up the natural communist constituency. As a practical matter, however, killing all the leaders and potential leaders of a conquered people made them easier to govern. That's what the Marxists had done in Russia, Ukraine, and the Baltic countries.

In the case of the Poles there was a bit of a diplomatic problem, though. The Poles supported the war Britain and France had declared against Germany, purportedly on their behalf, because they viewed that as their one hope for getting back at least the western part of their country. They were not happy about the Russians taking the eastern part of Poland, but the Russians at least were fellow Slavs. The thing to do was get rid of the Germans first and then worry about the Russians. This Polish strategy suited Stalin fine. But it made it desirable for him to avoid alienating the Poles any more than necessary. When Polish exiles asked about their imprisoned leaders in late 1939 and early 1940, the Soviet government promised that they would be released shortly. Meanwhile, the decision had been made to kill all of them. And so in April 1940 the

Polish leaders were taken from the three camps where they had been imprisoned, trucked off to various liquidation sites, and murdered. The ones who had been imprisoned at Starobelsk all went to the NKVD area of the Katyn Forest. After the war some of the NKVD executioners were interviewed in Israel and described how they had carried out the killings.

The Poles were driven up to the burial pits in long NKVD prison trucks known as "black ravens." They were pulled from the trucks one at a time by NKVD guards. Each Polish prisoner had his hands bound behind his back and then was dragged to the edge of a pit. There he was held by two NKVD men while a third fired a pistol bullet into the back of his head. Some of the officers had their coats pulled over their heads to keep them from seeing what was happening before they were shot. Some struggled and were bayoneted by NKVD guards before being shot and thrown into the pit. When all of the officers from Starobelsk had been killed, some 4,400 of them, the Katyn Forest burial pits were covered with dirt and pine trees were planted on them. The locations of the mass graves of the prisoners from the camps at Kozelsk and Ostashkov remain unknown, but none of the 15,000 Polish officers and intellectuals rounded up by the NKVD in September 1939 was seen alive after April 1940.

The Red Cross representatives and the Allied prisoners the Germans brought in to examine the mass graves in the Katyn Forest understood after their examination not only who had been killed; they also understood who had killed them. This was apparent not only from the medical estimates of the length of time the bodies had been buried, but also from documentary evidence on the bodies. Diaries, news clippings, letters, and other personal papers removed from the clothing of the victims all told the same story: the latest dates on any of these papers were from mid-April 1940. The Polish leaders had been killed in April 1940, when they were prisoners of the Soviet Union and when the Katyn region was under Soviet control. And this is what they reported back to their governments.

So what do you think happened? Were the British and American governments horrified to discover that their "gallant Soviet ally," as the Soviet Union was referred to by the mass media, was a mass murderer? Did the British government, which had gone to war against Germany under the pretext of defending Poland, decide that it had made a mistake? Did anyone condemn the Soviet Union for this act of genocide against the Poles?

Of course not! The Allied governments ordered their people who had inspected the Katyn site to keep their mouths shut, and the Jewish media immediately began announcing that the Germans had done it. A mass murder of Polish officers and intellectuals by the Nazis had been discovered in the Katyn Forest, the *New York Times* and the rest of the Jewish media shrieked. Poor Poles! Wicked Germans! The war must go on to free the poor Poles and punish the wicked Germans. And the war did go on, killing millions of more Germans, Britons, Americans, and other Europeans. And the Germans were indeed punished. The Poles, of course, were not freed. Instead they were turned over to the Reds, who had butchered their leaders in the Katyn Forest, and made to suffer under communist rule for half a century.

The war went on after the German discovery of the mass graves in the Katyn Forest, because its purpose from the beginning was not to free Poland but to destroy Germany, which had dared to free itself from the Jews. Roosevelt understood this. Churchill understood this. But the American

and British people didn't understand it, of course, because they were lied to by the Jewish media and by their own governments, who in 1943, as in 1998, did whatever was politically expedient. And what is politically expedient has been what the Jewish media bosses have decided.

The lies about Katyn were maintained by the media for some years after the end of the war, because these lies meshed nicely with the "Holocaust" story which was making so much money for the Jews. Nowadays, of course, the truth about the Katyn murders is generally accepted by historians everywhere. You can go into almost any large library and read about it and even see the gruesome photographs that the Germans took of the Polish bodies they dug up. One of several authoritative books on the subject is J.K. Zawodny's *Death in the Forest: the Story of the Katyn Forest Massacre,* published in 1962 by the University of Notre Dame Press. None of this is publicized a la Steven Spielberg for the illumination of American television audiences, of course. It still might undermine the Jews' "Holocaust" racket.

In 1945 and 1946, although the deceived citizens of the Western world didn't know the truth about Katyn, Polish patriots did. The word had gotten back to the Polish prisoners in German camps from the Poles the Germans had taken to examine the graves. After the war, when these Polish prisoners were freed, the word spread to other Poles. They knew that it was the communists, not the Nazis, who had murdered their leaders, who had beheaded their nation. And they knew who was behind communism -- from the Jew, Karl Marx, who started the whole business, to the Jewish commissars in Soviet-occupied Poland. They knew who had welcomed their Soviet conquerors and then collaborated with those conquerors. And so it is hardly surprising that in 1945 and 1946 a few Polish patriots organized lynchings of Jews in Poland, before the Reds had a chance to clamp down and suppress any further expressions of anti-communist or anti-Jewish feeling.

The Polish dislike of Jews isn't surprising. What is surprising is that so few patriots in America and Britain have expressed their outrage against the Jews, not only for what they did to the Poles during and after the war, but for what they have done to us: lying to us and using us to wage their wars for them. If patriots study the Katyn story and take its lesson to heart, they will understand why they cannot trust either the mass media or any government which dances to the tune played by the media. Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill were as much liars and traitors as Bill Clinton and Tony Blair.

You might remember Katyn the next time you hear the Jews or some of their bought politicians whining about how much gold was stolen from them by the Swiss or how badly the Poles and the Germans treated them during the Second World War.

Nationalism vs. the New World Order

An interesting thing happened recently. The government of India detonated five nuclear warheads in underground tests, and the establishment in the United States reacted with shock and dismay.

This is good news for at least six reasons. I'll name them, one reason at a time.

First, the nuclear tests were a complete surprise to the Clinton government. That's a wonderful proof of the fallibility of government. Too many people believe you can't fight the government because the government has the secret police working on its side, and the secret police know everything. Our Central Intelligence Agency spends $27 billion a year to be aware of what's happening around the world, including the building of facilities for making nuclear warheads and other weapons of mass destruction, and the CIA didn't have a clue! An even better scenario would be that the CIA knew but kept it a secret from the Clinton administration. But that is unlikely since the head spook himself is a Clintonista, and the Indian episode could cost him his job.

The Indian tests prove that for all of the government's repressiveness, all of its money, all of its jackbooted Federal thugs, all of its wiretaps, subpoenas, and paid informers, it still can be outsmarted by intelligent and determined patriots. Certainly not by a bunch of boozed-up yahoos who make their plans in the local bar, but by intelligent, disciplined, and determined patriots.

The second reason India's nuclear tests are good news is that they let a lot of air out of the principal excuse given by the Clinton government for its campaign against Iraq, which nearly led us into another war in the Persian Gulf a while back and which will still lead us into a war, if the Jews and the Clintonistas have their way. The excuse for the campaign against Iraq was that we must keep weapons of mass destruction under tight control. We must keep Iraq from developing such weapons.

India has demonstrated that we have already **lost** control. Of course, this won't stop the Clintonistas from arguing that Iraq can't be allowed to develop weapons of mass destruction, but that argument will seem a bit flat now. Some people accepted this argument only because they believed that the genie of "weapons of mass destruction" was tightly corked up in his bottle. It is now clear even to these deluded people that the genie is out, and bombing Iraq into the stone age won't put him back in again.

The third reason India's nuclear tests are good news is that all of the hullabaloo about countries developing nuclear weapons without permission from the United Nations should remind everyone that the most egregious example of such outlaw nuclear development is that of Israel. The controlled media, of course, have been covering for Israel, but the more fuss they make about India, the more questions thoughtful people will have about Israel. The hypocrisy of the treatment by the Washington government and the media of the whole topic of controlling weapons of mass destruction should become more apparent.

Obviously the policy of preventing unstable countries from acquiring nuclear or biological weapons is a sham. The failure to apply the policy in the case of Israel -- the deliberate failure to halt Israel's development of a nuclear arsenal, when the U.S. government knew that development was occurring -- undermined the moral basis for the policy long ago, and we should not be surprised that no one takes it seriously today.

The fourth reason we should be glad for India's nuclear tests is that they are a big psychological setback for the New World Order crowd. The liberals, the Jews, and the other New World Order boosters have worked hard to create the impression that the coming of the New World Order is irresistible. It is a steamroller, and you'd better not get in its way, or you'll be squashed. The impressionable masses have let themselves be persuaded to go along for the ride, even if they aren't especially enthusiastic. One of the consolations, in their eyes, is the promise of security and certainty: once the New World Order is solidly in place, no one anywhere will be able to do anything without permission from the people pulling the strings at the United Nations, and so there will be no more wars or other nasty surprises, and the masses can get on with being obedient consumers and television viewers without having to worry about making any difficult decisions.

Now India has demonstrated that the New World Order is quite resistible after all. India has thumbed its nose at all of the people who've been assuring us that national sovereignty is passé and that in the future everyone must do whatever the UN bosses say.

What are the Clintonistas and the Jews going to do about this little rebuff India has given them? Send a few aircraft carriers to the Indian Ocean and threaten New Delhi with cruise missiles? Not likely. It's a bit easier to push Iraq around than India, with its population of one billion and a continent to itself. The head New World Order gangster in the United States, Bill Clinton, says that India will be punished economically for daring to stand in the way of his gang. And undoubtedly that's what will happen. Even if the head gangster changes his mind, the economic sanctions already have been written into law. And these attempts to punish India by cutting off trade, blocking loans, and other economic measures are the fifth reason why India's nuclear tests are good news.

The Jews can get away with their starvation embargo against Iraq, but that sort of thing just won't work against India. On the contrary, it will have several good effects on the Indian people. It will teach them the virtue of self-sufficiency and strengthen their sense of nationalism and their determination to be masters in their own house. In fact, as soon as the threat of economic punishment was raised last week, the Indians expressed their defiance and their contempt for any American efforts to make them conform to UN policy.

The Hindus have always been wary of the Jews. Back during the Second World War, when they were under the colonial thumb of the British Empire, Hindu nationalists were sympathetic toward Germany, and they learned from the Germans many lessons about the Jews -- lessons which have not been entirely forgotten. Economic sanctions against them now by the Jews' American lapdog will confirm the Hindus' antipathy toward the people who believe that their god chose them to rule the world. The more economic pressure Bill Clinton tries to bring against

India, the more determined Indians will be to cut any dependence on the United Nations and become self-sufficient. All of that is very good.

Furthermore, because many American consumer goods are now imported from India, there might be some substantial economic dislocations in the United States if Mr. Clinton starts a trade war with India, and this should help everyone to see better just how uncertain and shaky the whole concept of a global economy is.

This is a good time to remember one of the most important and fundamental rules of historical development: Decisive historical events always catch many people by surprise, and the people most likely to be caught by surprise are the smart-asses who thought they had everything under control. Many decent people today are discouraged and pessimistic about the future, because they believe that the enemies of our people have an unbreakable grip on the course of events. Decent people see the media almost completely under the control of the Jews; they see the Jews all around Clinton, Jews running most of the important branches of the U.S. government -- the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the Defense Department. They see similar situations in the governments in Britain, Russia, Germany, and France. Everyone bows and scrapes to the Jews, every important politician is in their pockets, everyone is afraid to call them to account for their crimes.

They see the destruction wrought among our own people by the Jews' policies -- White kids hooked on MTV and behaving like Blacks, non-White immigrants pouring into America, and the threat of a non-White majority in America in the next few decades. They see the continuing implementation of the master plan: a global plantation with Jews as God's Chosen Overseers, and the rest of the world's population as obedient serfs. They see the United Nations "peacekeeping" forces always ready to put down any insurrection by the disarmed serfs. Decent people see these things, and they believe the Jews have everything under control. Many of them become discouraged and give up.

So the sixth reason why the Indian nuclear tests are good news for decent people everywhere is that they serve as an encouraging reminder of the fundamental rule of historical development: nothing about the future is certain, except that the smart-asses will be caught by surprise, no matter how tightly they think they have things under control. And it is a major upset of the kosher applecart when India, with its one billion people and its own strategically located subcontinent, tells the Jews to take their New World Order and stuff it.

Even more kosher apples are likely to be rolling in the gutter before the Jews have time to pick up the ones spilled by the Indians. India has had ongoing border disputes with both Pakistan and China for some time. Both of these countries will have a strong incentive now to tell the arms control people from the United Nations to go to hell and to resume the development of their own nuclear arsenals. This is an especially promising prospect in the case of Pakistan, which as an Islamic country has close bonds of sympathy with the Palestinians, the Iraqis, the Iranians, and the other Islamic peoples opposed to Israel's aggression in the Middle East. Every development which thwarts Washington's role as the Jews' global bully-boy and enforcer is a good development.

There are just two components of the Jews' power: one is money, and the other is their control of public opinion through their control of the news and entertainment media. In the West they are able to use both their money and their media control to retain their power. They use their money to buy politicians, and they use their media control to keep the general public more or less hypnotized and aimed in the direction they want.

In the East the Jews don't control the mass media and are not able to keep the Asian masses hypnotized. But they nevertheless have been able to use their money to corrupt Asian governments. That is, they have been able to use **our** money for that purpose. They have been able to use American foreign-aid money, loans from various international banks, and the giveaway or sale of military hardware to keep the politicians of the Third World more or less under control. If Saudi Arabia wants to buy American jets for its air force, then it must promise not to make any problems for Israel. If some Black potentate in Africa is encroaching on an Oppenheimer mining operation, then a few million dollars in foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury will make him mend his ways and keep his Black hands off the Chosen Ones' diamond mines. That's the way it always has worked.

There's just one thing in the Third World -- or anywhere -- which can beat the Jews' money power, and that thing is nationalism. That's why the Jews have such a hatred for every nationalism but their own. They hate **every** nationalism **except** Zionism. When India was ruled by the thoroughly corrupt Congress Party, the Jews were able to keep the Indians more or less under control. But in March of this year the Hindu nationalists won control of the Indian government, and for the nationalists independence is more important than all the comforts money can buy. That's why India's new nationalist prime minister is willing to defy the Jews and do without American money.

The Jews, of course, still will try to use their money power -- that is, their control over our public funds -- to bribe the Indians and others back into line. The first thing which the Clinton government announced after the Indian nuclear tests was that it was reconsidering its hold on Pakistan's purchase of American military aircraft. The sale had been held up because of Jewish objections to letting an Islamic country buy modern military aircraft. Now, says the Clinton government, if the Pakistanis will forego any nuclear tests of their own, maybe they can have the aircraft after all. And similar bribes will be offered to India and China. The Chinese will be told that if they don't react the wrong way to the Indian nuclear tests, then their exports of machine tools and shoes to the United States won't be jeopardized because of piddling little things like human rights violations.

These bribes have worked for the Jews in the past, and their money power is what they're counting on to keep the world moving toward their goal of a kosher global plantation. Nationalism is the one force which can thwart them, the one political ideology active on a large scale in the world today in which money is not the primary concern. That is why any success by nationalists anywhere in the world today, any declaration of independence from the global plantation, is good news for decent, freedom-loving people everywhere. It is good news when it happens in Germany, Hungary, or France, but it is especially good news when it happens in a place like India, which is big enough and sufficiently free from Jewish influence to be able to put

a significant monkey wrench into the gears of the New World Order's machinery of global enslavement.

We in the National Alliance are not nationalists in the old-fashioned sense, in the sense of geographical nationalism. We don't belong to the "USA, right or wrong" crowd, which considers any featherless biped claiming U.S. citizenship, regardless of race, color, or creed, as a compatriot. Our nationalism is really racial nationalism. Our compatriots are our fellow White men and women, our fellow Europeans, everywhere: in America, in Europe, in South Africa. Nationalism in our sense -- racial nationalism -- is still a relatively new thing as a political ideology, although it is based on instincts much older than any ideology.

A lot of people, conservatives especially, are still much more comfortable with the old-fashioned sort of nationalism -- or with an ethnic nationalism which is much more limited in scope than our racial nationalism. Conservatives are more comfortable with Scottish nationalism or German nationalism or Polish nationalism. And that's all right. We encourage these more limited ethnic nationalisms. We encourage any nationalism which is not anti-European or anti-White. We even welcome Black nationalism, Hindu nationalism, or Chinese nationalism, because nationalists of every variety are facing a much bigger threat today than any rival nationalism. Intelligent Hindu nationalists understand that Irish nationalists, Ukrainian nationalists, and Swedish nationalists need not be hostile to them, and we understand that too.

Every national group which is concerned with preserving itself, with preserving its unique racial characteristics, its unique language, its unique culture, traditions, and life-styles, is the natural ally of every other nationally conscious group at a time when all of us are faced with the threat of the Jews' New World Order. Once the Jews have realized their global plantation -- a plantation without national boundaries, with a homogenized population, a homogenized culture, and a uniform standard of living for the serfs -- every nationality will be lost permanently in the mass. Now is the time to derail this nightmare scheme for global subjugation, and any nationality, Hindu or other, which helps in derailing it, by whatever means, deserves our praise. The prospect of a nuclear arms race between India, China, and Pakistan may not seem very encouraging, but it is a far brighter prospect than a continuation of the process of globalization being promoted by the Jews and their allies, whether international capitalists or deranged liberals.

So for all of the reasons I have mentioned, India's detonation of nuclear warheads is very good news indeed for decent, freedom-loving patriots everywhere.

Building Understanding

We recently took a survey of just under a thousand regular listeners to *American Dissident Voices* who also subscribe to the texts of the broadcasts by e-mail. We wanted to know what listeners especially like or dislike about these broadcasts. We wanted ideas which will help us do a better job of reaching and moving as many people as possible. We were gratified by the many compliments and expressions of appreciation we received from listeners. It's nice to know that our efforts are being well received by so many thoughtful people.

We also appreciated the criticisms and suggestions for improvement made by listeners. The most frequent criticism we had was that I talk too much about Bill Clinton. One listener told me that everyone already knows that all politicians are lower than scum, and it doesn't do a bit of good to prove that to them over and over again by using Bill Clinton as an example. Another listener said it makes him depressed and sick to his stomach every time he hears Clinton's name, and he'd appreciate my talking about more positive things, such as the AIDS epidemic or the "Holocaust." A third listener said that he doesn't want to hear any more about Clinton's zipper problem; he wants to know what can be done about Clinton's breathing problem.

Well, I can sympathize with the people who are tired of hearing about Clinton, but I don't agree that it does no good to continue talking about him. I believe that we would be overly optimistic to assume that everyone already understands what dirtballs politicians are. I'm afraid that many people haven't figured that out yet, although probably those same people also don't have a long enough attention span to listen to an *American Dissident Voices* broadcast from beginning to end or to read an entire issue of *Free Speech* -- so perhaps detailing Clinton's problems doesn't really help them.

But I don't really talk about Clinton's problems to persuade people that he, personally, is a nogoodnik. I do believe that practically everyone who listens to this program already understands that. I believe that we have among our listeners very few people who give Clinton a high approval rating. But I also believe that Clinton can provide us with many very persuasive lessons about the system which put him into the White House. There are many people of reasonable intelligence and good will -- even many patriots -- who despise Clinton personally and despise Clinton's policies, but who still have faith in the **system** which made Clinton President. I think that an exposition of the Clinton phenomenon can help to illuminate these people. Clinton provides for us, after all, such a wonderfully extreme example of what can go wrong with a society and with a system of government.

If in 1982 I had described a man like Clinton to you and told you that in ten years he'd be in the White House and have an approval rating higher than any other President, you'd have thought I was crazy. You'd have laughed at me and told me it couldn't happen. So it is useful for us, to note that it **has** happened, and to try to understand **how** it happened, to try to understand **what** has gone wrong with us and with the system of government under which we live.

We need to convince a lot of Americans who already despise Clinton that we must do much more than simply get rid of **him** and his crowd of Jews, feminists, and 1960s-style whiners and

liberals. We need to convince Americans that the **system itself** is profoundly flawed and needs to be fixed in a radical way, in a fundamental way.

I am sorry, but I just cannot avoid talking more about Clinton. He is like the Rosetta Stone to an understanding of what's wrong with democracy; he's a gold mine for anyone looking for ammunition to use against this system. Just before a Federal court in Arkansas blocked Paula Jones's lawsuit, two more rapees had surfaced from Clinton's days as attorney general of Arkansas, one of whom apparently was paid to sign a statement saying she hadn't been raped, and the other of whom was trying to dodge a subpoena by staying out of the country. But I will promise to focus less on the sordid details of the Clinton life-style and more on the lessons about democracy these things teach us. I really don't need to rehash what everyone can now read in the *New York Times* about Clinton's zipper problem.

Another criticism of my broadcasts by some listeners is that occasionally I become a little bloody-minded. Sometimes when I'm talking about America's internal enemies I let my anger get the better of me and I express a "let's hang them all" attitude toward these enemies. I've thought about this, and I'm inclined to agree with my critics. There's no point in talking about vengeance or punishment at this point in our struggle. It's counterproductive, and it's a sign of weakness on my part when I let my anger influence what I say. I'll try harder to overcome this weakness in the future.

At the same time I should mention that I'm a little disappointed when I'm talking with another person about what's been done to our people and I don't see any sign of anger or passion in that person. Anger is an appropriate response to our situation. It only becomes inappropriate when it clouds our reason and hinders the effectiveness of our response to our enemies. We need to remain level-headed and calm; we need to let reason rather than anger control our tongues and guide our planning; but deep inside there should be a white-hot anger driving us.

So I cannot promise not to be angry, but I do promise to try to keep my anger under control, to keep it from leading me to say foolish things. And it is foolish to talk about hanging America's internal enemies at a time when we are in no position to punish anyone. I'll not speak of punishment or vengeance again, until that position changes.

But there's another aspect of this criticism of my bloody-mindedness. Sometimes I look ahead a bit to where the government's policies are taking us, and I see some horrible and bloody things coming, and I have a feeling that some listeners would prefer not to hear about these things. They become uncomfortable or frightened when I speak of domestic terrorism or the breakdown of civil order in the United States and the death and suffering of many White Americans. I suspect that 200 years ago, just after the French Revolution, the French population of Haiti didn't want to hear what some of their more realistic members warned them was coming as a result of extending liberty, equality, and fraternity to their Black plantation workers.

It's not really bloody-mindedness that compels me to talk about these unpleasant prospects. It is my sense of responsibility. Americans who believe that they can elect or even tolerate governments like the one we have in Washington now and continue to be safe and secure indefinitely are not living in the real world. People who believe that eternal vigilance is too high

a price to pay for their liberty inevitably will end up paying a much higher price, and they very well may pay it in vain. People need to be told this, whether they want to hear it or not.

The real world is not like it appears on television, where everything somehow works out all right in the end. In the real world when people abdicate their responsibilities, they pay the price, very often in blood. When governments fall into the hands of criminals, the citizens ultimately will suffer. When the owners of a country become soft and lazy and open their borders to hungry aliens, they will be eaten alive. A lot of listeners might prefer not to think about it, but they really should. And I will continue to remind them of that.

One of the questions on our survey asked listeners which program they found most interesting. There were a number of favorites, but the easy winner was the program I did in February on the sinking of the German passenger liner *Wilhelm Gustloff.* Often I've heard from people that I shouldn't talk about the Second World War. It makes people uncomfortable to be told that we fought on the wrong side in the war. A lot of older veterans, in particular, don't like to hear that. But I talk about subjects like the sinking of the *Wilhelm Gustloff* and the rape of the women of Monte Cassino even if they make some people uncomfortable, because it is necessary for us to understand the history of the Second World War. It was a watershed era. It was the time when our enemies established their deathgrip on America. It was the time when we were tricked into committing -- and assisting in the commission of -- the most horrible atrocities of the modern era, atrocities against our own race. Our participation in the Second World War was an act of national and racial suicide. The policies that are destroying America today grew directly out of that war.

The popularity of the program on the *Wilhelm Gustloff* is good because it suggests that the prejudice against talking frankly about the Second World War may be dying, and that in the future more Americans may be willing to listen to the truth about that war. I intend to have more programs dealing with various aspects of that war.

There are some very important subjects which I've discussed from a viewpoint which is considered taboo in polite society, even by people who are not liberals and who agree with me on less "sensitive" matters. My viewpoint on the Second World War is an example. So is my viewpoint on racial matters. Both viewpoints are taboo, socially forbidden. People who agree with me about who committed the mass murders of Polish leaders in the Katyn Forest, who agree with me about the horrible atrocities committed by the communists, and who agree with me on nearly every other material and moral issue of the war will gasp and turn pale when I conclude that we fought on the wrong side. Our enemies have invested so much effort in blackening that point of view, in brainwashing our people against it, that people who are taboo-conscious simply cannot overcome it. People who are able to take small steps which are Politically Incorrect simply cannot take such a large step. They think, often wrongly, that their friends would shun them if they did, and they wouldn't be invited to the "right" parties again.

Likewise, many people who will agree with me on most details of the racial problem run into a similar taboo when it comes to drawing conclusions as to what we must **do** about the racial problem. If what I propose to do in order to safeguard the future of our race seems "unfair" to other races, these taboo-bound people can't deal with it. At a polite dinner party they will discuss

the wrongness of affirmative action, racial differences in intelligence, and the damage that racial integration has done to our society. But if I point out that the only way to deal with the racial problem is total, geographical racial separation by whatever means are necessary, they will strangle on their hors d'oeuvres! Too big a taboo.

Some listeners have advised me to be a bit more cautious about running afoul of these taboos: if otherwise sympathetic listeners can't deal with it, then I shouldn't say it, they advise. Perhaps that makes sense in some cases. But I've got a pretty stubborn streak in me when it comes to dealing with the truth. It's seldom that I'm willing to suppress a truth or to leave an important truth unstated because of a taboo. I am by nature just not much of a politician, diplomat, or lawyer. I don't want to alienate good people, of course, but I'm inclined to believe that the time is getting a bit late to do anything other than deal forthrightly with the urgent matters facing us. Many people prefer to remain polite, but I'm inclined to get down and dirty. And ultimately I believe that's the only way we can win.

After the criticism that I spend too much time talking about Clinton, the next most frequent criticism is that I don't provide solutions to the problems I present. "You tell us what's wrong with the system," many listeners complained, "but you don't tell us how to fix it. You don't tell us what to do about it."

Well, actually, on a number of broadcasts I **have** said that what we must do now is build understanding. Ultimately, in order to fix things we need a total revolution. We need to weed out the people who have deceived, betrayed, and exploited us, and we need to completely redesign and rebuild the system and the institutions which have been corrupted. We need to build a new system which will not so easily fall prey to the abuses which have taken over the present system.

Before we can have a successful revolution, however, we must build understanding among our people. We must have a substantial portion of our people in agreement with us that the continuation of the present system is intolerable and will lead to chaos and disaster. We must have agreement that a revolution is necessary -- then there will **be** a revolution. But understanding and agreement must come **first.** We must not act blindly or foolishly or prematurely.

Therefore, my own efforts have been directed toward building understanding, and I suggest that you help with these efforts. I've said that often, but perhaps I haven't been concrete enough or specific enough. So now I'll try to be more specific and concrete.

What can we do about the lunacy which is wrecking our country, derailing our civilization, and threatening our race with extinction? What can we do to get the inmates back into their cages and put the keepers in control of the asylum again? The general answer is "build understanding." But specifically, what **I** am doing in that direction is broadcasting 12 times each week, on 10 different radio stations in the United States. One of these stations reaches the whole world via shortwave twice each week. The other stations reach local audiences in about a dozen states through the AM and FM broadcast bands. That's not much compared with what it could be and what it should be, but it's a beginning. I'm reaching a growing audience, both directly by radio and also through the Internet, where my programs can be heard too.

So specifically, that is one of the things **I** am doing to build understanding. I know that it is having some effect in that direction, just because the listenership is growing, and so are the responses.

I have said that **you** can help with this effort. There are several ways in which you can help. You can send money. It costs a lot of money to put this program on the air. The more money listeners send, the more stations we can get and the more people we can reach. If you can send money, then you should do it. You shouldn't assume that you don't have to because other people will.

There also are other things you can do to help build understanding. Instead of listening to these programs by yourself and keeping them a secret, you can tell other people about them. You can get other people to listen with you. Use every medium you can to help new listeners find us. Mention this program, with the time and frequency, on radio talk shows. Mention it in letters to the editor of your local newspaper. Buy extra copies of *Free Speech* and give them to people you think might be interested. The prices are below the masthead on the first page. Or get a tape of each week's show sent to you for $300 a year; then you can give copies of the tapes to people who you think are open to our ideas. Many people chip in with their friends for a tape subscription and then share the tapes.

And if you really want to help on a continuing and regular basis -- if you want to be involved in a program of very specific things you can do to help me build understanding -- then you can become a member of the National Alliance. Write to the address at the bottom of the page and ask for an application form, and we will send one to you.

The School Problem

The education of America's children is a matter of continuing controversy and anguish for many Americans, including a majority of White parents with school-age children. Americans are unhappy about the level of violence in the schools, which keeps going up, and the educational standards, which keep going down. Parents are increasingly concerned that their children are not safe in public schools, and just about every responsible White adult is concerned about the failure of America's schools to educate young Americans well enough to keep America technologically and economically competitive in an increasingly competitive world.

Now the politicians are arguing with one another about how to solve these problems -- well, not so much about how to **solve** the problems as how to convince the public that they **care,** that they feel the parents' pain, and that they **want** to help. Bill Clinton wants to demonstrate that he cares by spending $25 billion to build "better" schools and add more facilities. His proposal gives him an opportunity to attack Republicans who don't support his spending proposal as being uncaring.

For their part, the Republicans are enthusiastic about various schemes which permit students to opt out of the public schools and attend either private schools or so-called charter schools, which are an increasingly trendy variation of the traditional public schools. These Republican programs generally involve tax credits, vouchers, or other financial assistance to encourage private schools or charter schools and make it feasible for more parents to choose them for their children. Mr. Clinton and many Democrats attack the Republican programs as providing more help to middle-class Whites than to working-class Blacks and as undermining the viability of the public schools by draining off the brighter and better motivated White students, leaving only the non-White and the less-educable White students in the public schools.

Actually, the question of what to do about America's school problem becomes very complicated if one looks at it from the viewpoint of a reformer and considers the pros and cons of the various programs that are being debated today. In this discussion I will simplify the question quite a bit by looking at it from the viewpoint of a **revolutionary** rather than a reformer. Despite this simplification, perhaps you will find some new and worthwhile insights in what I have to say. And the first thing I will say is that the question of educational quality in America is much more than a question of economics, national prestige, or children's safety. It is a question of national survival -- and much more important, of racial survival. Our failure to understand this last point fully and to make it the basis of America's educational policy is at the root of our problems today.

To get back to basics, let's remind ourselves of the three fundamental purposes schools have had in traditional European societies. First, schools pass on a people's cultural, intellectual, and spiritual heritage from one generation to the next. By teaching to children the language, literature, history, and traditions of a people -- by teaching children about their people's heroes and legends and achievements and mores -- the schools help to assure cultural continuity, among other things. And they provide a sense of racial and cultural identity. They enable a child to define himself relative to his people and to the rest of the world.

Second, schools teach technique: they help children acquire the knowledge and skills needed for them to become productive and self-supporting members of their society, whether those skills are welding, computer programming, accounting, or household management. They teach the child or the young adult techniques which will be useful to him or to society: how to play a musical instrument, how to type, how to repair a motor vehicle, how to fight with and without weapons, how to draw, how to swim, how to raise children, how to grow food, how to build a house.

And third, schools train and develop character in children, so that they will grow up to be the strongest and most valuable citizens that their genetic inheritance allows. The schools challenge, test, and condition children; they force the child to exercise his will, to discipline himself, to endure discomfort, to make plans and carry them out, to overcome fears, to accept responsibility, to learn the consequences of failure, to be truthful, to act honorably, and generally to develop and strengthen those traits of character valued by his society.

So, cultural continuity, the teaching of techniques, and building character: those are the three fundamental purposes of our schools -- or rather those **ought** to be the purposes of our schools.

Unfortunately, the American educational system today completely neglects the third purpose and does rather poorly with the first two. Take cultural continuity, for example. How can the schools serve this purpose well when they cannot even answer the question as to whose culture is to be passed on to the next generation? In a society trying very hard to be multicultural the question is really not Politically Correct.

I must say that some of the new charter schools set up for Black students are serving this purpose much better than any White schools. Some of these Black charter schools are thoroughly Afrocentric, and they at least give the young Blacks a strong sense of identity, if nothing else. In the April 27, 1998, issue of *U.S. News & World Report* there's a picture of a classroom in one of these schools, the Black children all dressed in traditional African garb and pledging their allegiance to their fellow Africans with a clenched-fist salute. If a White school tried with equal fervor to instill a sense of European racial consciousness in its students, the Clinton government would be all over the school with subpoenas in a minute. But really, only a school which is racially and culturally homogeneous can serve the purpose of insuring cultural continuity. Furthermore, there must be the conscious will to serve that purpose, along with pride and a lack of fear.

The current multicultural curriculum of America's mainstream public schools, which treats all cultures as equally relevant and tries to teach every student a little of each, results in all of the students learning virtually nothing, since they cannot relate strongly to what is being taught, and only superficialities are covered.

Teaching techniques is probably the thing that American schools do best, but even there we've slipped badly. It used to be that we weren't afraid to recognize the differences in people. We understood that some people would grow up to be welders, construction workers, or farmers; and some would be mathematicians, poets, or rocket scientists. We also understood that shop courses made more sense for boys than for girls, and that girls needed home economics courses more

than boys did. Today, it is not Politically Correct to recognize such differences; everyone must fit the same egalitarian mold. Consequently, we don't teach anything as well as we used to.

I've brushed on two of the causes of the declining quality of America's schools: multiculturalism and egalitarianism. There's more to both of these causes. Multiculturalism is not just an educational theory which assigns equal value and relevance to every culture and thereby makes it impossible to teach any culture effectively; it also is a policy of mixing people of all cultures and races together for the sake of "diversity." This is by far the single greatest cause of violence and disorder in our schools. While the politicians launch one program after another to keep guns, drugs, and gangs out of the schools, they will not face the real problem of which guns, drugs, and gangs are only symptoms, because it is a **racial** problem, and they are more terrified of being accused of being racists since they feel this will threaten their careers.

When America's schools were racially segregated, the White schools had no problem with drugs, gangs, or schoolyard shootings. When Blacks, with their much lower capacity for self-control and their traditionally more disorderly and violent behavior, were integrated into our schools they brought the problems of their own community with them. Now even White kids are shooting each other in the schools, just as they are now using drugs and adopting other elements of non-White behavior.

I'll say that again because most White people have been so "sensitized," so brainwashed, by the controlled media that they have a hard time dealing with racial realities. They know that Blacks, mestizos, and other non-Whites are a big part of what's wrong with America's schools, and when they look for safer schools for their children they instinctively look for Whiter schools -- but they're afraid even to admit that to themselves.

So I'll say it: Behavior patterns are different for young Blacks than they are for young Whites, and in part these differences in behavior are rooted in heredity, so they don't disappear when Blacks and Whites are mixed together. Blacks may change their behavior slightly toward White norms, but White behavior also shifts toward Black norms, and the result is more violent, more dangerous, and less orderly schools. That's a fact of life, and White parents need to recognize it and deal with it without fear.

Black students also are substantially less capable, on the average, than White students at dealing with traditional school curricula. This has been a source of great anguish to the egalitarians, and they have tried to cope with it by changing the curricula and lowering the standards. These changes haven't brought Black performance much closer to White performance, but they have lowered the performance for Whites. This again is something that most White parents understand but are afraid to admit.

There's one other important cause for what's wrong with America's schools, and it's not related directly to race. This other cause is the growing influence of feminism on educational theory and practice. I believe we all understand that men and women have different ways of seeing the world and dealing with it. Evolution has made the sexes different. For millions of years men have had the task of hunting and killing the supper, bringing it home, and driving the wolf from the door. The woman has had the task of making the cave into a home and taking care of the

children. The traditional difference in responsibilities of the two sexes are the results of real differences: differences in the way man and women see things and the way they do things.

And ever since we have had schools, men have made the decisions about how the schools were to be organized and how the children in them were to be taught. Even though women were teachers, educational policy was made by men -- until this century, that is: really, until after the Second World War. For the past 50 years or so, however, feminists have been gaining influence in the educational establishment and changing educational policy to suit themselves. To the feminists, male educational policy is bad policy. To many of them, in fact, it is bad simply because it is male, and they have set out to change that. They have been working to bring educational policy into line with the female way of looking at the world and dealing with it.

To feminists, discipline and competition are male and bad. They should be replaced by permissiveness and cooperation, which are female. Strict rules are not good, nor are absolutes of any sort. Students should be permitted to study whatever they want to study rather than being required to learn a certain standard body of facts and techniques decided on by educators. When problems or difficulties arise, they should be dealt with by talking, not by the application of rules. Giving students numerical grades is bad, because it encourages competition and it hurts the self-esteem of those who don't do well. Being able to talk about something is more important than being able to analyze it. Analysis is too masculine.

Now, this feminist view of things is a bit over-simplified. Not all women are anti-analytical or opposed to discipline. But the feminists have seized on the very real differences between the male and the female approaches to education, they have magnified these differences, and they have worked hard and effectively to substitute their approach for the traditional male approach. To a large extent the feminists have succeeded in this, and that helps to explain why America's schools are what they are today.

The multiculturalism of the schools prevents their passing on our European culture and identity to the next generation. Egalitarianism and feminist influence have wrecked our standards, undermined discipline, and corrupted our curricula, so that we do not even teach techniques well. And feminism, in particular, has totally nullified the schools' traditional task of character building.

In view of these things, Bill Clinton's program of spending $25 billion for new schools and facilities is worthless: new school buildings are nice, but they have very little to do with the quality of education. Good education doesn't need a lot of glass and marble, a new gymnasium, or even a lot of computers. It needs good teachers and a good learning environment and discipline and a sound educational policy. One can learn as well in an unused warehouse or a tent as in the shiniest new multimillion-dollar school, if one has a disciplined environment, a good curriculum, and good teachers.

The Republican programs which aim at letting parents send their children to charter schools or private schools have the advantage of providing a safer environment -- and in some cases also a more disciplined environment with higher standards and better curricula -- than the public schools, but they all dodge the important questions. We ought to fix what's wrong with our

public schools instead of simply abandoning them. But of course, we can't fix the public schools until we are willing to face the real issues and deal with them. And we will not face these real issues and deal with them short of a total revolution -- because it is clear, I believe, that the majority of the White population have no stomach for it. They have been so strongly conditioned by the controlled mass media -- so brainwashed -- that they simply are no longer capable of challenging the Politically Correct policies on race, equality, and feminism. They are not only confused about these issues, they are terrified of them. Their fear makes cowards of them, and it makes them dishonest.

I'll give you an example of this by citing something which happened in one of our state universities recently. Our colleges and universities are experiencing exactly the same problems which have wrecked our public schools, and the causes of the problems are the same. Last month, at Southwest Texas State University, in San Marcos, Texas, three Black football players were arrested for raping two White female students in one of the dormitories. This sort of thing happens at our multicultural universities all too often these days, and the usual reaction of the media and the university administration is to hush it up. Their excuse for this is that they don't want to increase "racial tensions." In the Southwest Texas State University rapes there was a slip-up, however, and somehow the mug shots of the accused Black rapists were printed in the newspaper. The local NAACP was offended by this revelation and issued a statement to the effect that the White girls who were raped had brought it on themselves. The NAACP then raised the usual smokescreen with a lot of blather about "racist" policies against Blacks at the university.

Members of my organization, the National Alliance, who are students at the neighboring University of Texas campus in Austin, responded to this outrageous NAACP statement by distributing an e-mail message to students and faculty at Southwest Texas State University in which the attitude of the NAACP was condemned and in which it was pointed out that the rape of White women by Blacks is a growing problem on our campuses. This started a growing campus discussion about the rapes, about the NAACP's blaming the girls instead of the rapists, about our response to the NAACP, and about race generally. Black groups organized a public demonstration on the campus to protest what they saw as an unfriendly atmosphere for Blacks, and many White liberals attended the demonstration. The university administration and the local media could only wring their hands, reaffirm their full commitment to Political Correctness, and wish the "racial tensions" would go away.

In healthier times the whole issue would have been settled very quickly with the lynching of three Black rapists. Of course, in healthier times there would have been no rapes, because there would have been no Black football players on the campus. It's clear that we have a long way to go to restore health to our schools.

The Lesson of Africa

Another White farmer in South Africa was murdered a few days ago. He was 65-year-old Daniel Marais. His wife Maria managed to escape from their farm near Bloemfontein and run three miles with their grandchild to a neighboring farm, after she had been assaulted by a Black. Mr. Marais however was too badly wounded by the Black attacker to escape, and he died on his farm.

Two weeks ago Blacks invaded the Van Niekerk farm near Witbank. They beat 71-year-old Gerhardus Van Niekerk on the face and head with a metal rod until they thought he was dead, then shot him in the face. Van Niekirk lost a lot of blood, but he survived the attack. He was one of a lucky few. Most don't survive.

A few days before the Van Niekerk attack, a gang of Blacks descended on the farm of 65-year-old Don Delafield and his 52-year-old wife Verina, 80 miles from Johannesburg. The White farmer and his wife were tied up, tortured savagely, and then butchered by the Blacks. A note left at the scene identified the murderers as members of the Azanian Peoples Liberation Army, the military wing of the Pan-Africanist Congress.

Twenty White farmers and members of their families have been murdered in South Africa in the past six weeks. That's about the same rate at which White farmers and their families were murdered by Blacks in South Africa during 1997. If that were happening to White farm families in the United States at a proportional rate, it would be 100 farm families a week being murdered -- a major problem indeed.

White farmers in South Africa are very alarmed about the murders, of course, so they've sent several delegations to Nelson Mandela and other government officials to demand that something be done. They're not getting much satisfaction from the government, however. The government says that its hands already are full trying to deal with the crime situation in South Africa, and that it can't spare any additional policemen to investigate the attacks on White farms. Robbery, rape, and murder have soared since the Whites of South Africa voted to turn their country over to Black rule four years ago.

White farmers are convinced that the attacks on them are more than a simple matter of crime. If the Blacks attacking their farms merely had robbery in mind, it would not be necessary to torture and kill their White victims. The Whites believe that the aim of the Black gangs is terrorism, and the note left at the scene of the Delafield murders supports their belief. The White farmers also note that the farmers who have been murdered were in many cases those who had been well known for their generosity to their Black workers. They suspect that the aim of the murderers is to drive the White farmers out of South Africa, and so the terrorists are striking preferentially at the Whites who have good relations with Blacks.

Mandela's government doesn't want the White farmers driven out, because it would be an economic catastrophe for South Africa. The White farmers produce nearly all of South Africa's food and much of its foreign exchange. But many Blacks are more concerned with grabbing

White wealth now than they are with the prosperity of the country later. In addition, the idea of forcing the Whites out appeals to many Blacks at an emotional level. Being dependent on the productivity of White farmers is galling to Blacks, and they are more inclined to kill the goose now than to continue collecting the golden eggs.

If the murder of White farm families continues at the rate of the past 18 months, the terrorists undoubtedly will succeed. And there is little chance that the Mandela government or any Black successor government will be able to stop the killings; the government of South Africa becomes more chaotic, corrupt, and inefficient by the month. If it can do nothing to control the crime in Johannesburg, it is unlikely to have much influence on terrorism in the countryside.

The really disappointing aspect to all of this is that it should have been **foreseen.** The Whites of South Africa **voted** themselves into their present situation, when they agreed to let Blacks participate in their elections in 1994. They folded up under the pressure of being called bad names by the Jewish media and being told by their preachers that Jesus was angry at them because of apartheid. They were so eager to be in the good graces of Jesus, the Jews, and the "international community" that they took leave of their senses and handed their government over to Nelson Mandela and his fellow Black terrorists on a silver platter. They believed the assurances of the media and the bought politicians that everything would work out for the best if they let the Blacks run South Africa.

That's really incredible, considering what they knew about Black behavior in the rest of Africa. Consider Kolwezi, for example. Whites in America won't have heard of Kolwezi, of course, because the Jewish media kept pretty quiet about it over here. It's the sort of thing the Jews thought it better for us not to hear about, and so after a few sketchy news reports they blacked it out and never mentioned it again. But they couldn't keep it from the South Africans, who were much more attuned to what was happening in Africa than we were.

Kolwezi was a mining town in the Shaba province of what was known 20 years ago as Zaire. Before that it was known as the Belgian Congo, and today, under the rule of its latest African strongman it is known as the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Belgians had turned their colony over to Black rule in 1960, as part of the general decolonization process which accompanied the egalitarian craze following the Second World War. A deranged Black Marxist ideologue, Patrice Lumumba, presided over the transition to Black rule of the Congo, and the killing and rape of Whites began almost immediately.

Most of the Whites in the Congo weren't natives, as in South Africa. They were Belgian administrators and technicians and mining engineers, along with a few Christian missionaries, doctors, and nurses. Many of the longer-term White residents had their families with them. In 1964, when one of the Black factions struggling for control of the Congo captured Stanleyville, an administrative center with a population of about 25,000 where more than 2,000 Whites were living, the rapes and murders of Whites flared up again. Belgian paratroopers had to capture Stanleyville in order to rescue the terrified White survivors. Most Americans heard briefly about that at the time, but the news certainly wasn't emphasized, and so we quickly forgot about it. The South Africans didn't forget, though.

Then in May 1978, while the Congo was temporarily going by the name Zaire, a Black tribal faction that was at odds with the central government moved into Kolwezi. Kolwezi, a town of about 20,000 inhabitants at the time in the southeastern part of the country, was a local center for the copper and cobalt mining in the area, and a number of White engineers and technicians were there, some with their wives and children. The Blacks who were opposed to the central government saw the White minority in Kolwezi as supporters of the central government, because it was the Whites who were keeping the mines running. Actually, the Whites were on neither side of the conflict. They were there simply to do a job, and they didn't concern themselves much with Black politics, but the fact that their activity in operating the mines was keeping the central government afloat was all the excuse the Black rebels needed to kill them. And of course, the Blacks went about killing the Whites in a typically Black fashion, with lots of gang-raping and mutilation. White women had their breasts hacked off with machetes. Little White girls were literally raped to death by long lines of grinning Blacks, while their parents were forced at gunpoint to watch. Little White boys had their bellies slit open and their entrails pulled out. Altogether 160 Whites were butchered in Kolwezi. Even though that was in 1978, it made enough of an impression on White South Africans that they shouldn't have forgotten it by 1994.

And if Stanleyville and Kolwezi weren't enough, there were plenty of other instructive examples for the White South Africans. There was what happened in Angola in 1961, when Portuguese colonists were butchered in a terror campaign so terrible that I cannot discuss the details on this program. It is perhaps more difficult to sympathize with the Portuguese than with the Belgians, because many of the Portuguese had, as we say, "gone native." They didn't keep themselves separate enough from the Blacks around them. Some had even taken Black wives and had mulatto children. Race-mixing wasn't as abhorrent to the Portuguese as to other Europeans in Africa. Nevertheless, what the Blacks did to the Portuguese, even those with non-White family members, was as bloody and cruel as anything done to other Europeans in Africa.

The Whites of Rhodesia, South Africa's neighbor, certainly didn't mix with the Blacks in their country. The Whites of Rhodesia not only maintained their dignity and pride as Europeans, but they did a very creditable job of keeping their Blacks under control. Even the Rhodesian farmers, whose farms often were isolated and many miles from their nearest neighbors, were quite successful at dealing with Black terrorists. In Rhodesia the Blacks struck at the easiest White targets, and these were the Christian missionary stations. Various Christian churches had set up missionary stations throughout Rhodesia for the purpose of converting the Blacks to Christianity, and these stations usually had schools and clinics associated with them. They were unarmed. When Black terrorists would descend on one of these missionary stations they would rape and butcher all of the Whites they could get their hands on. This happened over and over again, and the South Africans heard all of the grisly details every time.

Nevertheless, the White South African government betrayed the White Rhodesians in 1976 by joining the United Nations embargo against Rhodesia and cutting off Rhodesia's supply of helicopters and other weapons. This move forced the Rhodesians to capitulate to the Blacks, and their country, now called Zimbabwe, is ruled by one of the former Black terrorist leaders, who is now a de facto "president for life" and has announced a plan to seize the land of the White farmers who remain in the country.

The South Africans betrayed the Rhodesians in 1976 in part because the Jews of South Africa always have had a strong influence on the South African government through their media control and their money. Harry Oppenheimer, with his vast holdings in diamonds, gold, and other minerals, had more money with which to corrupt politicians than anyone else in South Africa. And the Jews, of course, were as implacably hostile to the Whites of Rhodesia as they have been to other Whites everywhere and at all times.

And in part the White South Africans betrayed the Rhodesians because they thought that by throwing their White neighbors to the wolves they could buy time for themselves. As it turned out it wasn't much time: just 18 years. During those 18 years they really should have been paying more attention to what was happening in other parts of Africa. The fact that they learned nothing from the examples of Angola, Stanleyville, Kolwezi, and the Christian missions in Rhodesia should be instructive to us.

I talked with several South Africans before 1994. None were in favor of surrendering their country to the Blacks, but they had some very strange notions about what Black rule would mean. They thought that because the Blacks of South Africa had a standard of living so much higher than Blacks anywhere else in Africa they wouldn't do anything to jeopardize that. Blacks might engage in terrorism in Angola and Zaire -- those are very primitive countries, and the Blacks there are savages -- but the Blacks in South Africa are better educated and better treated than elsewhere. Blacks, these White South Africans told me, are like children. They can't run a modern country like South Africa by themselves. They need the Whites to keep things going for them, and the Whites will be able to control them, just as they have for the past 400 years.

These White South Africans that I spoke with were very civilized, very comfortable people. They all had Black servants back home. I think that they just couldn't deal with the idea of a South Africa without Blacks: a South Africa in which Whites would take care of their own children, clean their own toilets, cook their own meals, cut their own grass, take out their own garbage, and take in their belts enough to cope with any economic pressure applied to them by the rest of the world. It's too bad they weren't a little less civilized and a little less comfortable. Perhaps they'd still have their own country today. Perhaps they wouldn't be reading in their newspapers every week about three or four more White farm families butchered by Black terrorists. Perhaps they wouldn't have to be wondering if there is anywhere to immigrate to.

Perhaps I shouldn't be so hard on them. Certainly, they did an enormously foolish and shameful thing in giving up their country without a fight -- but are we Americans any less foolish? Think how many White Americans there are who believe that we'll all continue to live together as happy consumers and television viewers, regardless of race, color, or creed, when America has a non-White majority around the middle of the next century. Our Blacks, they believe, are much more civilized than those Blacks who are butchering White farm families in South Africa.

Or rather, that's what they'd believe if the controlled news media told them about what's happening in South Africa. White Americans have never given any evidence of being more intelligent, more independent minded, more courageous, or more morally upright than South Africans, so why should we expect Americans to make better use than the South Africans did of

the knowledge of what to expect under non-White rule, if the Jewish media let them have that knowledge?

But three White farmers a week -- or 100 a week -- being murdered by Black terrorists in South Africa isn't news that fits. Much better to restrict the news from Africa to scenes of Mr. Clinton hugging happy Blacks.

Perhaps we **can** learn from the example of the South Africans. Of course, when I say "we" I don't mean White Americans as a whole. Since White South Africans as a whole didn't learn a thing from the example of the Portuguese, the Belgians, and the Rhodesians, I don't expect Americans to do any better. But perhaps **some** of us can learn a few things.

One of those things is that we really need to find a better way than mass democracy for governing ourselves. We've been fed a lot of egalitarian baloney about people all being pretty much the same, and so we tend to assume that since **we** can look at facts and make rational decisions, **everyone else** can. But most people cannot. Most people are not rational and can be manipulated by playing on their fears and desires, the way the majority of South African Whites were manipulated by the media and the churches in their country in 1994. The South Africans didn't **want** the situation they have today, but they let themselves be bullied, lied, and tricked into it. If only hard-headed and rational South African Whites had been permitted to vote in 1994, South Africa still would be a White-ruled country today: perhaps even an all-White country.

The second thing we should learn from the South African experience is that we cannot permit our mass media to remain in the hands of the Jews or in the hands of those under the influence of Jews. The foolish South Africans were manipulated, and it was the mass media more than anything else which manipulated them.

The Jewish media in South Africa could not keep the news of Black behavior in other parts of Africa away from White South Africans, but they could and did play down that news. They could and did berate South Africans non-stop about the wickedness of apartheid and about how awful it was to be unpopular among liberals in other countries, and they could and did play on the feminine nature of the White masses by telling them over and over, as seductively as possible, how nice it would be to be loved by the international community instead of being hated.

And the third thing we must learn from the experience of Whites in Africa is that the only way for our people to survive and flourish is to live among our own kind. Multiracial societies do not work and **cannot** work. If we permit Whites to become a minority in America in the next century as the Clintonistas are planning, then we will suffer a fate similar to that of Whites everywhere else that they have let themselves become a minority. What we must do to avoid becoming a minority may be extraordinarily hard, but we must do it to survive. The extinction of our people is the alternative.

Cowardice and Individualism

In various *Free Speech* articles I've spoken about our problems with Blacks, with Asian immigrants, with mestizos, and of course, with Jews -- especially about our problems with Jews, in deference to their demand always to be at the head of the line. Now, I'd like to talk about our problems with ourselves, with European-Americans: about what's wrong with White people.

Actually, this is such a huge subject that I can deal with only a tiny part of it. In the organization which I head, the National Alliance, I've been talking with members about two aspects of the White problem: White cowardice and White selfishness. Here are some of our thoughts.

If most White people weren't such terrible cowards, we wouldn't have problems with Blacks, mestizos, Jews, or anyone else today. We would have solved all of those problems long ago. There are plenty of people who agree with us about the type of society we want, the type of future we want for our people. There are many people who are disgusted with the rotten politicians and the rotten political system we have in Washington, people who are angry about what non-White minorities have done to our schools and our cities, people who are sick and tired of seeing television and the other mass media promote everything which is sick, perverse, and destructive. Many people don't feel guilty when the media tell them to feel guilty. There are plenty of people who want a clean, decent, White society for their children to grow up in. But these people are afraid to say or do anything. Many are terrified even to have other people know what they are **thinking.** Why is that? What are White people afraid of?

I understand the difference between prudence or reasonable caution on the one hand and cowardice or unreasoning fear on the other hand. Prudence is no vice. Cowardice is. Imagine, for example, that you work in an office under a Jewish supervisor. You are close to retirement, and you can't afford to lose your employment. Your Jewish boss is a big supporter of Clinton, affirmative action, "diversity," homosexuality, feminism, racial mixing, and every other thing which is bad for our people. And the boss always is pushing these things, is making favorable comments about these things, around you and your fellow employees. He's always saying that Bill Clinton is a wonderful man and that all of the people who are attacking him are just a bunch of bigots who hate him because he has been so good to Israel. Every time your Jewish boss says something like that you bite your tongue and keep your mouth shut, even though you want to tell him what you really think. You consider the consequences to yourself and to your family if you speak out, and you decide that it's not worth it. So you grit your teeth and remain silent. What does that make you? Well, certainly you are no hero, but under the circumstances I don't think it would be fair to call you a coward either. You are just a prudent person.

The times we are living in tend to make cowards of us all. We are pressed to make moral compromises every day, and it becomes a habit. Certainly, if a man today tried to act honorably in all things according to the standards for honorable behavior 100 years ago he would very likely find himself in prison in short order. For all practical purposes we are living like a conquered people under an enemy occupation government. We adjust our behavior in order to get by without a lot of trouble. We do not act heroically, because heroism is out of fashion. We try to do what is prudent rather than what is heroic.

But some people go **too far** in this direction, and they must be judged as cowards even by today's lax standards. There are people, for example, who whisper to me that they agree with everything I say, and ask me for information about the National Alliance. I will offer to mail the information to them, and they will turn pale and tell me that I must not do that: the postman or a neighbor might see their mail. "So what?" I respond, and they will just look frightened and scurry away. There are other people who are afraid to talk with me on the telephone, because they are certain that the FBI is recording all of my calls.

I won't bore you with all of the details, but over a period of years I have been made aware repeatedly of the fact that there are many people in America -- White adults of reasonably sound mind -- who are so afraid of the government in Washington that their fear controls them; it dominates them. They are afraid that the government will find out if they send a letter to anyone who is critical of the government, such as me. They are terrified of being on the mailing list of a Politically Incorrect organization. They are terrified of having their telephone records show that they have made calls to or received calls from anyone who is on the government's blacklist. And these are people who themselves hate the government! But they are terribly afraid that the government will find out what they feel, what they think. There are, I am sorry to say, millions of such people in this country.

When I have spoken with some of these people in an effort to find out just what it is they are afraid of, what they believe will happen to them if the government discovers that they are thinking Politically Incorrect thoughts, I usually get a defensive reaction. Most of them don't have any precise idea of how the government might punish them. Some of them will express vague fears about economic retaliation -- an IRS audit or the loss of a pension -- and others worry that all constitutional rights will be suspended under some Presidential declaration of a national emergency, and all dissidents will be rounded up and put in concentration camps. In most cases their fear is irrational.

I think it likely that there always have been people who were dominated by irrational fears, people who were afraid of their own shadow, but I am sure that there are many more of them today than there were in the past. I believe that the type of life-style we have today is partly responsible for this prevalence of unreasonable fear. Men who have been sheltered from danger all their lives, who have grown up in a welfare state, and who have never faced physical danger or seen another man die a violent death may not be able to cope with the idea of risk or be able to overcome even the minor fears which beset all of us every day of our lives.

Another part of the reason for this fear is that the controlled mass media encourage it and exacerbate it. The media bosses all will tell you that they support the First Amendment, that they believe in free speech and the rest of the Bill of Rights, but they don't. They want the same sort of laws in this country they have lobbied for and gotten in other countries, such as Canada, France, Switzerland, Germany, and a dozen others, where one can be imprisoned for Politically Incorrect speech. It's what they like to call "hate speech," and they've been lobbying quietly for laws against it for years.

Part of their campaign has involved persuading the more impressionable elements of the public that it's already illegal to say anything which is "racist" or "anti-Semitic." I'm sure that all of you

have seen newspaper stories to the effect that someone was arrested for distributing "racist" leaflets, or that the police found "anti-Semitic" literature in the home of someone who was charged with a "hate crime." The way these things are reported they create the impression in the public's mind that distributing Politically Incorrect leaflets or having Politically Incorrect books in one's home is illegal in itself. And they report things that way **deliberately.** They deliberately deceive us. They want people who read these news reports to believe that having the wrong type of reading material on one's bookshelf -- or the wrong type of ideas in one's head -- can get one into trouble. They want the people who think Politically Incorrect thoughts to be fearful.

They are masters of psychological manipulation. I reported to you about the nine schoolchildren in Florida who were thrown into jail for producing a Politically Incorrect pamphlet which lampooned a Black principal at their school. The children had done nothing illegal. The purpose of putting them in jail and making a big thing of it in the newspapers was to intimidate the children -- **and** everyone who read about what happened to them. And unfortunately, this sort of intimidation all too often works. It works because many of our people already are too timid, too cowed, to fight back.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn is one of my favorite authors. In one of his books, the first volume of *Gulag Archipelago,* he wrote about how the communists in Russia, who consisted of only the Jews and a tiny minority of Russian criminals, amoral opportunists, and welfare rabble -- the sort of people who support Bill Clinton in America today -- were able to maintain their grip on all of Russia by keeping the Russian majority, which hated them, too frightened to resist.

Solzhenitsyn writes of the period in 1934 and 1935, when the Jewish commissar Genrikh Yagoda headed the Soviet secret police, and Yagoda's black vans went out every night in St. Petersburg, known then as Leningrad, to round up "class enemies": former members of the aristocracy, former civil servants, former businessmen, former teachers, professors, and professional people, any Russian -- any **real** Russian -- who had graduated from a university. A quarter of the population of the city was arrested and liquidated by Yagoda during this two-year period.

Solzhenitsyn laments that the citizens of St. Petersburg cowered behind their doors when the black vans pulled up at their apartment houses night after night to arrest their neighbors. If only the decent Russians had fought back, Solzhenitsyn says, if only they had ambushed some of these secret police thugs in the hallways of their apartments with knives, pickaxes, or hammers, if only they had spiked the tires of the police vans while the thugs were in the apartments dragging out their victims, they could easily have overwhelmed Yagoda's forces and forced an end to the mass arrests. But they didn't fight back, and the arrests and liquidations continued. And so, Solzhenitsyn concludes, because of their cowardice and their selfishness the Russians deserved what the communists did to them. Do we deserve better?

The other problem White people have that I want to talk about is selfishness or individualism. Every week I receive letters accusing me of being a "collectivist." The people who write the letters are indignant because I suggest that all of us have a responsibility for the future of our race, that we should put the welfare and security of our people, of our race, ahead of personal

considerations. What happens to our people is more important than what happens to any individual.

This kind of talk irritates the individualist, and he tells me that although he agrees with my criticisms of the government, he doesn't agree with my racism. Racism is a form of collectivism, which in his mind is akin to communism, and so I am just as bad as the communists. His only concern is for himself, and he believes that everyone else should feel the same. He resents being told that he has a responsibility to his race. He tells me that he knows some Blacks, Jews, or Asians who make better neighbors or better employees than some White people, and he is just as resentful of White welfare bums as he is of Black welfare bums, and so he rejects my call for him to think of himself as a White person or as a European-American. He makes all of his decisions on the basis of what is good for him, and he thinks everyone else should do the same.

The individualist responds to my warnings about the overwhelming Jewish influence in the mass media by saying, "So what? The Jews are smart businessmen. That's why they control the media. If you don't like it, buy yourself a television station and compete with them."

If I complain about the media promoting interracial sex or homosexuality, the individualist doesn't understand what I'm concerned about. To him the choice of a sexual orientation or the race of one's sexual partner is strictly an individual matter, and no one has any right to say that one type of relationship is inherently better than another. If a White person wants to marry a Black and have mixed-race children, that's okay with the individualist. The more extreme individualists also believe that the government has no business making laws against abused drugs. He believes that it should be up to the individual to decide whether or not he wants to use drugs, and he doesn't care about the consequences to society of the widespread use of harmful drugs. That's not his responsibility.

You know, if we were living in a White world I wouldn't worry much about individualists. I still would deplore their selfishness and their refusal to accept responsibility for anyone or anything but themselves, but I wouldn't consider them a major threat. As it is, with our people under assault by organized minorities on every front, I consider individualists to be worse than communists. Their way of thinking is really a mental illness: an illness which can infect others. And like cowardice it has been deliberately encouraged by the controlled media, because it weakens our people, it destroys our solidarity and makes it easier for the media bosses and their allies to keep us under control.

I doubt that there's anything we can do to make a man out of a coward. However, at least some individualists may overcome their illness and change their ways as our social and political situation continues to deteriorate.

Perhaps some of them will read Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago,* and they will understand that the reason the Russian people fell victim to the tiny communist minority was not just their cowardice but also their unwillingness to take responsibility for the welfare of their people and to stand together as decent Russians against the Jews and the rabble. And perhaps they will see the parallel between what happened in Russia in the 1930s and what is happening in America now.

Perhaps some of them will come to understand that the reason our race is in peril now is because we are the only race which has tolerated individualism. The Jews certainly have not achieved their position of dominance by being individualists: they have achieved it by supporting each other against the rest of the world, by putting the welfare of their race first. Any Jew who collaborated openly with non-Jews against Jewish interests -- the way White politicians habitually collaborate with minorities against White interests -- would be ostracized and condemned by his fellow Jews. He would become an outcast.

Blacks have achieved their own measure of political power because they think and act as a group: they think of themselves as Blacks first, and they use their organized strength to demand special treatment and special favors from the government.

Perhaps some of our individualists will realize that their own lives can have no lasting value or meaning, no matter how rich or famous they become, unless they are part of something larger and more enduring than themselves. Perhaps some of them will realize that the limb they've been sawing off by supporting Jewish policies at the expense of their own people is the limb they're sitting on. Perhaps when they contemplate the extinction of their own race they will realize that, despite all of its faults, it's all they have. Perhaps we can help them realize that.

Paying the *Organizatsiya*

Illegal immigration is a huge and growing problem for this country. So is legal immigration, to the extent that the immigrants are nearly all members of minority groups these days. Immigration is changing the complexion and the character of America. We are becoming less European and more Middle Eastern, Asian, African, and mestizo. I have discussed what this non-White immigration is doing to our schools, our cities, and our tax burden. Let's look today at some of the other costs involved.

Before the Second World War we had immigration laws which insured that most immigrants to the United States were Europeans. It was extremely difficult for Asians or Africans or other non-Whites to enter the country. Then in the rush of feel-good egalitarianism and yankee-doodle democracy which were promoted by the media after the war, the members of the liberal elite let themselves be persuaded by the media bosses that our immigration policies were "racist." What we needed in America was more "diversity," they decided. A Jewish congressman from New York, Emanuel Celler, headed the drive in the Congress for a new immigration law which would favor the Third World instead of Europe, and in 1965 such a law was passed, with the co-sponsorship of Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy.

Of course, at the time the Jews and the liberals were campaigning for their new immigration law they didn't advertise it as a law which would change America's complexion. They didn't talk of it as a diversity-enhancing law. Quite the opposite, in fact, because in 1965 the masters of the controlled media hadn't had time yet to make diversity fashionable among ordinary Americans. Television was still relatively new and hadn't worked its magic yet.

People who wanted to maintain America's European racial character foresaw the effect the new law would have and argued against it on that basis, but its proponents deceitfully claimed that it wouldn't change America's racial character at all, knowing full well that it would. And so the law was passed, and since it went into effect in 1965 most of the legal immigrants to the United States have been non-European, non-White. So have nearly all of the illegal immigrants. And America's racial complexion has changed drastically as a result. In the last census taken before Emanuel Celler's new immigration law -- the census of 1960 -- the population of the United States was 89 per cent White. In the 1990 census, after 25 years with the new law, the White percentage of the population had fallen to 76 per cent. Actually, the situation was worse than that, because illegal immigrants, nearly all of whom are non-White, tend to avoid the census-takers. And the percentage of Whites in the United States has continued to plunge since 1990. Today the country is somewhere between 70 and 75 per cent White.

Occasionally Congress has made special modifications to the 1965 immigration law to admit favored groups of immigrants. The largest such group is from Europe but actually is not racially European. It consists of Jews from the former Soviet Union claiming "refugee" status. A Jewish legislator, New Jersey's Senator Frank Lautenberg, succeeded in 1989 in having Soviet Jews officially designated as a "persecuted minority" in the Soviet Union and therefore eligible for admission to the United States without regard to regular immigration quotas. It has been reapproved every year since then.

As a matter of fact Jews in the Soviet Union, far from being persecuted, have been a favored race ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 -- a revolution which they in large part engineered. While communism ruled in Russia, Jews were far more often persecutors of Russians than the other way around. But in 1989, with Russia bled dry and communism on the brink of collapse, Soviet Jews decided to find a new host. And so for the past nine years, whereas it has been nearly impossible for a real Russian or Ukrainian to become a U.S. immigrant, Jews from the former Soviet Union have been pouring into the United States at a rate of about 50,000 a year. Furthermore, as "refugees from persecution," Soviet Jews are given a cash handout from the U.S. Treasury and various other Federal subsidies as soon as they arrive.

Whenever anyone has dared to question why Soviet Jews continue to be exempt from the immigration laws which apply to everyone else, he was likely to be charged with "anti-Semitism." And the claim will be made that these Soviet Jews are a very clever and skilful bunch of people who contribute greatly to America's economy, and we're fortunate to have them in the country.

Not really. They are clever, all right, but the only economy they contribute to is their own, and it's at the expense of the rest of us. Soviet Jewish immigrants in the United States have been a far larger per capita burden on White Americans than any other immigrant group. A substantial part of this burden is due to the fact that a great many of these Soviet Jews are gangsters: members of a global organized crime network, which they call the *Organizatsiya:* the "Organization." Under communism, Jews controlled organized crime in the Soviet Union, and when communism collapsed at the beginning of this decade Soviet Jewish gangsters not only branched out into various new money-making enterprises in Russia and Ukraine, including the White slave trade, they also began building their criminal operations in the United States and in Western Europe. Today they virtually control organized crime in Germany, Poland, and several other European countries. And the *Organizatsiya* has replaced the Italian and Sicilian Mafia as the principal organized crime element in the United States. And these Jews from the former Soviet Union are far more predatory than the Mafia ever was. They suck far more blood from law-abiding Americans.

Three or four years ago they made the headlines with their gasoline-tax rackets in New Jersey and New York, where a handful of Jewish gangsters from Russia were stealing an estimated $1.5 billion a year from these two states alone. More recently they've come into the news in connection with automobile insurance fraud in California. They hire people, hundreds of people every week, to participate in staged automobile accidents, and then, using their own lawyers and their own clinics for treating the alleged injuries in the accidents, they collect from the insurance companies.

Now, anyone can do this sort of thing, and as a matter of fact Chinese, Vietnamese, and Mexican gangs had been engaging in automobile insurance fraud before the *Organizatsiya* became involved, just as the Mafia had been stealing gasoline taxes in New York and New Jersey before the Soviet Jews made a multi-billion-dollar racket out of it. When the Jews moved into insurance fraud recently, however, they did so on a massive scale, converting what had been a minor irritation to a huge drain on the pocketbook of nearly every American. Automobile insurance fraud is currently sucking nearly $20 billion a year from the American economy and is costing

the average American household an estimated $300 per year in additional insurance payments -- because, of course, every dollar paid to a Jewish gangster as a result of a fraudulent automobile accident comes from the pockets of all the people who are obliged to buy automobile insurance. This is an enormous racket, and it dwarfs anything that the Mafia used to do.

And gasoline-tax fraud and automobile insurance fraud are by no means the only rackets that Soviet Jewish immigrants have moved into. In New York, Los Angeles, and other port cities their presence has substantially increased the likelihood that your car will be stolen, for example. They control gangs of thieves who steal expensive cars off the street, and then the Jews arrange for the cars to be shipped in freight containers to other Jewish gangsters in the Middle East, where they can be sold for much higher prices than in the United States -- and where they will never be recovered by the police. As with the other rackets, the Jews aren't the only organized criminals who steal cars, but they do it on such a large scale that they run insurance rates up much higher than all of the non-Jewish auto thieves together.

There are perhaps 400,000 Soviet Jewish immigrants in the United States, most of them in the New York and Los Angeles areas, and only about 4,000 of these Jews belong to organized crime gangs, or about one per cent. But the infrastructure for these Jewish gangs is the entire Soviet Jewish community. They could not function without all of the other Jews who make up the community within which they live.

Don't let yourself be misled by the argument that 99 per cent of Soviet Jewish immigrants to the United States are not gangsters. The bottom line is that these Soviet Jewish immigrants, gangsters or not, are draining about $50,000 per capita per year from the American economy as a result of Jewish organized crime activities in the United States. It may be only one per cent of them who are actively engaged in the rackets, but we wouldn't have Jewish organized crime gangs in the United States sucking money from all of us if we didn't have Soviet Jews in the United States. And we wouldn't have Soviet Jews in the United States if we had a sane immigration policy.

The United States is still nearly three-quarters White, but most of the crime in the United States is committed by non-Whites. In some cases we may overlook this non-White crime because it doesn't impact on us directly. For example I have a news story in front of me now about a Mexican gang which operates a sex-slave racket in the southeastern United States. The gang members force Mexican girls, some as young as 14, to work as prostitutes in a chain of brothels they own in Florida and South Carolina, which cater mostly to illegal Mexican aliens doing farm work. This may be dismissed as a case of non-Whites committing crimes against non-Whites which doesn't cost us anything, but as long as it is happening on our turf we should be concerned about it. If we permit non-White moralities, non-White attitudes toward women, non-White concepts of propriety and proper behavior to flourish here, they eventually will take root here and will infect White Americans, just the way Black life-styles began influencing young Whites after our schools were racially integrated. We cannot have growing communities of Chinese, Vietnamese, Haitians, Mexicans, Soviet Jews, and a hundred other alien races springing up all across the United States, taking over our cities, spreading into our suburbs, and still have any realistic hope of maintaining White values and a White morality as the basis of our own community life. The poison eventually will infect us, sicken us, and destroy us.

This is in no case more true than with the Soviet Jewish gangs which have established themselves here during the past decade. When the *Organizatsiya* decides to move into an area of criminal activity, whether it be gasoline-tax fraud, insurance fraud, or exporting stolen cars, they do it efficiently and in an organized way which dwarfs the activity of other criminal gangs and typically brings them billions of dollars in loot and makes it possible for them to engage in bribery and political corruption on a massive scale. Bill Clinton accepts political donations from them, and you can be certain that police chiefs, mayors, and other politicians and public officials do too. No government, even one which initially is honest, can remain uncorrupted by the sort of money these organized Jewish criminals have at their disposal.

And the controlled media cover for them. When, occasionally, the newspapers are forced to report on some *Organizatsiya* racket, the criminals are never referred to as Jews. Instead they are called "Russians." The media customarily refer to the *Organizatsiya* as the "Russian mafia."

One other reason why the activities of the *Organizatsiya* ought to be of special concern to us is that we are their chosen victims. Mexican gangs often confine their activities to their own people, as in the case of the sex-slave gang I mentioned. Vietnamese and Chinese gangs also tend to focus on extortion and other rackets which victimize their own people. Of course, when these non-White immigrant gangs engage in the drug business, many White Americans end up as victims. But the Jewish gangs deliberately choose us as their victims from the beginning. Part of the reason is that they want money on a much larger scale than they can extract from their fellow immigrants. They're not interested in a paltry few million dollars. They want -- and they get -- billions, and it's from the American majority they get it, whether they're fleecing the stock market a la Michael Milken and Ivan Boesky or running our auto insurance premiums up through organized fraud.

And part of the reason they choose White Americans as their victims is that they believe they have a God-given right to plunder us. Whenever they immigrate into a non-Jewish country, whether it is ancient Egypt 3500 years ago or America today, their imperative is the same: "Ye shall eat the fat of the land," their Torah commands them: "Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles."

It is a difficult thing, a painful thing, for most Americans to face this problem of non-European immigration into America. Most Americans want to be nice, they want to be polite, they don't want to give offense. And because of this inherent politeness we have, we let ourselves be buffaloed by those clamoring for more "diversity." If there's one thing America doesn't need, one thing which is pure poison to America, it's more "diversity." But the Jews of Hollywood and Madison Avenue have done a very effective job of selling the notion to an impressionable and easily manipulated public that it's "nicer" and more "tolerant," "open-minded," and "fairer" to be in favor of letting non-Europeans -- including Soviet Jews -- continue pouring into America. A great many of us understand that we don't want any more non-Whites or any more Jews in America -- in fact, we don't want the ones that already are here -- but we feel an enormous pressure to smile, to be nice, and not to object to what is happening to our country. We are afraid to stand up against the propaganda of Jewish television, Jewish magazine advertisements, and Jewish films: propaganda that tells us more "diversity" is good for us, even when we know that it isn't.

Their propaganda, their pressure, is pervasive; it is everywhere. I just finished viewing a Jewish film about the history of the Hollywood film industry. The name of the film is *Hollywoodism.* It openly discusses what everyone knew but was afraid to speak of openly for fear of being denounced as an "anti-Semite": namely, that Hollywood and the motion-picture industry are almost completely Jewish. The film talks about the Jews who came to America from Russia and other areas of eastern Europe early in this century and took over the fledgling motion-picture industry in Hollywood, elbowing most of the non-Jews out. The film claims that these immigrant Jews reinvented America for us. They cooked up an image of what they wanted America to be like -- more diverse, more democratic and proletarian, more vulgar, with lots of Black music and other elements of Black culture mixed into our culture -- and then they sold that image to the American people, first through cinemas and later through television. They persuaded White Americans that this Jewish image of America was a better image than our own. The Jews **boast** of this transformation of America they made through their control of the motion-picture and television industries.

If you haven't seen this film, you still can read the book it is based on. The book is Neal Gabler's *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood,* and it is available from National Vanguard Books, the publisher of *Free Speech.*

It is very difficult for the average American to stand up against this flood of Jewish propaganda which clamors for ever more "diversity" and intimidates most of those who would like to stop the flow of Haitians, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Soviet Jews into America. As long as White Americans still have the option of moving to a Whiter neighborhood or sending their children to a Whiter school, they'll choose that option rather than make a fuss and be considered rude by speaking out against the insane immigration policies of the government in Washington. It's too bad we're that way. It just means that our future will be much bloodier and more painful than necessary.

Meanwhile, it will be good for us to remember every time we pay our automobile insurance that one consequence of non-White immigration into America is the size of our premiums. It will be good to remember that a third of every premium pays just for insurance fraud, and that virtually all automobile insurance fraud is perpetrated by gangs of non-White immigrants, a growing number of whom belong to the *Organizatsiya.* If you are paying, say, $800 a year in automobile insurance, then between $250 and $300 of your hard-earned money is going directly into the pockets of grinning Soviet Jewish gangsters, courtesy of the U.S. Congress. Think about it, sucker!

Democracy

Let's talk about democracy: about democracy as a system of government and its implications for our future. Democracy is a system where a country's legislators and its top executives are chosen by a direct vote of the citizenry, more or less; I'm not concerned at the moment with such details as the electoral college. The basic fact is that nearly every citizen over 18 years of age has an equal vote, and the politician with the most votes is elected to office.

We also have a Constitution, of course, and the Constitution is supposed to constrain to a certain extent what these politicians can do after they're elected. Sometimes it does, and sometimes it doesn't. We also have a system of Federal courts which are supposed to make sure that the politicians don't deviate too far from the Constitution. But the judges on these courts are appointed by the politicians they're supposed to keep an eye on.

Very roughly that's the system we've had for the last 210 years or so. During that time America has grown and prospered enormously, and many people believe that it's because of our system of government. They believe that if we had had some other system of government -- monarchy, say, or a dictatorship -- we wouldn't have become so rich and powerful. Other people like to equate our system of government with freedom. If we didn't have democracy we wouldn't be free, they believe. In fact, the belief in the efficacy of democracy as a guarantor of wealth and freedom has become a religion in the United States. Politicians and preachers alike fear to question it. It is assumed not only to be the best possible system of government, but the **only** conceivable form of government for decent folk. No one in public life is permitted to doubt that dogma. The United States has gone to war and slaughtered millions of people in order to impose this religion on them. We have bombed our European cultural treasures into ruins and rained fire and high explosives from the sky onto White women and children in order to "make the world safe for democracy," and we've done all of this with the same sort of self-righteousness and intolerant zeal with which we used to burn heretics 500 years ago -- except that we've butchered a lot more White people for the sake of democracy than we ever did for the sake of Jesus or some particular brand of Christianity.

And so questioning democracy is not something that a prudent person does lightly. Nevertheless, many people have begun to have their doubts about democracy these days. Every time Mr. Clinton's smiling mug appears on the TV screen, and people are reminded that it was the democratic process which put him at the head of our government, they are assailed by doubts about democracy. How could this have happened? they think. We always had faith in democracy, but now it has made a laughingstock of our government around the world. And there are other reasons for doubts as well -- at least, on the part of the more observant and thoughtful portion of the population.

Take, for example, the media and government hullabaloo about the lynching of a Black ex-convict in Texas by three boozed-up White ex-convicts in June. Lynching, of course, is a nasty business, and one can't tolerate that sort of lawless, undisciplined behavior in a civilized society, even when it's only a Black ex-convict who gets lynched. But watching the Clinton government and the controlled news media carry on about this particular lynching, one could not help but

wonder, when was the last time the government or the media made such a fuss about a Black-on-White crime?

I remember something which happened just seven months ago in New Jersey. A pretty, little, ten-year-old White girl, Lauren Relyea, was dragged into a vacant lot near her home in Piscataway, raped repeatedly, and then beaten and stabbed to death and her body mutilated: a truly horrible crime. The rapist and killer was a 24-year-old Black, and the affair was in the papers in New Jersey and New York for a day. Of course, national television ignored it, and so did Mr. Clinton, because the victim was only a little White girl, not a Black ex-convict.

Another crime which is in the news in Hawaii but nowhere else is the rape and murder of a White tourist in Hawaii by three native Hawaiians. The tourist was 23-year-old Dana Ireland, a lovely blonde girl, who was vacationing after graduating from college. The three Hawaiians were driving in a rural area near Kapoho, on the eastern edge of the island of Hawaii, when they saw Dana riding a bicycle. They swung their car around and deliberately struck her with it, knocking her off her bicycle and breaking her pelvis. They stuffed the badly injured girl into the trunk of their car, drove around for several hours smoking cocaine, then pulled off the road, dragged the girl out of the trunk, gang-raped her, and sexually tortured her. Finally, they beat her in the head with a tire-iron and left her to slowly bleed to death. An ambulance, called by a White neighbor, but manned by native Hawaiians took nearly an hour to reach her. Police found deep bite marks on her body, as well as numerous other injuries. One of the most shocking aspects of this atrocity is that it happened nearly seven years ago, on Christmas Eve 1991. The Hawaiians who raped and killed Dana were only arrested by the Hawaiian police and charged, after years of procrastination, as a result of the insistence by Dana's parents that something be done. The trials of the Hawaiian killers are still being delayed. Prosecuting native Hawaiians for crimes against Whites is not politically popular in Hawaii. And it's not politically popular in the White House either. In any event, Mr. Clinton has not been on television about the horrible crime against Dana Ireland the way he was about the recent lynching of a black ex-convict in Texas.

You know, I could go on and on about this sort of thing. We all know that nearly all interracial crimes are committed by non-Whites against Whites, but the only interracial crimes our democratically elected government is interested in are the rare White-on-Black crimes. Whites are still a pretty substantial majority in America, but it is clear that the government they elected cares much more about its favored minorities than it does about the White majority. And it is clear that the government seizes on the rare White-on-Black crimes and uses them as excuses for pushing a program of racial mixing and racial brainwashing which is opposed by most Whites.

An even starker example of democracy gone haywire is provided by South Africa. In the June *Free Speech*, I spoke about the systematic murder of White farm families in South Africa by Black gangs, and I mentioned that the Black South African government is unable or unwilling to cope with the situation. This is a government which the Whites of South Africa voted for, for all practical purposes, when they agreed in 1994 to let the Black majority vote. Prior to that only Whites could vote in South Africa, and they had a government which was able to keep Black crime under control and provide a high degree of security for White South Africans. But the Jewish media, the Christian churches, and the racial democrats in the United States howled about how unfair and undemocratic it was not to let the Blacks in South Africa vote. And so finally the

White South Africans proved to the world what good democrats they are by voting to let the Black majority vote in all future elections. And now they're paying the price. You wouldn't know that by reading the newspapers or watching television in the United States, of course. What we see here is Mr. and Mrs. Clinton talking on television about how much better things have gotten in South Africa since the country became more democratic in 1994.

I'll tell you about another benefit of democracy in South Africa. It's a popular sport among the Blacks of South Africa called "jack rolling." A Black gang will cordon off a whole block in a suburb of Johannesburg, so that no one can go either in or out, and then they will systematically gang-rape every woman and girl inside the cordon. They do this sort of thing in the Black townships all the time, but now that the situation is much more democratic they've extended their sport to White areas. Since 1994 the rape of White women by Blacks in South Africa has soared from almost nothing to the point where no White woman feels safe. A woman is raped by Blacks in South Africa every 83 seconds on the average -- the highest per capita rate in the world -- and the proportion of White women among those raped is continuing to increase.

All too typical is what happened in the home of Leon and Gina Erasmus in early June. While they were sitting at dinner, armed Blacks burst into the house. They tied up Leon and made him watch while they gang-raped 18-year-old Gina, who was nine months pregnant. Also watching was Gina's three-year-old niece. One of the Black rapists shouted to his friends, "Look, every time we do this it gets easier. These Whites are too scared to move." The police in newly democratic South Africa have for all practical purposes given up trying to stop these rapes or catch the rapists. Sometimes Black policemen themselves are rapists.

The really unfortunate thing about what's happening in South Africa is that Whites who voted against turning their country over to Blacks are just as likely to become rape or murder victims as are the trendy, democratic idiots who voted for it. But certainly all Whites in South Africa must have considerably less faith in democracy now than they did four years ago. They must be asking themselves, just as Americans do when we think about Bill Clinton in the White House: How did this happen to us? We have a democracy.

And America and South Africa are not the only places where White people are feeling that their faith in democracy was misplaced. When the communist system in the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991, the Russian people were told that henceforth they would have democracy, and things would be much better for them. Well, with democracy things have gotten a great deal worse for the real Russians -- although not for everyone living in Russia. There is genuine democracy in Russia today, just like we have in the United States. During the Russian presidential election in 1996 the Jews and Clintonistas in the United States, all of them rooting for Boris Yeltsin, really were worried that Yeltsin might not win. But Yeltsin did win, because the controlled media in Russia were backing him heavily, just as the controlled media in this country were backing Mr. Clinton. And, needless to say, the same tribe controls the media in Russia that controls the media in the United States -- and in South Africa too, for that matter. One Jew in Russia, Boris Berezovsky, has boasted publicly that he and six other businessmen, all of them Jews, own or control half of the Russian economy. A good bit of their holdings are in the mass media.

After Yeltsin won his democratic election in 1996 he promptly appointed his principal media backer and financier, Boris Berezovsky, to the post of deputy head of the National Security Council, which sets policy for Russia's police and military. Berezovsky, incidentally, is the biggest of the organized crime bosses in Russia. When Russia made the switch from communism to democracy in 1991, most of what previously had belonged to the government -- and that was nearly everything in Russia, including collective farms, factories, and the mass media -- was "privatized": that is, it was sold piece by piece to private citizens. The rationale was that this would enable Russian entrepreneurs instead of the Kremlin to run the economy. Actually, very few Russians were involved in this transformation of the economy. Instead Soviet Jews inside the government arranged "sweetheart" deals with Soviet Jews in the private sector, and most of the choice properties ended up in Jewish hands at nominal prices. The Jews didn't race to become private farmers, but they did race to become factory owners, store owners, and television network owners.

Not surprisingly, many of the Jews who got in on this theft of the Russian economy already were involved in organized crime. The result is that today while Boris Yeltsin surveys Russia from an alcoholic haze in the Kremlin, surrounded by his Jewish cabinet ministers and his claque of Jewish media bosses, Russia continues to be plundered under its new democracy by the same people who plundered the country for more than 70 years under its old communism. Filthy-rich Jewish crime bosses and Jewish factory owners are driven in their chauffeured limousines to glitzy nightclubs in Moscow, while the Russian people try desperately to make ends meet. And more and more Russians, like Americans and South Africans, are asking themselves, how could this happen to us? We have a democracy!

And all that Americans hear about this is that anti-Semitism is on the rise in Russia, as if that phenomenon has nothing to do with the nature and behavior of the Jews in Russia themselves.

So what do these accounts of what is happening in America, South Africa, and Russia tell us about democracy? How is it that the United States, which became so strong and prosperous under democracy, is now undergoing a process of self-destruction under democracy? How is it that our fellow Whites in South Africa and in Russia are having such catastrophic experiences with democracy?

A complete answer to these questions would take too long, so I'll give you a simplified answer. The two principal reasons that democracy has turned against our people are, first, that the results a people obtains from a democracy depend on the quality of the electorate; and second, that the influence of the mass media on the democratic process has been overwhelming.

That first reason simply tells us that we should expect a democracy to work better when we have a responsible, intelligent, moral, and racially conscious electorate than when we have an electorate of overweight couch potatoes, basketball fans, trendy airheads, and hymn-singing bigots. And certainly, the average quality of White voters in America has declined sharply from the time of the Founding Fathers to the present. Today we have a less manly and a much softer, more impressionable, vulgar, and irresponsible electorate than we had in the 19th century. And I'm talking only about White voters.

And the influence of the mass media on this more feminine and impressionable and irresponsible electorate -- an influence which has become overwhelming in this century with the development first of radio and then of motion pictures and television -- has made a mockery of the whole concept of democracy as a system of government by the mass of the people, who make their choices on the basis of their own innate values and attitudes. The masters of the mass media can and do manipulate the emotions and the opinions of the public on every issue of importance to themselves. They can and do set the political fashions of the day. They can and do form the image in the mind of the public of every candidate for public office.

Democracy in America today is no longer rule by the mass of the people; that is only the outward appearance of our system today. What we really have is an oligarchy, and the oligarchs are the people who own and control our mass media: the mass media, which by manipulating public opinion and the images of candidates, constrain the flow of public policy within boundaries chosen by their masters. And the really disastrous thing about this oligarchy is that the oligarchs are for the most part not even of our people but are of a people wholly alien to us.

The consequences of rule by this alien oligarchy, which hides behind the pretense of democracy, is that we have amoral and irresponsible political leaders, whose only concern is pleasing the oligarchs and thereby advancing their own careers. These are leaders like Bill Clinton, Boris Yeltsin, and Frederick de Klerk, the last White president of South Africa, who deliberately betrayed his people into Black rule. They are politicians -- really, more actors, more showmen, than statesmen -- who are addicted to the feeling of power, to the idea of controlling people and nations, but who have no real concern for the welfare or the destiny of the people they pretend to lead. With democratic politicians of this sort, obedient to the will of the hidden oligarchs of the media, White people have been led into two horribly destructive and fratricidal world wars in this century: wars which killed millions of the best people of our race, wars which led to the rise of communism and to its flourishing for more than 70 years, wars which weakened our race to the point that the oligarchs are now in the final stages of consolidating their domination of us in what they gloatingly refer to as their "New World Order."

You know, if the modern world has become such that real democracy no longer is feasible, if we **must** be ruled by oligarchs, then let us do whatever we must do to insure, first, that those oligarchs are of our own people and not of an alien race; and second, that they are moral, responsible, and racially conscious men whose primary concern is the destiny of our race. We **can** have that.

Lew, Bill, Tupac, and Mitchell

I was surprised to receive a number of letters from irate citizens who were angry and frightened about what Bill Clinton said in a speech to graduating seniors at Portland State University in Oregon on June 13. The Fastest Zipper in the West told his audience -- and that included television viewers all over America -- that we must not do anything to slow the flow of immigrants from the Third World into the United States. He denounced as "wrongheaded" those White Americans who fear that "the America they know and love is becoming a foreign land." That is a wrongheaded view of Third World immigration, Clinton said. Instead we must welcome more "diversity." More "diversity" will be good for us, he said. Anyway, he gloated, there's nothing you can do to stop it. The White majority in America will become a minority within the next 50 years, so get used to it, you wrongheaded bigots. The White America you knew and loved will become non-White. And to try to oppose this transformation of America is "more than wrong. It is un-American."

That's right. Monica Lewinsky's boyfriend, the czar of Whitewater, the mad groper of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the principal American benefactor of the Chinese missile industry, is telling **us** that **we** are un-American for not wanting to become a minority in our own land.

Now, I was surprised that a number of people contacted me after Clinton gave this speech at Portland State University, and they were angry and agitated about what he had said. I was surprised at this reaction because I have been telling everyone for the past five years that Clinton is doing everything he can to make the United States a non-White country. And the people who contacted me after the Portland State University speech acted as if they'd heard this for the first time. I believe many people think that I exaggerate the seriousness of our situation, and so they discount about half of the things I say. I guess that this is because the economy in the United States is still relatively strong, and as long as most people have a full refrigerator and can make the monthly payments on their credit cards, they can't believe that things really are catastrophically bad. They think I'm just being colorful when I say that Bill Clinton is a constitutional psychopath, an indictable criminal, and a piece of filth, and that the fact that he was elected President of the United States twice is justification for an armed rising by every patriot. They think I'm exaggerating, but I'm not exaggerating at all. If anything, I understate things.

All that's new is that Clinton was feeling his oats when he spoke at Portland State two weeks ago and blurted out his hatred for White America and his intention to destroy us a little more forthrightly than he usually does. It was this openness on Clinton's part which alarmed people. They'd heard me telling them what Clinton was up to, but they only half believed me. When they heard Clinton admit it himself they believed it. Well, thank you for that, Mr. Clinton!

One of the things which galled me most about Clinton's speech was his dragging the Irish into it. He said that our objections to having more Haitians, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Mexicans in our country is akin to the unwillingness of some of the early English immigrants to America to accept the later Irish immigrants. Baloney! My Irish ancestors may not always have gotten along with my Scottish and English ancestors, either in this country or back in Europe -- just as the

Scots and the English didn't always get along either -- but that has nothing to do with the united opposition of all sane and healthy White Americans to turning their country over to a non-White majority.

I'll tell you something else that Clinton did the same day he gave that speech at Portland State. He went to the high school in Springfield, Oregon, where one of the recent school killing sprees took place, and he spoke piously to the survivors about how he "felt their pain" and about his determination to bring an end to the epidemic of school violence which has been plaguing the country. He put on a show of real concern for the two students who had been killed and the 22 who had been wounded at Springfield's Thurston High School. He bemoaned the "culture of violence" which incites young students to kill.

Then, right after his talk to the students, teachers, and parents at Thurston High School -- right after his pious moaning about the "culture of violence" which causes school shootings -- Clinton hopped onto Air Force One and flew to Los Angeles, where he was the guest of honor at a lavish party in the mansion of Hollywood record mogul Lew Wasserman. All of the other big Hollywood Jewish media bosses were there too. The purpose of the party was to raise donations for the Democratic Party, and the Clintonistas were expecting close to a million dollars in donations from Wasserman and the other media bosses at the party. Now, remember, Mr. Clinton arrived at this party and gave Mr. Wasserman a big hug just a few hours after his teary speech at Thurston High School, where a 15-year-old student had blown away 24 of his schoolmates.

Lew Wasserman, Mr. Clinton's host, is the chairman emeritus of MCA, the giant record company which is the world's principal promoter and distributor of the musical genre known as "gangsta' rap." For those of you who don't already know this, gangsta' rap has lyrics glorifying the life-style of Black gangsters and drug bosses. It glorifies street shootings and other aspects of Black criminality. Its rap lyrics are very graphic about murder and rape, which it promotes as being very "cool" and fashionable. Gangsta' rap has been pushed hard by Wasserman and other big media Jews in an effort to get White kids hooked on Black culture and Black life-styles. It fits right in with Mr. Clinton's efforts to eliminate White racism by getting Whites to accept Blacks and other aspects of "diversity."

To be more specific, Lew Wasserman's MCA owns Interscope Records and a number of other record labels. One of Interscope's featured performers, until he was himself killed in a drive-by shooting in Las Vegas last year, was the Black gangsta' rapper Tupac Shakur.

Do you remember the school-yard shooting in Jonesboro, Arkansas, in March, when two young gunmen killed four of their schoolmates and a teacher? One of the killers was 13-year-old Mitchell Johnson. Thirteen years old, and he murdered five people in cold blood! How could it happen? everybody was asking.

Well, Mitchell Johnson's English teacher, Debbie Pelley, told the world how she thought it happened, but apparently not many people were listening, because her answer was politically inconvenient, if not Politically Incorrect. The Jonesboro English teacher had noted that Mitchell Johnson's behavior began changing in the months before the shootings, when he began listening to gangsta' rap. He became addicted to the music, his teacher said, when she told a U.S. Senate

committee in Washington about it: "Mitchell brought this music to school with him, listened to it on the bus, tried listening to it in classes. . . . He was far more into this music than anyone else his friends knew." Young Mitchell Johnson's favorite rapper was Tupac Shakur. The CDs that Mitchell brought to school and listened to on the school bus were sold to him by Lew Wasserman's company.

Mitchell's teacher told the U.S. Senate that the 13-year-old White boy would sing along to the lyrics as he listened to the Black rapper, lyrics about "coming to school and killing all the kids." To Debbie Pelley, who saw the transformation of Mitchell Johnson with her own eyes -- and who was lucky not to have been shot when the 13-year-old did, in fact, come to school and begin killing all the kids, it's perfectly clear what made the impressionable boy think it would be "cool" to shoot his schoolmates.

Did Bill Clinton not know what Debbie Pelley knew? Did Bill Clinton not know that she placed the blame for the massacre squarely on the influence that "gangsta' rap" had on Mitchell Johnson? Had Bill Clinton's advisors not told him that the boy's favorite rapper was Tupac Shakur? Was Bill Clinton unaware that Lew Wasserman's company produced and distributed Tupac Shakur's music about "coming to school and killing all the kids"?

I think not. I think he was aware of it, but he figured that the general public wasn't, and so he could get away with going to Lew Wasserman's party and hugging Lew Wasserman and accepting money from Lew Wasserman just a few hours after telling the parents at Thurston High School in Springfield, Oregon, that he "felt their pain" over the shootings there and that he was determined to do everything he could to end the "culture of violence" which led to such shootings. He figured he could get away with it because Lew Wasserman's fellow Jewish media bosses wouldn't call him to account for it. I guess he figured right, didn't he?

Now do you understand why I say that I am not exaggerating at all when I refer to Bill Clinton as an unspeakable piece of filth and describe his presence in the White House as clear evidence that we need an armed revolution in America? Do you understand what a dangerous situation our country and our children are in as long as the system that put Bill Clinton in the White House remains in place?

I've said this before, and I'll say it again: The reason we need a revolution in America is not that Bill Clinton is a liar and a hypocrite; that's true of every politician in Washington and has been for a long time. We don't need to be especially concerned that Bill Clinton is a groper and a fondler, and that he solicits oral sex from 21-year-old White House interns and then lies about it and tells others to lie about it. We don't even need to be especially concerned that Bill Clinton is a thief, a swindler, and a solicitor of bribes. We can live with a perjurer in the White House, and a suborner of perjury, and an obstructor of justice. We can survive these things; the country can survive them. We can even survive having in the White House a politician so rotten, so crooked, and so cynical that he can put on a big pretense of sympathizing with the parents of children wounded or slain in a school-yard shooting and denounce the "culture of violence" which led to the shooting, while knowing that in a few hours he will be embracing one of the principal promoters of that "culture of violence" and accepting money from him.

No, Bill Clinton's real crimes, his unforgivable crimes are none of those things. Bill Clinton's real crimes, the crimes that justify a revolution, are the things he confessed to in his speech at Portland State University. Bill Clinton admits to having policies intended to make America less White. He admits to working for a non-White majority in America. He admits to combating any effort by Whites to protect their culture and race or to keep America from becoming a Third World country. He boasts about these things, and he encourages impressionable young people to accept these things, to cheer him for these things, to join him in promoting these things.

Bill Clinton's real crime is not perjury: it's genocide. The reason he is a disaster for America is not that he takes bribes or that he stole money in his Whitewater escapade; it's that he is stealing our children's future. If Bill Clinton has his way, America will become a non-White country within the next 50 years -- that is, during your children's lifetime -- racial mixing and miscegenation will continue increasing, and our race eventually will become extinct. That's what Bill Clinton is planning. That's what he's working toward. That's what he's trying to sell to impressionable young Americans. That's what he's trying to make seem fashionable and "cool": **genocide** -- racial suicide. While his good buddy and financial backer Lew Wasserman promotes school-yard massacres by selling gangsta' rap to children, Bill Clinton promotes the annihilation of our race.

So that's the situation we're facing: genocide, the annihilation of our race. I will explain a little about the background of this situation, about how and why we got into it, in the future, but now let us talk about what we ought to **do** about it. I said that Bill Clinton's presence in the White House is justification for an armed rising. That does not mean that I want individual patriots to begin shooting at the White House now. No, it's too soon for that. That wouldn't accomplish what we want. It would just play into our enemies' hands by frightening the couch potatoes into accepting even more limitations on their freedom. An armed revolution is **morally** justified, but it is not yet **strategically** justified. We still have a big educational job to do first. And we need to do this job at several levels: we need to educate the couch potatoes as well as people with broader horizons, people who care about the future as well as the present.

The couch potatoes may not be capable of becoming indignant about Mr. Clinton's plan to make America non-White. That's too big and too distant for them to get their minds around. But even the Joe and Jill Six-packs ought to be able to understand and be angry about his cynicism in weeping publicly about school-yard shootings in the afternoon and then hugging the principal promoter of school-yard shootings in the evening. School-yard shootings they can understand. Tupac Shakur's lyrics they can understand. The influence of those lyrics on Mitchell Johnson in Jonesboro they can understand just as well as Mitchell Johnson's English teacher could. And Bill Clinton's cozy relationship with Lew Wasserman they can understand. It's all tied together into a very pretty package.

Of course, the controlled media won't tie it together so the couch potatoes can see the whole picture, but I've just done that. You can do the same thing in talking to people you know. You can paint the same picture in letters to the editor of your local newspaper. You can explain it in detail on your favorite radio call-in show. People can understand that. And when they do understand it, many of them will be angry.

As for the people with broader horizons, the bright and perceptive people in our universities, in our professions, among our business leaders -- and you know, there are some of these people who still do have a moral sense, a sense of racial responsibility -- you should reach out to these people too. Many of them are just as concerned and angry as you are about Bill Clinton's plans for the destruction of our race and culture. What they need is encouragement. They need to know that they aren't alone. They need to know that there are many other bright, capable, and idealistic people willing to work together to derail Bill Clinton's nightmare program for a mulatto America. They need to see and hear other people who are not afraid to speak out. These people have never been more ready than now to accept your hand if you reach out to them. They understand the urgency of our situation as well as you do. When Bill Clinton goes public with his plans, the way he did at Portland State University, in his effort to recruit the trendier airheads for his program of genocide, he also alerts decent and thoughtful people. He helps them snap out of their fog and understand the reality and the urgency of what we must deal with. That's why I got a lot of agitated letters after Clinton's speech at Portland State.

In the future I'll explain more about what's behind Bill Clinton's nightmare program for the continued darkening of America, but you don't have to wait for that. What you can do now is talk to everyone you know about the things I've just told you. Use every medium available to you. Use the Internet. Use your telephone. Use radio and newspapers. More and more people are ready to respond. So don't be afraid. Speak out. Explain. Recruit.

The Jewish Gold Rush

A subject we've discussed often enough for many of you to be tired of hearing about it is the continuing -- make that the escalating -- Jewish effort to extort reparations from the rest of the world for claimed injuries done to Jews of past generations by Gentiles of past generations. I would drop the subject, except that every week Jewish leaders make new demands which surpass all previous bounds for greed and arrogance. You wouldn't believe the arrogance and pushiness of these Jews when they smell gold -- except that it's all documented, all in your daily newspaper for you to read. Therefore, this Great Jewish Gold Hunt makes a wonderful educational tool for helping others to understand the nature of the Jews, and I cannot resist using it.

You remember, this current gold hunt began early last year, when Jewish leaders came up with the idea of expanding their claim for reparations from the 1930s and 1940s to include countries besides Germany. They already had bled Germany for $60 billion since 1948, most of which went to Israel. That averages out to about $60,000 for every Jewish family of four now in Israel. Getting that money from Germany was relatively easy, because the Allied governments had an occupation army in Germany that was ready to squeeze the Germans whenever the Jews gave the word. All they had to do to keep the Germans from complaining about these massive extortion payments was step up their whining about gas chambers and about the soap and lampshades supposedly manufactured from the corpses of gassed Jews. When they really wanted to shut up the doubters and the questioners, they would have Steven Spielberg crank out a new Hollywood dramatization of the so-called "Holocaust," which would have the effect of making anyone so "insensitive" as to think of denying the poor, persecuted Jews anything they demanded seem like a real heel to the public.

A few years ago they added a new twist to their racket by implying that it was not just the Germans who owed them reparations for having run Aunt Sarah and Uncle Abe through a crematorium at Auschwitz: **everybody** owed them for **permitting** the wicked Germans to "Holocaust" Sarah and Abe. The United States and the other Western countries who fought against Germany during the Second World War could have stopped the "Holocaust" if they really had wanted to, the Jews complained. The Allies could have bombed the rail lines leading to the German concentration camps, but they didn't, the Jews complained. The Allies could have taken in many Jewish refugees fleeing from Germany before the war, but they didn't: they turned the refugee ships back, and the Jews aboard them consequently perished in the "Holocaust," the Jews complained. "You could haff saved millions of us if you really had vanted to, but you didn't vant to. It vass your anti-Semitism which made you insensitive to our needs back in the 1930s and 1940s. So now you owe us."

After a good, long whine along this line intended to soften up and "sensitize" the Gentile world, and after a law prohibiting negative comments about identifiable ethnic groups was passed in Switzerland, the Jews became much more specific in their complaints. They claimed that many Jews who had stashed their money in secret, numbered Swiss bank accounts during the 1930s and early 1940s in anticipation of difficulties with the German authorities, subsequently died during the war, and their money still remained in the secret accounts. The Swiss had not done all they could to try to locate heirs of the depositors. They owed all of that money in dormant

accounts to the Jews -- plus interest, of course. The head of the World Jewish Congress, Edgar Bronfman, who also belongs to the family who owns the world's biggest liquor company, Seagram, took charge of the effort to force the Swiss to pay up. Bronfman estimated that the amount owed to the Jews by the Swiss is $7 billion. Later the Jews expanded their claims to include insurance policies held by Jews who disappeared during the war and also gold used by the Germans to pay the Swiss for various commodities imported by Germany during the war. The Swiss should have known, claim the Jews, that some of that gold had come from confiscated Jewish assets. "Giff it back to us," the Jews now demand.

Of course, every large bank does have some dormant accounts, and in the case of Swiss banks, which always have taken pride in the confidentiality they offer to their customers, it is understandable that today Izzy and Rebecca may not have been able to get their hands on or even find the money that they believe Uncle Abe may have stashed in a secret account 60 years ago. The Swiss bankers pointed out that they always have treated their Jewish customers just like everyone else, and that any heirs who establish their claims in the normal manner would receive whatever was in Abe's account. The Jews feigned outrage at this response and accused the Swiss of being "insensitive" for failing to take into account the fact that there were no death certificates or other documents for many of the Jews who disappeared during the war. Of course, with the widespread destruction that occurred during the war, the same is true for non-Jews.

A few Swiss officials recognized these Jewish claims for the shameless extortion effort that they are and publicly denounced them as such. Most Swiss politicians and bankers, however, were more concerned with not jeopardizing their public image by having the Jews unleash their media weapon, and so they took a conciliatory approach to the Jews. They made a special search of their accounts and then took the unprecedented step of publishing the names of all their depositors whose accounts had been dormant since the Second World War, so that Jews could more easily file claims. It turned out that only a very tiny percentage of these dormant accounts belonged to Jews. Of course, this was largely ignored by the media. And of course the Jews continued to whine about how the Swiss had wronged them. They added to their list of grievances the fact that the Swiss had interned Jews who came across the Swiss border during the war in their effort to avoid being arrested by the Germans. The Swiss put them into work camps for the duration of the war. One might think that the Jews would be grateful to the Swiss for this, but if you thought that then you don't understand the Jewish mentality. Instead of being grateful to the Swiss for saving them from the Germans the Jews publicly lamented the fact that the Swiss made them work for their room and board. The media only occasionally mention that all able-bodied Swiss citizens were also forced to work during the war.

The Swiss are a bit naive when it comes to dealing with Jews, and so they have continued to try to appease them, even as the Jewish demands have escalated. The Swiss bankers and politicians got together recently, estimated the **most** the Jewish assets they **might** be holding could amount to is in the neighborhood of $150 million, multiplied that figure by **four,** and then offered to pay the Jews $600 million to settle all of their claims.

Now, if you understand the Jewish mentality, then you don't have to be told how Bronfman and the other Jewish leaders responded to this offer. The Jews simply escalated their demands again. They feigned shock and outrage that the Swiss offered them **only** $600 million. Liquor czar and

World Jewish Congress boss Edgar Bronfman scoffed at the $600 million offer and said that the Swiss owe his people billions of dollars, not millions. Israeli spokesman Yoram Dori called the Swiss offer "offensive" and said: "If we were not dealing with such a tragic story, this would be laughable." Bronfman's colleague in the World Jewish Congress, Israel Singer, claimed to be "pained" by the Swiss offer and said that the offer had been made in a "shabby" manner. Rabbi Marvin Hier of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles said of the Swiss offer: "We consider it a lack of seriousness on their part." He added that the offer "will be unanimously refused." New York Jewish lawyer Edward Fagan, who is representing more than 30,000 Jews claiming to be heirs to dormant accounts, called the Swiss offer "insulting" and said, "My 31,000 clients will not stand for this. . . . A billion dollars is not enough."

Behind all of this pretended outrage and these claims of feeling insulted by the Swiss offer of $600 million is a lot of very cold-blooded calculation by the Jews. They simply believe that by using their media power and their virtually total control of the Clinton administration, the U.S. Congress, and several state legislatures they can squeeze substantially more than $600 million out of the Swiss. The Jews' number-one step'n'fetchit in the Congress is New York Republican Senator Alphonse D'Amato, chairman of the Senate Banking Committee. He is running for re-election in November and is counting heavily on Jewish support. After the Jews let their displeasure with the latest Swiss offer be known, D'Amato threatened to use the Senate Banking Committee for reprisals against Swiss banks operating in the United States. He said: "If they continue to proceed in this manner, whereby they are ducking their responsibilities, we have no other course in the Congress of the United States than to go forward."

New Jersey state Assemblyman Joel Weingarten has introduced legislation to bar New Jersey from investing state funds in Swiss banks, and similar measures are moving forward in New York City and in the New York state legislature. In California, the Chinese State Treasurer, Matt Fong, also is eager to prove his loyalty to the Jews.

So confident are the Jews that ultimately they can pressure the Swiss into yielding to their demands that World Jewish Congress boss Edgar Bronfman already is talking publicly about other countries on the Jews' hit list. "It's not just the Swiss banks," he said in a published telephone interview with the New York Jewish newspaper *Forward.* "We still have problems with the Poles, with the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the other neutrals." It's pretty clear that after the Jews have sucked the Swiss dry they will be looking for blood from a long line of other countries they believe haven't done enough for them recently.

A new line of attack which the Jews are using is that the European countries which claimed neutrality during the Second World War and refused to join the Jewish-American-Soviet crusade against Germany weren't really neutral: they provided aid to the Germans, and so now they owe reparations to the Jews. Switzerland also had business dealings with the Allies, but this is ignored. A Jewish official in the Clinton administration, Stuart Eizenstat, has been especially active in pushing the idea that the neutral countries were guilty of not doing enough for the Jews. He has prepared a report for the U.S. State Department in which he strongly criticizes Sweden, Spain, and other neutral countries. Eizenstat concludes: "It is clear that these countries were committing unneutral acts, even by the standards of the times."

The arrogance of Eizenstat's complaint is really breathtaking, considering the fact that under Jewish pressure the Roosevelt administration, in 1939, 1940, and 1941, at a time when the United States was officially "neutral," was committing unneutral acts against Germany which dwarfed into insignificance anything the Swedes and the Spaniards might have been doing to help Germany. Not only was the Roosevelt government supplying first Britain, and later the Soviet Union, with vast supplies of war materiel, but Roosevelt was trying everything he could to provoke the Germans into some action that would give him an excuse to enter the war on the Jewish side. In September 1941, three months before the official entry of the United States into the war, he went so far as to order the U.S. Navy to shoot on sight at any German naval vessel encountered in the Atlantic.

Unfortunately, the historical facts of the behavior of all the parties involved in the Second World War are not presented to the American public by the mass media, but just the facts the Jews want the public to know about. The average citizen listens to the complaints of the Jews about the unneutral behavior of Switzerland, Sweden, and Spain and believes that there may be some justification to the Jewish demands for reparations. It never occurs to the average couch potato to ask, "Hey, what about reparations for all of the other peoples who were looted during the war? Why are the Jews the only ones entitled to reparations? And if the Jews are entitled to reparations for losses that occurred 60 years ago, why shouldn't the Palestinians be entitled to reparations for what the Jews stole from them much more recently?"

No, unfortunately, it doesn't occur to the average American to ask such questions. He just accepts at face value whatever he reads in his newspaper or sees on his television screen. And as long as his newspaper and his television screen are controlled by the Jews, he's not likely to see anything which would cause him to question the current Jewish demands for gold from the rest of the world.

You might wonder how anyone could possibly be as arrogant as the Jews are in their quest for reparations. I think that the best explanation for that is to be found in the Jews' view of themselves and their relationship to the non-Jewish peoples of the world. This view is best expressed in documents the Jews themselves have written: documents such as their Talmud and their Old Testament. I understand, of course, that most Jews today are entirely secular and do not regard such documents with any special reverence or awe. Nevertheless, they provide wonderful insight into the Jewish mentality.

More than 3,000 years ago, when the immigrant Jew Joseph managed to become the most powerful bureaucrat in the Egyptian government by claiming to be able to interpret dreams for the superstitious pharaoh, according to the Old Testament book of Genesis, he acquired a monopoly control over the Egyptian grain market and doled out grain to the hungry Egyptian people or withheld it, according to his policy -- although he invoked the name of the pharaoh in exercising his policy. He then invited his fellow Jews to come into Egypt and to "eat the fat of the land." Not surprisingly, this policy caused resentment toward the Jews by the Egyptians, and eventually the Egyptians, under a new pharaoh, threw the Jews out.

Now, it's not really important whether or not this account in Genesis is historically accurate. What's important is the Jews' attitude toward this account, and their attitude is that it was right

and proper for them to exploit the Egyptians, and that the Egyptians were persecuting them in expelling them. It was the Jews' right to exploit the Egyptians, because whatever the Egyptians had really belonged to the Jews as God's Chosen People.

One sees this attitude of "what's yours is really mine, because I am a member of the Chosen People" expressed over and over again in the Old Testament. In the book of Isaiah it is perhaps most explicit. Isaiah presents to his fellow Jews a vision of the future in which the Gentiles of the world will deliver all of their wealth to the Jews and will become the servants of the Jews. And anyone who refuses to pay reparations to the Jews will be punished severely: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish." This is spelled out in detail in the sixtieth and sixty-first chapters of Isaiah.

Observant Jews focus their consciousness of their Jewishness on this assumed obligation of the Gentile world to turn its wealth over to them. They have a custom of attaching a little box to one of their doorposts, with a piece of parchment, called a mezuzah, in the little box. The parchment is inscribed in Hebrew characters with 22 lines from the Old Testament which epitomize to them what it means to be a Jew: that is, with the 22 lines they regard as the most important in all of their religious writings. These 22 lines are from the fifth book of Moses, also known as Deuteronomy. They stress the importance of Jews adhering to the contract they have with their tribal god. The interesting thing is that immediately following these 22 lines in Deuteronomy is spelled out what their god will give to them as his obligation under the contract. And what is promised to the Jews is essentially all the wealth of the world: specifically, all the wealth now in the hands of non-Jews. "Thy god shall . . . give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not, and houses full of all good things, which thou filledst not, and wells digged which thou diggedst not, and vineyards and olive trees which thou plantedst not. . . . Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours." Remember, religious Jews regard this promise, this contract, as the core of their religion.

As you know, it is not my custom to bring religion into these broadcasts. I certainly don't want to start any religious arguments among my readers. But I do think that a consideration of the nature of Jewish religious belief, as expressed in their religious writings, can shed some useful light on their attitudes today. Whether they are religious Jews or non-religious Jews they all seem to have the attitude that they have some god-given right to exploit the rest of us. If there are Jews who dissent from this policy of collecting reparations from the rest of the world, I would like to hear them speak up. So far they seem to be rather unanimous in their support of the notion that the Swiss owe them billions of dollars -- and the Swedes and the Spaniards and, in fact, all the rest of us.

The Genocide at Vinnitsa

In the May issue of *Free Speech,* I discussed he mass murder of the leadership stratum of the Polish nation by the Soviet secret police in the Katyn Forest in April 1940. We discussed that genocidal atrocity in the light of the ongoing Jewish campaign to portray Jews as the principal victims of the Second World War. A good deal of interest in that article was expressed by readers, many of whom had not been acquainted previously with the facts of the Katyn atrocity. I will now explore this general subject further. Here is some information about the fate of the Ukrainian nation at the hands of the Soviet secret police.

In 1943 Germany was at war against the Soviet Union. Twenty-five years earlier, at the end of the First World War, when communist revolutionaries were attempting to take over Germany, Adolf Hitler had sworn to devote his life to fighting communism. He was only a corporal at the time, recuperating from his war wounds in a military hospital, but 15 years later, in 1933, he became chancellor of Germany, and in 1941 his army invaded the Soviet Union with the aim of destroying Soviet communism. The German Army pushed far into the Soviet empire and liberated all of Ukraine from the communists.

In May 1943 units of the German Army were stationed in the Ukrainian city of Vinnitsa, a community of 100,000 persons in a primarily agricultural district. Ukrainian officials in Vinnitsa told the Germans that five years earlier the NKVD -- the Soviet secret police, very similar to our FBI -- had buried the bodies of a number of executed political prisoners in a city park. The Germans investigated, and within a month they had dug up 9,439 corpses from a number of mass graves in the park and a nearby orchard.

Unlike the Poles murdered in the Katyn Forest, all of these bodies found at Vinnitsa were those of civilians, most of them Ukrainian farmers or workers. The bodies of the men all had their hands tied behind their backs, like the Polish officers at Katyn. Although the men's bodies were clothed, the bodies of a number of young women were naked. All of the victims had been shot in the back of the neck with a .22 caliber pistol, the trademark of the NKVD executioners.

The Germans called in an international team of forensic pathologists to examine the bodies and the mass graves. The international team, which included pathologists from Belgium, France, Netherlands, and Sweden, as well as from several countries allied with Germany, examined 95 mass graves and conducted a number of autopsies.

Including the autopsies already performed by Ukrainian medical personnel in Vinnitsa, 1,670 of the corpses were examined in detail. The identities of 679 of them were established either through documents found in their clothes or through recognition by relatives, who flocked to Vinnitsa from the surrounding countryside when they heard that the graves had been uncovered.

The authorities estimated that in addition to the 9,439 bodies exhumed, there were another 3,000 still in unopened mass graves in the same area. The international team concluded that all of the victims had been killed about five years earlier -- that is, in 1938. Relatives of the victims who were identified all testified that the victims had been arrested by the NKVD in 1937 and 1938.

The relatives had been told that those arrested were "enemies of the people" and would be sent to Siberia for 10 years. None of the relatives had any idea what the reason was for the arrests and testified that those arrested had committed no crimes and were engaged in no political activity. As I said earlier, nearly all of the victims were farmers or workers, although there were a few priests and civil servants among them.

By interviewing a large number of people who had some knowledge of what had happened in Vinnitsa and the surrounding region in 1938, the Germans were able to piece together the following picture. In 1937 and 1938 gangs of the NKVD's jackbooted thugs roamed the villages and towns of Ukraine, arresting people in a pattern that seemed almost random to observers. One victim's wife reported that as the NKVD goons dragged her husband away they said only, "Hey, you dog! You've lived too long." Other observers thought they saw a pattern. A Ukrainian who was renting a part of his house to a Jewish lawyer refused to sell the whole house to the Jew when he offered to buy it at an unreasonably low price. A few weeks later the Ukrainian homeowner was arrested by the NKVD. Another Ukrainian who had threatened to beat up a minor communist functionary who made a crude pass at his sister was arrested shortly thereafter. It seemed that many of the arrests were the settling of personal scores and that anyone who had crossed a Jew was especially likely to be arrested.

All of this was nothing new for Ukrainians. They had borne the brunt of the communization of the Soviet Union for nearly two decades. Ukraine was primarily an agricultural nation, a nation of farmers and villagers, and as such was regarded with suspicion by the Jews and the urban rabble who filled the ranks of the Communist Party. The communists championed the urban workers, but they wasted no love on farmers and villagers, who tended to be too independent and self-sufficient for communist tastes.

During the civil war which followed the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the Ukrainians wanted to opt out. Ukrainian nationalists wanted no part of the Soviet Union. In 1921 and 1922 the Red Army occupied Vinnitsa, and Ukrainians were butchered wholesale by the Reds in order to kill the Ukrainian nationalist spirit. The craving for Ukrainian independence nevertheless kept flaring up, and further massacres followed, notably in 1928.

Ukraine was the stronghold of the kulaks, the independent farmers and small landowners, always regarded with special hatred by the communist bosses. Stalin gave the job of exterminating the kulaks to his right-hand man in the Kremlin, Lazar Moiseivich Kaganovich, known later as the "Butcher of Ukraine." Kaganovich, the most powerful Jew in the Soviet Union, supervised the collectivization of Ukrainian farms, beginning in 1929. To break the spirit of the kulaks, Ukraine was subjected to an artificial famine. The NKVD and Red Army troops went from farm to farm, confiscating crops and livestock. The farmers were told that the food was needed for the workers in the cities. None was left for the farmers. And in 1933 and 1934 seven million Ukrainians died of starvation, while Kaganovich watched and gloated from the Kremlin.

Perhaps in 1937 and 1938 the bosses in the Kremlin simply thought that it was time to apply the lash to the Ukrainians again. In any event, the NKVD was given the task this time. The NKVD was even more Jewish than the rest of the Soviet communist apparatus. The commissar of the NKVD until September 1936 had been the Jew Genrikh Yagoda, and he had staffed his

instrument of terror and repression with Jews at every level. And those who were not Jews were the worst sort of Russian and Ukrainian rabble, the resentful louts and ne'er-do-wells who saw in communism a way to get even with their betters. In any event, the Ukrainians were fully aware of the preponderance of Jews in the secret police, and they suspected that there was a Jewish angle to the pattern of arrests in 1937 and 1938. And indeed, it did seem as if the Talmudic injunction to "kill the best of the Gentiles" were being followed, for those who were arrested seemed to be the most solid, steadiest, reliable, and irreproachable of the Ukrainians.

Thirty thousand were arrested in the Vinnitsa region alone, and most of these eventually were sent to the NKVD prison in the city of Vinnitsa. This prison had a normal capacity of 2,000 prisoners, but during 1937 and 1938 it was packed most of the time with more than 18,000 prisoners. Throughout much of 1938 a few dozen prisoners were taken from the prison each night and driven to a nearby NKVD motor pool area. There their hands were tied behind their backs and they were led, one at a time, a few hundred feet to a concrete slab in front of a garage. The slab was used for washing vehicles, and it had a drain at one side with an iron grating over it. Just as the prisoners reached the edge of the slab they were shot in the back of the neck, so that when they fell onto the concrete their blood would run into the drain. This was what the NKVD men jokingly called "mokrii rabota" -- "wet work" -- and they had had plenty of experience at "wet work." A truck parked next to the slab kept its engine racing so that the noise of the engine would cover the sound of the shots. While the next prisoner was being led up, a couple of NKVD men would throw the corpse of the previous prisoner into the truck. When the night's quota of victims had been murdered the truck would drive off with its load of corpses to the fenced-in park or to the nearby orchard, where new graves already were waiting. And this "wet work" went on night after night, month after month.

So why is this gruesome story important to us now? After all, this massacre of Ukrainians in Vinnitsa took place 60 years ago. I'll tell you why it's still important to us, aside from the fact that these Ukrainians were our people, our kinfolk, part of our race.

First, you might ask yourself why you have never before heard about Vinnitsa, and I'm sure that's the case for about 99 per cent of you. Of course, Alexander Solzhenitsyn wrote about what happened at Vinnitsa, in the third volume of his *Gulag Archipelago,* but you're not likely to find that in the rack at the checkout counter. And Ukrainians and Germans have written about it, although for the most part their writings have never been published in English, because publishers in this country understand that it would be Politically Incorrect to publish anything about Vinnitsa. Much better that people just forget about it.

Isn't that odd, though, when we continually hear so much about Auschwitz? Isn't it odd that when Jewish groups are using their political influence to have laws passed in a number of states requiring high school students to take courses about the so-called "Holocaust," what happened at Katyn or at Vinnitsa is never mentioned in high school? The excuse given for requiring students to study the so-called "Holocaust" is that it was the greatest crime in history, and we should know about it so that we won't repeat it. But then why shouldn't we learn about Katyn, Vinnitsa, Dresden, and a thousand other atrocities where our people were the victims, and so the lesson should be even more pertinent for us?

We all know the answers to these questions, but I just want you to think about their significance. To Jews, Auschwitz is important because Jews died there, and Vinnitsa is not important, because only Gentiles were killed there. And the media bosses are, of course, mostly Jews. They keep rubbing our noses in Auschwitz, because they want us to feel guilty, they want us to feel that we owe the Jews something for letting it happen. The Jewish media bosses never mention Vinnitsa because Jews were the guilty ones there. Besides, they make a lot of money by promoting the "Holocaust." It's certainly not going to help their profits to divide the attention and the sympathy of the American public between Auschwitz and Vinnitsa. And it's certainly not going to help their effort to extort billions of dollars in "Holocaust" reparations from the Swiss and from everyone else to admit their own guilt at Katyn and Vinnitsa.

If Poles controlled the news and entertainment media in America, we'd hear a great deal more about Katyn, I suspect. If Germans controlled our media we'd hear much more about the terror bombing of Dresden. And if Ukrainians controlled our media, every high school student would know about Vinnitsa. But it's the Jews who control our media, and so all we hear about is Auschwitz: never even a whisper about Vinnitsa. That's important. We ought to be concerned about that. We ought to be concerned whenever any part of our history is suppressed, is hidden from us. We ought to find out why. It might help us to make sure that what happened to us at Vinnitsa never happens to us again.

I'm sure that you've all heard the maxim that the best defense is a strong offense. Do you remember the persecution all through the 1980s of John Demjanjuk, the retired Cleveland auto worker whom the Jews accused of being "Ivan the Terrible"? John Demjanjuk is a Ukrainian who came to America after the Second World War. In 1978 the Jews made a big hullabaloo about Demjanjuk being a guard in a German prison camp during the war, and the U.S. government obediently hauled him to court and stripped him of his citizenship. Then he was handed over to the Jews for crucifixion and deported to Israel. The mass media in America were full of sensational stories for 15 years about Ivan the Terrible and how the Ukrainians had helped the Germans persecute the poor, innocent Jews.

This strategy worked for the Jews. The Ukrainians kept their heads down instead of raising the issue of Vinnitsa. Of course, even if they had begun trying to tell Americans about Vinnitsa or about what Kaganovich had done to the Ukrainian kulaks, who would have heard them? Ukrainians don't own the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, *Time* magazine, *Newsweek* magazine, or *U.S. News & World Report.* The Jews own all of those media. And the Ukrainians don't own Hollywood, so they can't make movie dramas about Vinnitsa either, like Steven Spielberg does about the so-called "Holocaust."

The Jews have been getting away with presenting a grossly distorted version of history to us, a version in which they are the completely innocent victims, and our people -- the Ukrainians and Poles and Germans -- are the bad guys who have been persecuting the poor Jews for no reason at all. They've been pumping out this propaganda in concert, consciously and deliberately, without a single major medium under their control deviating from their party line. People try to tell me Jews may control the media, but they don't conspire with each other. Baloney!

And because they've been getting away with giving us a falsified version of history, they've been able to change America's foreign and domestic policies in directions to suit themselves, to our enormous disadvantage. Everything which has happened in the Middle East, for example, since the Second World War is based on this false history.

More than that, everything that has happened in Europe since the murder of 12,000 Ukrainians at Vinnitsa in 1938 has been based on the Jews' power to control what we learn about our history, about what is happening and has happened in the world around us. The U.S. government allied itself with the Soviet government in 1941 for the purpose of destroying Germany. The communists were presented to the American public as the good guys, as worthy allies, and the Germans were presented as the bad guys. And the American public bought that lie because they didn't know about Vinnitsa or about a thousand other atrocities committed against our people by the communists.

When the Germans brought in the international commission to examine the graves in Vinnitsa in 1943, the controlled media kept the news from the American people, just the way they kept the news about the Katyn Forest genocide away from the American people. And because of this, there was no real opposition to turning half of Europe over to the communists at the end of the Second World War. If Katyn and Vinnitsa had been publicized, so that every American voter knew in detail what the NKVD had done at Katyn and at Vinnitsa, the politicians in Washington never would have been able to get away with turning the Poles, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Croats, Serbs, Czechs, Slovaks, Balts, and all of the Germans in the eastern part of Germany over to these communist butchers. The politicians in Washington got away with this not just because they were in the pockets of the Jews, but because the American people weren't given the truth. And because we weren't given the truth millions more of our people died at the hands of the NKVD after the war, all of eastern Europe was plundered by the communists for 50 years, and there was a Korean War and a Vietnam War -- which there wouldn't have been if we hadn't kept the communist empire alive. Because of our own ignorance, because of the lies we'd been told about what happened in Europe, we lost more than 100,000 of our best young men in the Korean and Vietnam wars alone.

So you see, it is important what the public is told. It is important that our people know the truth about our history, even about things which happened 60 years ago. And I intend to do everything I can to give them the truth.

Now, I believe that you can understand why the Jews try so hard to keep me off the air, why they bring pressure against every radio station which carries *American Dissident Voices.* They are desperate to keep the American people in the dark about Vinnitsa, Katyn, and their other crimes. And I am determined to tear down the curtain of silence and darkness and give truth and light to our people.

There is some urgency about this, because the Jews are continuing to push for laws against what they call "hate speech" -- which means any speech which contradicts their lies. They have succeeded in getting such laws passed in other countries. If I tried to make this broadcast in Canada or Britain, for example, the police would arrest me and shut down the station before I could finish. Let's not let that happen in America.

Superman, Volkswagen, and Lazar Kaganovich

I have a number of news reports on my desk which have come to me from around the world during the past couple of weeks. These reports deal with various events in a half-dozen countries, but they all have one element in common: organized Jewish groups with their hands out, demanding money, demanding sympathy, demanding the punishment of their critics. Some of these reports reveal an arrogance, greed, and pushiness so extreme as to be almost comical. For example, a couple of recent issues of "Superman" comics -- issues 81 and 82, to be specific -- had Superman fighting the Germans in the Warsaw ghetto back in the 1940s. The Germans were the bad guys, and the residents of the ghetto, who had names like "Baruch" and "Moishe" and were shown wearing yarmulkes, were the good guys. Superman was saving Moishe and Baruch from being shipped off to a concentration camp by the Germans. Pretty standard pro-Jewish, anti-German "Holocaust" propaganda, of the sort we've been seeing for the past 60 years, right?

Well, organized Jewish groups weren't happy with it, because the good guys weren't identified explicitly as **Jews.** "Moishe" and "Baruch" and the yarmulkes weren't explicit enough. The word "Jew" wasn't used. The Jews are concerned that a child reading the comic books who had never seen a yarmulke and who didn't know that the names "Moishe" and "Baruch" are strictly kosher might think that the people Superman was saving were Poles instead of Jews. The Poles might get some undeserved sympathy from the reader as victims of the Germans. And the Jews always have demanded that they be given **all** of the sympathy connected with the so-called "Holocaust." They don't want anyone else horning in on their "victim" status. Kenneth Jacobson, of the ADL, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the largest and most powerful Jewish pressure group in America, called the Superman comics depiction of the "Holocaust" outrageous. That's the word he used: "outrageous." He complained that it is an "insult" to the "six million Jews" who died in the "Holocaust" because it didn't use the word "Jew."

Another ADL official, Myrna Shinbaum, said: "We found it extremely offensive that in what was to have been a positive teaching lesson Jews were not mentioned. You can't be general when you talk about victims of the Holocaust." One might think that she and Jacobson were lecturing an anti-Semite for his "insensitivity." Actually, however, DC Comics, the company which publishes Superman comics, is a completely Jewish outfit, like most of the other major publishers of children's magazines in America. The president and editor in chief of DC Comics is a Jewess, Jenette Kahn.

So what we were seeing in this particular tempest in a teapot was the Jews grabbing yet another chance to remind all of us once again about how much they have suffered, poor dears, and about how we must never forget it.

And why this victim status is so jealously guarded by the Jews was brought out in another news report which came in a few days ago. This was a report that the Volkswagen company, Germany's largest automaker, has caved in to Jewish demands and now will pay compensation to Jews who worked involuntarily for Volkswagen during the Second World War. That's the war

during which every Jew the Germans could get their hands on was supposedly gassed and cremated. Volkswagen employed 15,000 non-German workers during the war, and they often are referred to by the media as "slave laborers." Only a small fraction of these workers were Jews, all of them were fed and housed, and many of them had relative freedom of movement during their non-working hours. But they had been dragooned from other countries to help the Germans deal with their severe labor shortage during the war, and they certainly weren't paid union scale. So a few months ago the Jews among those wartime Volkswagen workers demanded that they be paid for their work -- plus interest, of course. Volkswagen initially told them to shove off. It was not Volkswagen which had forced them to work, it was the German government, Volkswagen officials said. Besides, that was more than 53 years ago. If they had a valid claim they should have presented it sooner.

The Jews, all of whom now live in Israel, threatened to sue and to make other difficulties for Volkswagen if their demands weren't met. "You vant to sell cars in the United States, then you pay us," the Jews threatened. Two weeks ago Volkswagen, seeing how government officials in the United states were dancing to the Jews' tune in applying pressure to Switzerland in connection with Jewish claims against that country, caved in and agreed to pay. It seems cheaper to Volkswagen than having the Jews mount the same sort of worldwide propaganda campaign against the company that it has mounted against Swiss banks.

I've talked before about the Jewish extortion effort against the Swiss. Now one can begin to see how all of these demands for money hang together. When the Swiss had made an offer of $600 million to the Jews and the Jews had pretended to be insulted by such a paltry offer, the Jews figured that they could turn up the pressure and get a lot more than $600 million out of the Swiss. And that's what they've done. They've got all of their bought politicians in the United States starting boycott legislation of one sort or another against the Swiss. Not only will Swiss banks be barred from doing business in various parts of the United States, but other Swiss companies will be punished as well until the Swiss cough up every cent the Jews are demanding. We are being **used** -- that is our public institutions are being used -- by the Jews to get what they want as if our institutions belonged to the Jews and were theirs to use and abuse for their purposes.

It's important for the Jews to make an example of the Swiss. That's what made Volkswagen decide to cough up. That's what the Jews figure will make the Swedes, the French, the Portuguese, the Spanish, and everyone else cough up. They are demonstrating their ability to use the power of government in the United States to coerce anyone who doesn't yield voluntarily to their demands for money. And they're able to use the U.S. government like this because they've kept the American public feeling sorry for them as "Holocaust" victims. That's why they raised such a stink when Superman failed to state explicitly that Moishe and Baruch are Jews. It all hangs together.

This notion that the world owes the Jews for what they claim happened to them more than half a century ago has interesting implications. I've just finished reading a book which really casts a lot of light on the whole concept of reparations -- and on the question of who owes whom. The book is a biography of Lazar Kaganovich, one of the bloodiest of the communist butchers during the 1930s and 1940s and the number-two man in the Kremlin for many years. The book is *The Wolf of the Kremlin,* and it was written by Stuart Kahan, an American Jew who is Kaganovich's

nephew. Kahan went to the Soviet Union in 1981 and interviewed his uncle extensively -- in Yiddish -- to write this biography, and it is a goldmine of revelations.

To sum it up, Lazar Kaganovich was a Jew raised in the Jewish tradition, a *yeshiva* boy taught to guide himself on the basis of doing always what is best for the Jews, and this precept actually is cited explicitly several times in the book. He attended his first Communist Party meeting in 1911, when he was 18, to hear the Jewish communist Trotsky give a speech in a synagogue in Kiev; that's right: in a synagogue. He rose rapidly in the inner circle of the Communist Party, which contained many more Jews than Gentiles. His success was due primarily to his aggressiveness and his ruthlessness. In his communist activity he held back from nothing, no matter how brutal or bloody. He even killed his fellow Jews when they got in his way. He was a gangster among gangsters.

In 1930 Kaganovich organized a special department of the Soviet secret police, with himself as the head. It was referred to as the department of "wet affairs," with "wet" meaning "bloody." It handled clandestine mass executions, of the sort carried out later at Vinnitsa in Ukraine and at Katyn in Russia and at a thousand other places throughout the Soviet Union over the next two decades. Kaganovich became the commissar in charge of mass murder. When the German Army invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, however, it was Kaganovich who was the savior of the Jews: he arranged for the evacuation of all Jews from the frontier areas and their resettlement far to the east, where they would be safe from the Germans. Let the Ukrainians and the Russians bear the brunt of the German invasion, but protect the Jews from hardship and danger at any cost.

And Kaganovich boasts that he saved the Jews once again, in 1953, when Stalin was planning to rid Russia of them, by arranging for Stalin to be poisoned. He and his sister Rosa, who was a doctor, devised a scheme to switch pills in Stalin's medicine cabinet so that he would have a fatal stroke, which he did.

When the Gentile communist Nikita Khruschev accused Kaganovich in 1957 at a Soviet Party Congress of having murdered 20 million Russians during his career, Kaganovich didn't even deny it. He only accused Khruschev of being a murderer too. "Your hands are blood-stained too," Kaganovich told him. Khruschev pointed out that the difference was that he, Khruschev, had merely followed Kaganovich's orders, while it had been Kaganovich who had formulated the policies of mass murder and had given the orders for carrying out those policies.

It's a fascinating book and if you really want to gain some insight into the Jewish mentality, into the way they justify themselves, into the way they view the non-Jewish world, you should read it for yourself. Kaganovich wants to boast about the power he once held, and at the same time he wants to evade responsibility for his crimes, and one can see this ambivalent attitude throughout the book.

Kaganovich **did** manage to evade responsibility. He was permitted to retire and to live out his life in comfort in Moscow. He was expelled from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1957, when he lost a power struggle with Khruschev, and he was kicked out of the Communist Party itself in 1962. So Kaganovich simply retired from the business of mass murder and then lived in peace and relative luxury for nearly 30 more years, until his death

in 1991 at the age of 98. Not even the publication of his nephew's biography of him in 1987, with all of its revelations of his crimes, brought a demand that he be punished. Not even after the collapse of communism did anyone call him to account for his genocide against the Russian and Ukrainian people.

Suppose that instead of being a Jew who murdered 20 million Gentiles he had been a German accused of killing just 100 Jews. Can't you imagine the screams from the media around the world that he be put on trial and punished? Can't you imagine the hysterical demands for revenge from the Jews, the non-stop demonstrations in front of German embassies everywhere? Such a wonderful opportunity to remind everyone about the "Holocaust" and how the poor, innocent Jews had suffered, and how the world now owed them reparations -- such an opportunity certainly would not go unexploited. But in the case of Lazar Kaganovich only silence, only disinterest by the media. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, you and I understand the reason for this difference, don't we? We understand that the "Holocaust" story is important to the Jews because they are able to milk the Gentile world for billions of dollars every year by keeping the Gentiles feeling guilty for letting it happen. And we understand why the Jews don't feel guilty for having unleashed communism on the world, just as they don't feel guilty for having spawned monsters like Lazar Kaganovich. They really believe that only **their** lives count, not ours.

And we understand why the Germans back before the Second World War really wanted to get the Jews out of their country and off their backs. We understand why Stalin decided in 1953 that he would leave as his gift to the Russian people something that they would be eternally grateful for by getting rid of every Jew in the Soviet Union.

So, the question now is, what can we do to free ourselves from the Jews? What can we do to break their deathgrip on our mass media of news and entertainment and on our political system? How can we bring about an end to their racket of using **us** to extort money from the rest of the world for them?

One thing that **wouldn't** be effective is an appeal to our elected leaders in Washington. Most of the politicians understand quite well what's going on, but they don't care unless it's an issue in the mass media or they can figure out a way to get donations or votes from it.

About the only difference between Bill Clinton and the rest of the gang in Washington, Republicans as well as Democrats, is that Bill Clinton has more charisma. If we had an honest, patriotic government they'd all be gallows bait.

Another bunch we can't count on are businessmen, like the people who run Volkswagen or the Swiss banks. Generally these are pretty smart people, and they understand the same things we understand. But just as the politicians don't care about anything except votes, these big businessmen don't care about anything except profits. The Volkswagen people understand that if anyone owes something, the Jews who worked in their plant during the war owe Volkswagen for keeping them alive and permitting them to survive the war in one piece. But they won't say that

publicly, because as long as the Jews control the media and the government in America there's no profit in that. And the same for the Swiss bankers.

In fact, there's more than a possible loss of profit involved. There are hundreds of people sitting in prisons in Germany and Switzerland now, because they dared to speak the truth about the Jews and thus violated so-called "hate" laws the Jews had their bought politicians in those countries enact for the specific purpose of silencing those who would expose them. An example is Rudolf Keller, a member of the nationalist Swiss Democratic Party, who was arrested earlier this month in Zurich and charged with being a "hate criminal." Mr. Keller's "crime" was announcing publicly that if the Jews proceed with their anti-Swiss boycotts in America, then the Swiss people should in reprisal refuse to buy any American-made goods, shop in stores or eat in restaurants owned by Jews, or take vacations in America or Israel. The politicians who had him arrested claimed that Keller's announcement might incite "race hatred" against the Jews -- and in Switzerland, Germany, and many other countries the Jews already have arranged for that to be illegal. They're working hard to have similar laws enacted in America.

So what can we do? Well, not everyone in America is a politician or a businessman. And not everyone is a couch potato, who is incapable of understanding anything which doesn't come to him directly from his television screen. There still are decent, honest, and rational people in America: people who are capable of understanding if one makes information available to them and who will care once they understand. You and I aren't the only ones. There are enough good people left to upset the Jews' applecart -- if we do our part.

And our part is to reach these decent people and help them understand. And we can do that. I can keep on presenting facts -- facts which will help people understand who is persecuting whom, who owes whom. And this is important, because most of these decent, rational Americans have never heard about Lazar Kaganovich. Most of these decent people are too busy with their own lives to pay attention to the current Jewish campaign to silence their critics with new laws against what they call "hate speech." They need to be told. They need to be made to pay attention.

You can help make them pay attention. I'll keep presenting the facts; you get other people to listen. I'll bet you know at least five decent people who have never listened to *American Dissident Voices* or have never seen a copy of *Free Speech.* Get them to start listening or start reading. Get them to start paying attention.

Thinking about a White Future

I nearly always discuss the **problems** our people are facing: a corrupt, treasonous, and degenerate government which seems hell-bent on destroying what's left of our civilization; our mass media of news and entertainment in the hands of an alien people who use their control over the media to bring about the election of such governments; the mass insanity which, under various names -- egalitarianism, feminism, liberalism -- leads large segments of our people into unnatural and self-destructive behavior.

Sometimes I've talked about historical events, but that's been pretty negative too: the atrocities committed against our people by the communists before and during the Second World War and the atrocities we committed against ourselves during and after that war.

It's necessary for us to talk about these negative things, because we need to understand our problems before we can hope to solve them. But in this article I will try to be more positive. I will discuss what we want our future to be like. Of course, we can't discuss all of this in one short article, but we can explore a few aspects of the future we'd like to build for our people after we've solved the problems we're facing.

One of these problems I've talked about which we are facing is non-White immigration, which is changing America's racial complexion. This changing racial complexion is something which Bill Clinton not only recognizes but welcomes. In the July *Free Speech* I discussed his speech on this subject at Portland State University. The Clinton government -- and Democrats generally -- are pushing hard to increase non-White immigration and to avoid any effective measures to stop illegal immigration, which is almost completely non-White, because non-Whites nearly all vote Democratic. The Republicans aren't much better: some of them welcome non-White immigrants as cheap laborers for Republican factory owners and big farmers, and others are afraid to do anything about immigration from fear of being labeled "racists" by the media.

Now, I must admit that I share one thing with Bill Clinton: he wants to change America's racial complexion, and so do I. He wants America's complexion to be darker, or more "diverse," to use the Politically Correct term. And I want America's complexion to be lighter: much lighter. Bill Clinton said in his Portland State University speech that anyone who doesn't want America to become darker is "un-American." Isn't that something? This jerk who used to organize anti-American demonstrations during the Vietnam war and chant, "Ho, Ho, Ho Chih Minh, the Viet Cong's gonna win," is now telling us that we're "un-American"! I'd like to have that un-American piece of filth tell me that, one on one, without any of his jackbooted Secret Service thugs around! Then there would be one less piece of filth to deal with in this country.

Bill Clinton thinks a White America would be "un-American." The Jews who control the mass media certainly agree with him, because they know there would be no room for them in a White America. We made the terrible mistake of letting them in when we had what for most practical purposes was a White America in the past, and they immediately set to work to take over our mass media, to corrupt our political system, to corrupt our culture, and to corrupt our educational system. After they gained control of the media they began brainwashing the public with the

notion that the worst of all possible sins is to want to keep America White. "That is racism, a very, very bad thing," they whispered to us in a thousand subtle ways. And now, to want to make America White again is even worse, they and their collaborators, like Bill Clinton, tell us. "It is too late," they tell us. "America will become non-White. It is inevitable. You cannot stop it. But a non-White America will not be so bad; there will be much more diversity, and diversity is a wonderful thing. So don't try to resist us. Just relax and enjoy it."

So why do we resist the Jewish plan for America? Why do we refuse to go quietly, the way the Clintonistas want us to? Wouldn't it be so much easier just not to struggle, just to relax and let them push our race into oblivion?

But you know, us White people have always struggled. We have always resisted alien domination. We are a race of conquerors, of inventors, of builders, not slaves or couch potatoes. We have always fought for a better future, instead of just relaxing and letting other people tell us what was good for us. A very troublesome trait, this determination to be masters of our own destiny, this determination to live in accord with our innate values instead of someone else's, this determination to hang onto our traditions and our life-style and to do things our way. This troublesome trait of ours is really a big obstacle to the planners of the New World Order, who want us just to relax and not struggle while they mix us with Haitians and mestizos and Vietnamese to produce the nice, coffee-colored blend preferred by Mr. Clinton, a blend without racist traditions or racist habits or racist ambitions to shape our own destiny.

So why do we not want to be blended? Why do we insist on remaining a race of conquerors, inventors, and builders; a race of explorers; a race of poets, philosophers, and dreamers; a proud race, an independent race, a race with our own traditions, instead of the agreeable, placid race of coffee-colored consumers and couch potatoes those nice Jews in the media and those nice politicians in Washington want us to be? And I guess that the best answer to that question is that that's just the way we are. That's our God-given nature, and we want to keep it. In fact, we are determined to keep it!

The White future that I dream about, the White America that I want for my people, is not an America of brainwashed couch potatoes and trendy consumers, not an America of feminists, homosexuals, democrats, and hymn-singing boobs who take their theology from their television receivers; my White America is an America of proud, masculine men and proud, feminine women. It is an America based on our history and our traditions and our ways: history and traditions and ways we brought here from Europe. It will be an America governed by our values and our standards: our standards of behavior, our standards of performance, our standards of quality, our standards of beauty. It will be an America where little White girls and little White boys go to White schools and learn how to be independent and productive White men and women. It will be an America where there are no advertisers trying to push racial mixing by putting a few Black, mestizo, and Asian faces into every group illustration, advertisers who like to pair off White girls with Black boys in their ads. It will be an America without drugs, without rap music, and without the dark faces and alien sounds which pervade our cities today.

Can you imagine such an America? We used to have a White America back before the Second World War. Ask your parents or your grandparents about it. Go to the library and look at some of

the old magazines published back in the 1920s and 1930s. Look at the advertisements in these old magazines and compare them with the advertisements produced today. I have a painting from about 1890 of ice skaters in Central Park, New York: men, women, and children gliding across the ice in a wintry landscape. Some of the faces are smiling or laughing; some are sober -- but they're all White. Yes, even New York City was once White. Los Angeles was White, except for its Chinatown. Look at the 19th-century paintings. Look at the photographs taken before the Second World War of scenes on university campuses, of street scenes in American cities, of sports events, of outdoor recreation. The people are all White. That's hard to imagine today, isn't it, but 75 years ago one could walk through downtown Los Angeles or New York and hardly ever see a non-White face.

Of course, in a White America we will still have problems to overcome; that's what life is all about: overcoming problems. We still will have a certain amount of crime, even without non-Whites, who commit the majority of the crimes of violence and vice in America today. Although our streets and homes will be much, much safer than they are today, we will still have criminals -- but we will know how to deal with our criminals. In this regard, let me reprint a little poem written by one of the truly great English poets, Rudyard Kipling. It is a poem you won't find in any of the Politically Correct anthologies approved for use in our schools today. It was written in a saner, prouder, Whiter, less Jewish time, a much less hypocritical time.

THE STRANGER

The Stranger within my gate,
He may be true or kind,
But he does not talk my talk --
I cannot feel his mind.
I see the face and the eyes and the mouth,
But not the soul behind.

The men of my own stock
They may do ill or well,
But they tell the lies I am wonted to,
They are used to the lies I tell.
And we do not need interpreters
When we go to buy and sell.

The Stranger within my gates,
He may be evil or good,
But I cannot tell what powers control --
What reasons sway his mood;
Nor when the Gods of his far-off land
Shall repossess his blood.

The men of my own stock,
Bitter bad they may be,
But, at least, they hear the things I hear,

And see the things I see;
And whatever I think of them and their likes
They think of the likes of me.

This was my father's belief
And this is also mine:
Let the corn be all one sheaf --
And the grapes be all one vine,
Ere our children's teeth are set on edge
By bitter bread and wine.

That was Rudyard Kipling's view of things a century ago, and it also was the view of most of our people in a time before they had been deceived and led astray by the alien masters of the mass media.

A feeling of community, a feeling of family, a feeling of common blood, common soul, common history, and common destiny: that is what it takes to make a viable nation, and that is what we must have again if America is to survive. A White future for America is much more than a material thing; it is much more than safe and orderly schools with higher performance standards; it is much more than safe streets, clean cities, and a lower crime rate; it is much more than a huge reduction in taxes for the support of welfare queens and their swarms of pickaninnies; it is much more than a more efficient, productive work force and an end to the injustice of affirmative action. It is more than all of these things: it is a spiritual thing, this feeling that one's neighbors are one's kin; this looking on White faces and feeling a genuine sense of brotherhood that rises from the heart -- not the strained sense that one **ought** to feel brotherly when one looks on alien faces; this feeling of sharing in their joy when one looks on a young White couple in love -- not the sense of obligation to give a Politically Correct smile when one passes a racially mixed couple and tries unsuccessfully to suppress the rage in one's heart.

There are young people growing up today who have never known what it means to live in a White country, who have never known the feeling of racial community which one can feel in a White environment and which Americans used to take for granted. They have been robbed of this knowledge by the people who for their own selfish purposes have taken over our mass media and swamped us with their poisonous propaganda of rootlessness and cosmopolitanism and the wonders of the "melting pot" -- and by the politicians who have implemented their destructive racial policies: policies which have darkened America so noticeably during the past 50 years.

My dream of a White America is not nostalgia. I know that we can never return to the past. But I also know that if we are ever to move forward again we have to get rid of this racial mess which has engulfed America. I know that no multi-racial society can be a healthy or stable society. Some people who agree with me that the present racial situation is untenable and can only become worse under the government's present policies nevertheless cannot conceive of rectifying the situation. They believe that once a country has been integrated racially it cannot be un-integrated. But it can be -- although the process of un-integration is likely to be a very painful and bloody process. It is likely to require a civil war much worse than the one we went through in the last century. It certainly will disrupt the lives of everyone involved. The soft couch

potatoes and the trendy consumers would much prefer to avoid the disruption, so that they can continue their TV-viewing and their consuming. Even people made of somewhat sterner stuff are horrified by the prospect of straightening out our racial situation. But we must do it. We must plan for it. We must not refuse to think about it just because it will be difficult and unpleasant. We are in our present mess because we failed to act when action would have been far less painful.

In these uncertain times in which we live there is one thing of which we can be certain: and that is, the Jews and their collaborators in the government, the media, the schools, and the churches will cling to the death to their plan for the destruction of our people through miscegenation. They have a tiger by the tail, and they know that they must not let go. And so conditions in America will continue to grow worse and worse, as the enemies of our people continue desperately to push us to the point of no return. Our schools and our cities will become more jungle-like; our popular culture will become more alien, more debased, more Negroid, more Mexican, and more Asian; the behavior of our politicians and our sports and entertainment stars will become more animalistic; our government will become even more corrupt. And White Americans will run out of suburbs to which they can flee. And when they no longer can evade the situation, when they no longer can ignore it, when they no longer can parrot the Politically Correct lies about race without any danger of being contradicted by reality -- then more and more White Americans finally must make decisions about the future they don't want to think about now.

And we know that many of them will just wring their hands and cry in womanish despair, "Oh, why can't the races get along with each other? Why can't there be peace and cooperation between the races, so that I can continue to consume in comfort and safety and Political Correctness? Oh, why must I deal with this difficult and unpleasant problem of race?" And we know that more of the weakest and most degraded of our people, the most corrupt and selfish of our people, will join our enemies in the hope of temporarily improving their own personal situations. But we also know that many others, when there no longer is a safe suburb to which they can flee, finally will be ready to stand and fight.

And my message to these last is this: Don't wait until the last minute to make your decision; much better to make it sooner than later. My message is: Don't fall for the defeatist lie that we cannot un-integrate America because it will be too difficult, too violent, and too painful. Don't refuse to think about the grim remedy of a civil war -- because the alternative is far grimmer and far bloodier. The fate that Mr. Clinton and the Jewish media bosses have planned for us is infinitely worse than any civil war could possibly be. Civil war is thinkable, civil war is plannable -- when the alternative is extinction. Be a man and face reality and steel yourself to do whatever must be done to undo the damage that our enemies have done to us, so that our people will have a future.

The Romanovs, Child Porn, and "Hate" Laws

I'm very pleased by the really big increase in the number of responses to *American Dissident Voices* during the past few months. That's what we want: to get people to respond, to pay attention, to begin thinking, and to begin speaking out.

One of the things I often hear is that it's interesting to listen to *American Dissident Voices* and learn new things, but how does that help us solve the problems we're facing as a people? When will we begin putting up candidates for office so that we can begin making some changes in the way our society is headed? They say we must begin making changes very soon because the Jews and their collaborators are getting closer every day to their goal of a multiracial global plantation, where no one will be able to rebel. And they cite the things they can see happening around them: more and more non-Whites in the population everywhere; more and more Whites involved sexually with; and tighter and tighter government control on our lives, with the threat of an end to our Bill of Rights looming ever larger.

I answer by telling them that what is happening is not so much a shift of the general public in the direction the Jews are pushing as it is a growing schism in our society between the Jewish party and the party of those able to think for themselves. It is a growing division between the lemmings obediently stampeding toward the precipice and the people who are beginning to dig in their heels and say "Whoa! I don't want to go over that cliff!" And more and more people are aligning themselves with this second party. Furthermore, not all of them are White racists. There are non-White groups who are no more attracted to the idea of becoming serfs on the global plantation than we are. There are homosexuals who are not looking forward to living in a society which has a non-White majority. There are even people who call themselves "liberals" who are not in favor of replacing William Shakespeare with Jerry Springer and Beethoven with MTV. People of every stripe are aghast at the level to which public life in America has sunk in the Clinton era.

Of course, we shouldn't draw too much comfort from that observation, because the Jews are continuing to push their programs forward with the aid of their step'n'fetchits in the Congress and the White House. And as long as real power continues to be measured by the standards of electoral politics, we won't have any, because the lemmings will **always** outnumber the independent thinkers. But there may come a day when real power will be measured by other standards, and when the most feasible way of bringing about change won't involve putting up candidates for public office. But let's not get too far ahead of ourselves now.

The most important thing for us to do now is what we have been doing, and that is to help people understand what is happening to America, to the world, to our civilization, and to our people. I'm not talking about helping the lemmings understand. Lemmings never have understood anything and don't want to understand anything. Lemmings just want to do what they believe they're expected to do: whatever the other lemmings are doing. If you strapped a lemming in a chair and explained to him 14 times in the simplest possible language that if he keeps going in the same

direction he'll go over a cliff, he still won't understand, and he won't care. To change the direction of a lemming you must persuade him that all the other lemmings are changing direction, and the only feasible way of doing that is to change the flavor of what he sees on television. There's not much chance of our acquiring control of the television networks any time soon, so we just have to accept the fact that the lemmings will continue happily toward the precipice for the time being.

But there are people who can understand and who want to understand, people who care about our civilization and about our people. Those are the ones we are having increasing success in reaching out to, in explaining things to, in helping develop their understanding. We need to continue doing that. Although we're getting a much larger response now than when we started, it needs to grow a lot more. So far we've reached only a relatively small portion of these independent-minded people. And we must do more than help them understand. We must persuade them to accept some responsibility. We must persuade them to be more than mere spectators. And if we can do these things -- if we can continue reaching more and more thoughtful people and help them to understand what is happening, and if we can persuade them to act on their understanding -- then we are coming closer to solving our problems. We are coming closer to having the power to change the course of events.

Understanding and a sense of responsibility are prerequisites for any other sort of activity, electoral or otherwise. We need to build a lot more understanding and a lot more sense of responsibility before we can have any reasonable expectation of winning an election.

There's one really good thing about the work we're doing now, and that is you can participate in it. You don't have to become a candidate for public office. You don't have to have your own radio program. You just have to be willing to help. You have to be willing to talk with your friends, with your relatives, with your co-workers, with the people you already know. I'm sure that not all of them are lemmings. I'm sure that some of them are reasonable and responsible people.

I can explain things in my radio show and this magazine, but you probably have friends who think they're too busy to listen to *American Dissident Voices* or read *Free Speech.* Or perhaps they just need the personal approach that you can give. Perhaps they need to know that someone they trust is concerned enough to try to help them understand. Or they may need to know that they are not alone in their Political Incorrectness.

Let me tell you something that can be really helpful in leading a friend to understanding: approach him with something very specific that you have reason to believe he will respond to with interest. Perhaps he's someone who has told you that he's not interested in politics and doesn't want to hear anything about the corruption in the government or about the Jewish control of the media. But there will still be something he is interested in. Start with that.

For example, some people -- women especially -- are interested in celebrities, in people that have an aura of glamour. You might approach such a friend with a comment about the Russian imperial family, whose remains finally were reburied in St. Petersburg in late July, 80 years after their murder by the communists. The czar's daughters, who were murdered with him, were

beautiful, glamorous young women: Anastasia, Olga, Tatiana, and Maria -- all lovely girls. Legends about one of these girls -- the beautiful 17-year-old Princess Anastasia -- have been widely circulated ever since her murder. And their reburial a couple of weeks ago has sparked a number of new news stories and reminiscences about them.

One interesting thing about the butchering of the Russian imperial family that you're not likely to see in any of these news stories, however, is the fact that the head butcher was a Jew. His name was Jacob Yurovsky, and he carried out the murder of the czar and his family in an especially brutal and sadistic manner. You might bring that fact up in a conversation about the imperial family. And that fact then can lead the conversation into either of two very interesting areas. One of these areas centers on the fact that in a vast country like Russia with such a small Jewish minority, so many of the butchers of the Russian people just happened to be Jews, Lazar Kaganovich being a prime example.

The other conversational area that Jacob Yurovsky can lead you to is the control of our news and entertainment media. Why is it that your friend has never heard about Yurovsky's Jewishness or Kaganovich's Jewishness? Why are the Jews always portrayed as the innocent victims of Russian anti-Semitism, instead of the other way around? Could it have anything to do with the Jewish control of our news and entertainment media?

Does your friend need to have the atrocities committed against the Russian people by Jews like Yurovsky and Kaganovich tied in to something closer to home? How about the continuing flood of Jewish gangsters into America from the former Soviet Union? They circumvent our immigration laws and get in as "refugees from persecution," because the media, by keeping quiet about Jews such as Yurovsky and Kaganovich and about the Jewishness of organized crime in Russia, are able to maintain the popular delusion that Jews are persecuted in Russia. And because these Jewish gangsters get in they are better able to run their international trade in White sex slaves and sexually exploited children. Although the White slave trade and the child pornography business are headquartered in Israel, they depend heavily for their profitability on the Jews' ability to move freely from one country to another.

Does your friend know anything about the child pornography business? If he's capable of being shocked by anything, he'll be shocked by hearing a few of the facts about this horrible business. The same Jewish gangsters who trap poor, unemployed women from Russia and Ukraine into becoming sex slaves also procure children, film them being sexually abused, and sell the films to perverts around the world. Some of these films show babies as young as two years old being raped by adults. It's a big business, and though not all of the perverts who are the customers for child pornography are Jews, the people who run the child pornography racket are Jews. And that is why this racket is allowed to flourish with virtually no exposure from the mass media.

There have been a few hints about the child pornography business in the media very recently, however, in connection with other news events. For example, there was a United Press International story out of Amsterdam on July 17 about a distributor of child pornography who was murdered recently and about the thousands of photographs the police found in his home. The article also mentioned the distributor's connections to other distributors in Israel, Russia,

Ukraine, and the United States. No mention of Jews, of course -- but believe me, the people who run this business are just as Jewish as the people who run the White slave trade.

Perhaps your friend has an interest in civil liberties: in things like freedom of speech. Then begin by talking with him about two men who were sent to prison in Switzerland just last week because one of them wrote a book the Jews don't like and the other one published the book. It sounds almost incredible that this could happen in a modern, civilized nation like Switzerland, but it did, because the Swiss people let themselves be tricked into accepting a law in 1995 -- just three years ago -- making it illegal to criticize Jews or to say anything the Jews find offensive. The Jews had mounted a big propaganda campaign to get this law passed, claiming that it would put an end to "hate" in Switzerland. They got all of their bought politicians and their bought Christian church leaders to speak in favor of the law. And in Switzerland, just as in the United States, the Jews have most of the politicians and the leading church spokesmen in their pockets. So they got their law passed in 1995, calling it an "anti-hate speech" law, and the Swiss felt very proud of themselves for being against "hate."

Then, having made it illegal to criticize them, the Jews launched their campaign to extort $7 billion in World War Two reparations from the Swiss. Pretty neat, wasn't it?

Swiss who understood that the Jewish demand for gold was extortion were afraid to say so publicly from fear of being prosecuted under the new "hate speech" law. And so the Jews have been able to move ahead with their extortion campaign against the Swiss without fear of having their wild claims for gold be contradicted by the muzzled Swiss. In late July, Swiss author Jügen Graf and his 78-year-old publisher Gerhard Förster were ordered to prison by a judge in Baden, Switzerland, under this new "hate speech" law because Graf wrote a book in which he stated that fewer than six million Jews were killed in the so-called "Holocaust." Graf didn't deny that the Germans killed some Jews; he just wrote that all the evidence indicates that fewer than six million were killed. And so the Jews complained that Graf was in effect calling them liars by refusing to accept their figure of six million killed, and by calling them liars was inciting hatred against them. So the judge ordered Graf and his publisher to prison.

Isn't that clever? You plan an extortion campaign against someone, but then before you make your extortion demands you persuade your intended victim to muzzle himself with a "hate speech" law, so that he can't defend himself against your extortion. That's what the Jews have done to the Swiss -- and that's what they're trying very hard now to do to Americans. They're campaigning for the same sort of "hate speech" laws to muzzle Americans that they're already using to muzzle the Swiss. And Bill Clinton is one of the biggest advocates of the new "hate" laws the Jews want for silencing American dissidents.

When three White ex-convicts killed a Black ex-convict in Texas by chaining him to the back of a truck and dragging him, Clinton seized on this bit of drunken hooliganism as a reason why America needs a Federal "hate" law similar to Switzerland's. If you noticed the details of the way the media handled the news of the Texas killing, you can see the collaboration between Clinton and the media Jews in pushing for a Federal "hate" law. For example, the Black who was killed was, like the three men who killed him, a criminal, an ex-convict. But most news reports carefully avoided mentioning that fact. Instead they described the Black as "disabled," almost

creating the impression that he was confined to a wheelchair or at least on crutches, when as a matter of fact he was walking along a road with no apparent disability when he accepted a ride from the men who later killed him. It's clear that the media were trying as hard as they could to make this Black ex-con into a sympathetic figure, so that they and Mr. Clinton could use his death as an argument for a Federal "hate" law. One might think they would have picked a better example of a racially motivated crime to use as an argument. After all, racially motivated assaults, murders, and rapes happen every day in America's cities. However, they needed a crime with White criminals and a Black victim, and those don't happen very often, so they had to take what they could get. It gives you a pretty clear indication of who it is that they are so eager to silence with their new Federal "hate" law. It isn't the Blacks.

It may seem incredible to reasonable people that the government could hope to end hatred in our society by passing a law. But it's not reasonable people who really count in this matter: it's the lemmings, and they're ready to believe whatever the government or the mass media tell them. And of course, it's not really hatred that the government and the media Jews hope to end with a Federal "hate" law. It's **dissent.** They want to muzzle reasonable people in America the way they've muzzled them in Switzerland.

To help your friend understand what's happening, don't try to explain everything to him at once. Start with a specific thing you believe he'll be interested in: the murder of the Romanovs by a Jewish Bolshevik; the growing power of Jewish organized crime in America and its control of the international trade in child pornography; the threat to Americans' freedom of speech by the Clinton government's push for a Federal "hate" law in this country like the one in Switzerland. Give him specific facts. Tell him where he can check it out for himself. For example, National Vanguard Books carries *The Last Days of the Romanovs* on the murder of the Czar's family and *The New Ethnic Mobs* on modern organized crime. The conviction and sentencing of the Swiss author and publisher were reported by the Associated Press on July 21. You can go to any large public library and find the Associated Press story for yourself. Then show it to your friend, if that's what he's interested in.

I'll keep telling you about things like these, but you do your part too.

Media Myths

The subject I've discussed most often is the dominant Jewish influence in the mass media of news and entertainment. I've spoken most often about this because it is the most important problem with which we must deal. It's also a subject on which I receive a lot of flak. One of the most common forms of flak is the objection that it doesn't matter. Sure, the Jews control the media, but it doesn't make any difference, critics tell me. They're just good businessmen, and they know how to run the media profitably. That's why they've gained control, and it's no worse than it would be if a bunch of Irishmen or Mormons were in their place.

I think that many of the people who tell me this don't actually believe it themselves. They just want to be Politically Correct, and it's Politically Correct to absolve the Jews of blame for anything. Even many of the people who are distressed about what Jewish media control is doing to our society don't want to identify that control as Jewish. The Baptists, for example, who have launched a boycott of the Disney Corporation because of the raunchy movies its Miramax films division has been turning out, refuse to identify either Disney boss Michael Eisner or the Miramax bosses Bob and Harvey Weinstein as Jewish. The Baptist protest is against immorality in films, they insist, not against the Jewish control of the film industry.

That's a bit like saying you're against syphilis but you have nothing against spirochetes. And it's not really honest, this determination to be Politically Correct. Political Correctness is based on a denial of reality, on the substitution of a deliberately falsified picture of the world in the place of reality. And this dishonesty, this refusal to admit Politically Incorrect truths, has very serious consequences for all of us. If we refuse to talk realistically about the Jewish control of the mass media, we may as well give up on trying to do anything about the negative effects this Jewish media control is having on our society.

Let me give you a specific example of refusal to face a Politically Incorrect truth. Steven Spielberg has a new film out, *Saving Private Ryan*, and it's been getting a lot of attention by the reviewers. They say that the film is good because it is so realistic, because it gives such an honest portrayal of the Second World War. And of course, the film does show the blood-and-guts aspect of the war a bit more starkly than other films have. But **honest** it is **not.** It propagates the same lies about the Second World War that every film -- and I mean **every** film -- made by the Jewish film industry in Hollywood for nearly 60 years has propagated. And the reviewers, regardless of what else they say about these films, all repeat these same basic lies.

These lies are that the Second World War was a "necessary" war -- that is, that there was no way we could have avoided it -- and that it was a "good" war -- that is, a morally justified war. We were forced to fight Germany in order to protect America. We could not have stayed out of the war or fought on the other side, because that would have been immoral. The other side was evil. We fought against evil. By destroying Germany and Hitler we saved the world, Hollywood tells us. We saved freedom. We saved the world from slavery and tyranny. Hitler was an evil man, the most evil man who has ever lived, and with his evil SS troops he intended to enslave the world and destroy everything beautiful and good. But we stopped him. We saved America. We saved the world.

That's Hollywood's unvarying story, and it's a lie: an extremely dangerous and destructive lie. Unfortunately, it is a lie which is accepted unquestioningly, uncritically, by almost everyone, and not just by the lemmings. We hear that lie today in connection with Spielberg's new movie; and in fact, we hear it from television news anchormen and from politicians and from other authority figures every time the war is mentioned. No dissent is permitted. But that's the case **only** for the Second World War. One can have dissenting views about the Spanish-American War, the First World War, or about the Korean War. One can question the morality or the necessity of those wars without being considered an evil person. And as for the war in Vietnam, one can even take the position of America's enemies, as film actress Jane Fonda and a student activist named Bill Clinton did.

But it has not been the government's hard line against dissenters which has kept people parroting the dogma that the Second World War was a war which was both necessary and good. And it hasn't been any reluctance to offend the veterans of the Second World War, because we have more living veterans of the Vietnam war in our society, and those opposed to the Vietnam war have never worried about offending them.

No, the dogma that the Second World War was necessary and good, that it saved the world or that it preserved our freedom, is entirely the creation of Jewish propagandists. Of course, the Second World War didn't preserve America's freedom. America's freedom was never threatened by Germany. Hitler could not even have imagined taking away America's freedom. His war against America was entirely defensive. We were the aggressors. The U.S. Army invaded Germany and took away Germany's freedom, not the other way around. There was never the slightest danger that Hitler would invade America.

And we certainly didn't save the world; what we did was turn half of the world over to rule by communist butchers for nearly 50 years. We didn't even defend America's vital economic interests by destroying Germany. The only people whose vital interests were defended by America's participation in the Second World War were the Jews.

And these facts really aren't even disputed by serious and knowledgeable people today. No reputable historian or military leader would make the claim today that the United States was in danger of being invaded by Germany or that our vital interests were threatened by Germany. In other words the war was not necessary. Every knowledgeable person understands that, but very few will say it.

As for the claim that Hitler and his SS were evil monsters, and that America was on the side of righteousness in destroying them, we can simply look at the facts again: look at what the two sides actually did during and after the war. It is generally conceded that the Germans treated American prisoners of war about as well as they could under the circumstances. And it also is generally conceded that Hitler's troops, SS or otherwise, behaved themselves better toward the civilian populations of the countries they occupied than did the armed forces of any of the other combatants, including the Americans. Hitler's SS troopers did not rape civilians, for example. Contrast this behavior with that of the Americans and our allies, such as the Red Army.

The Red Army, our comrade in arms, was notorious for raping and murdering civilians; in fact, Red Army men were encouraged to engage in atrocious behavior by their own government, our ally. And the U.S. Army itself engaged in several massacres of German prisoners of war: for example, the massacre of more than 500 disarmed SS prisoners at Dachau by members of the U.S. Army's 45th Division on April 29, 1945. And then there was the mass starvation of German POWs in prison camps after the war. And there was the massive ethnic cleansing, in which more than 2 million German civilians were murdered after the war. The U.S. government approved of this mass murder, of this ethnic cleansing -- we gave the OK -- and our allies carried it out.

If we consider the mass rape and murder of civilians to be evil, if we consider the mass execution of prisoners of war to be evil, and if one of our motives for going to war was to fight evil, then clearly we were fighting on the wrong side. And it's not as if we didn't know how our gallant Soviet ally would behave before we began our effort to destroy Hitler and his forces. We had plenty of evidence of massive Soviet atrocities even before the war began. Our government knew what the communists had done in Ukraine. Our government knew about the mass arrests and executions in the Soviet Union. And before we crossed the English Channel to invade Europe we knew about the mass executions of Polish officers by the Reds at Katyn and elsewhere. And yet we allied ourselves with the mass murderers. We helped the mass murderers and mass rapists murder and rape millions of more Europeans. And so the claim that we were going to war to fight evil is simply a lie. The Second World War was not a good war. It was not a moral war. It was the most atrocious war of modern times. And we were on the side of those committing nearly all of the atrocities during that war: we were deliberately on the side of evil.

And there is just one reason that we fought on the side of evil. It was because that was the Jewish side. In the years before the war Hitler wasn't rounding up people by the thousands and shooting them the way the communists were. Hitler wasn't shooting anybody. His SS troops weren't raping or terrorizing anyone either. Hitler was doing one thing which resulted in a huge, lying hate-propaganda effort against him from Hollywood. That one thing was Hitler's campaign to break the grip of the Jews on Germany. In Germany Hitler took the news and entertainment media away from the Jews. He kicked them out of the legal profession, which they had monopolized. He kicked them out of the teaching profession, where they had been pumping their ideas into the heads of German children. And Hitler did all of this peacefully, non-violently. He didn't round Jews up and shoot them. He simply made it illegal for them to own German newspapers and German radio stations. He made it illegal for them to practice law or to teach in German schools. And so the Jews were leaving Germany. Between 1933 and 1939 two-thirds of the Jews in Germany emigrated. At the same time Jewish commissars in the Soviet Union were butchering millions of people. But the hate propaganda coming out of Hollywood was entirely anti-German, not anti-Soviet. The Jews' only concern was the welfare of their fellow Jews. They didn't care how many Russians or Ukrainians were murdered. But they screeched at the top of their lungs when Hitler took the German media away from them.

And they lied to the American people about what was happening in Europe. They lied in order to try to make us hate the Germans the way they did. When a Jew assassinated a German diplomat in Paris in 1938 and the German people reacted by smashing up Jewish department stores and synagogues in several German cities, the Jewish news media in the United States reported the incident as if Jews were being massacred wholesale in Germany. That was the famous "Crystal

Night," which the Jews still continue to remind us of every year in order to milk a little more sympathy from us. The picture of Germany painted by Jewish hate-propaganda in the United States during the years preceding the Second World War was a complete distortion of reality. Americans were told that Germans lived in constant fear of the Gestapo and the SS, that Hitler was a madman who terrorized the German people and who fell to the floor and chewed the edge of his carpet when he became angry. Americans were told that Germany was a land of concentration camps and barbed wire and police dogs. Our invasion of Germany was to be a "liberation" of the German people from the tyrannical rule of Hitler and the SS. That's actually the word the Jewish propagandists used to describe the American and Soviet terror bombing, rape, and dismemberment of Germany: "liberation." The American and Soviet invaders were to be the "liberators."

Of course, the Jews didn't control all of the mass media before the Second World War. They didn't control the *National Geographic Magazine*, for example, and this magazine, with its articles and photographs on life in Germany flatly contradicted the hate-propaganda coming from Hollywood. A good example, if you have access to old *National Geographics*, is the February 1937 issue. But the *National Geographic Magazine* really wasn't a mass medium, and Jewish Hollywood had a much stronger grip on the average American's mind. And so the image of Germany most Americans had was the Jewish image of a land of terror, fear, brutality, and repression controlled by Hitler's SS automatons, a land which needed to be "liberated" and which was a deadly menace to America. The hate-propagandists of Hollywood lied us into the most murderous and destructive war of all time solely because they hated the Germans, and they wanted us to destroy the Germans for them.

And they have maintained their pre-war lies even to this day, their portrayal of Hitler as a crazed carpet chewer and the SS as a gang of sadistic thugs, and they have added to this their postwar hate-propaganda of gas chambers and of lampshades and soap supposedly made from the bodies of murdered Jews. Most Americans still believe that their fathers or grandfathers "liberated" Germany and "saved" the world. They still believe that the Second World War was a "necessary" war and a "good" war. And the reason they believe it is that they have seen hundreds of Hollywood films and television shows which have repeated these same lies to them over and over and over again, and no public figure has ever had the courage or honesty to contradict them. We're still hearing the same lies in films like Steven Spielberg's *Saving Private Ryan* and in the reviews of that film in the controlled media: Americans as "liberators."

The fact is that Hollywood's lies about Germany led to millions of White Americans and Europeans being slaughtered solely for the sake of punishing the Germans for throwing the Jews out of Germany. And we are put at a great disadvantage even today by those same lies, because they prevent so many of us from examining the past honestly. And if we cannot understand what happened in the past, we are much less likely to choose a wise course into the future. But the real point of my example of Hollywood hate-propaganda about Germany before and during the Second World War is that the Jews, with their control of so much of the mass media today, are able to sway the attitudes of the whole country to suit themselves. They are able to persuade us to give precedence to their interests and concerns instead of ours. They are able to change the course of history to their advantage and to our disadvantage by changing the way the American masses see the world. They were able to do that in the 1930s and 1940s, even before television.

Today, with television, they are even more able to change American attitudes and opinions to gain advantages for themselves.

And today there are plenty of other examples of the Jews' misuse of their media power to manipulate the opinions and attitudes of our people to our disadvantage. There is the current prospect of another war in the Middle East. Saddam Hussein and Iraq are being held up as a threat to America, a threat to the world, just as Germany was represented as a threat to the world before the Second World War, when in fact Iraq is a threat only to the Jews' plans for the Middle East, and Germany was a threat only to the Jews' plans for controlling Europe. But the prospect of another war is very real, and it will remain real as long as the Jews retain their control of the media and of U.S. government policy. Iraq certainly is no threat to America and never has been, but if the Jews become worried about Saddam Hussein's ability to thwart Israel's further expansion, you can be sure that we will be called on again to save America, to save freedom, and to save the world by "liberating" Iraq. And unfortunately, most Americans will respond to the call. They will believe that they are being patriotic by responding, just as most of the veterans of the Second World War still believe that they were being patriotic in responding to the call to save America from Hitler.

That's not the way it should be. Our people's patriotism shouldn't be abused like that. Our mass media shouldn't be used to manipulate our people to our disadvantage. Of course, most people being what they are, they will be manipulated one way or another. Most people will believe what they're told to believe by their television. Which means that it is essential that the people who control the mass media, the people who decide what the masses should be told -- these must be our people, people with our interests -- not people with an entirely different agenda of their own. The mass media could be a powerful force for good, a powerful force for enlightening and uplifting and guiding our people rather than for exploiting them.

A lot of people understand that; they understand the power of the mass media. Our political leaders certainly understand that. Many academics understand it. But they won't buck the Jews. They prefer to go with the flow, to get what advantage they can for themselves, but not to speak out against the way the media have been and are being misused to exploit our people. They are afraid of becoming targets of Jewish hate-propaganda themselves. And they understand the difficulty of convincing the public of the truth after the public already has been convinced of a lie. The public is fond of its myths, especially its patriotic myths, and hardly any patriotic myth is more cherished than that of the Second World War being a necessary and a moral war.

And so the politicians and the academics won't point out the lies inherent in Spielberg's *Saving Private Ryan.* And that means that we'll have to do it ourselves, the hard way. We'll have to continue building our own media: media like *American Dissident Voices* and *Free Speech.* That's a long and difficult job. And while we're doing that we'll be hearing and seeing a lot more romanticized propaganda from Steven Spielberg and the Weinstein brothers and the rest of the Jewish media establishment. But at least we are reaching more people with the truth this month than we did last month, and we'll reach more still next month.

The Lesson of Amy Biehl

People have told me that I talk too much about the Jews. They have told me that I should focus more on America's race problem, that I should talk more about how Black crime and Black welfare and Black -- may I call it "culture"? -- are degrading our civilization. White people don't have their homes burglarized by Jews, these critics tell me. Jews don't sell heroin to our children on school playgrounds. It's the Blacks and Mexicans who are the problem. And Jews don't throw their trash in their yards and get on welfare. So get off the Jews' case and tell us how we can solve the race problem before it destroys America.

Now, when I hear comments like this I feel that I have failed in my main purpose, which is to get people to understand what's happening. I try to keep my message very simple, and I try to present it as clearly as I can, but when I hear people telling me that the Blacks and the Mexicans are the **real** problem and **not** the Jews I realize that I just haven't been getting through.

Of course, I understand that in some parts of the country Blacks or Mexicans are a much more immediate threat than they are where I live, and that White people who have been heavily impacted by non-Whites in their schools, neighborhoods, or workplaces feel so hard pressed that they can't really worry about less visible threats. Here in the mountains of West Virginia what little crime there is -- and that's very little -- is committed by my fellow Whites, and it's mostly drunken driving or domestic fights.

I do sympathize with the people who live in our cities and are forced to mix with non-Whites. But we need to look beyond the most immediate and visible problems. We need to look at what is behind these problems, at what has caused them. And when we look for the causes of problems we can look either inside our own house or outside. That is, we can either look for weaknesses and faults in the nature of our own people and our own society which have left us vulnerable to external enemies, or we can focus on those external enemies. And sometimes it's not an altogether clear distinction. Some of our traits are not really faults in themselves, but they have nevertheless been turned against us by external enemies.

For example, there's our combination of objectivity, altruism, and universalism, which has so often been used by our external enemies to manipulate us for their advantage and to our great disadvantage. Our enemies have discovered that it is very easy to make us feel sorry for them or feel guilty because they are inferior to us in some way, or to convince us that we must bend over backward to be nice to them because we owe them compensation for some past wrong we have done them.

Some of us are made to feel guilty because our ancestors took North America away from the Indians or because we brought Black slaves here from Africa. This is apparently a unique racial trait we have. Indians certainly don't feel sheepish about the fact that their ancestors, whenever they managed to capture a few of ours, had the habit of torturing them to death in ways so horrible that they are almost beyond our ability to imagine. Torture was a habitual public recreation of the Indians long before Whites arrived in the New World, and many of the tribes had permanent torture facilities set up in their villages for the specific purpose of putting

prisoners to death publicly in the most painful ways possible. They found the screams of their victims amusing. I'm sure you weren't taught this in your American History course in high school because these days it's Politically Incorrect, but many knowledgeable historians -- President Theodore Roosevelt, for example -- wrote in detail about these things. The Indians don't feel guilty or apologetic about this behavior today, but many of us feel guilty because our ancestors responded to this nasty habit of theirs by slaughtering them and taking their land.

And there are those of us who believe that we shouldn't begrudge Blacks their welfare payments, because their ancestors worked as slaves for ours. How many Blacks have you met who can look at the matter objectively and tell us how grateful they are to Whites because our ancestors brought them from the African jungle to a life that was infinitely more pleasant and secure in America? I mean, they already were slaves in Africa, and working and living conditions were a great deal better under White masters in America than under Black masters in Africa.

As I said, we have traits which are used against us, but that doesn't mean that they are bad traits in themselves. They are a strength for us when we are left to ourselves, and they only become a weakness when we come in contact with those who use them to manipulate us. And certainly the masters of manipulation of these traits are the Jews. The best example of this is the way in which they have used their "Holocaust" story to keep us on the defensive while they exploit us in every way they can. Among themselves they boast about the self-hatred they have managed to generate in the Germans just by harping on how the Germans supposedly wronged them during the Second World War. They have gotten the Germans to the point, they boast, where it is unfashionable to be patriotic or even to show any interest in German culture or German traditions. It is much more fashionable today for Germans to show interest in Zulu traditions, in Turkish art, in Chinese music, or in anything Jewish than in anything German. To express affection for anything German is tantamount to shoving more Jews into the gas chambers. This artificial self-hatred which the Jews have induced in the Germans has had the effect of pushing the German birthrate below the replacement level. It is more fashionable for a young German couple who really follow the party line of the controlled media to adopt a Turkish baby than to have one of their own.

War guilt: this was a war, remember, which began as a local conflict between Germany and Poland over historically German territory which had been taken from Germany at the end of the First World War, and it developed into a war between Germany and the Soviet Union because of Hitler's hatred for communism and his determination to break the power of communism in Europe before the Soviet Union's expansionist tendencies led to the further spread of communism. But it only became a world war which the Germans could not win because of the Jews' influence over Franklin Roosevelt in the United States and Winston Churchill in Britain and the ability of the Jews to manipulate public feelings in both countries.

Certainly Hitler did not want a war with America, and the American people didn't want a war with Germany. But surrounded by Jews the way Bill Clinton is, Franklin Roosevelt connived and finagled America into the war in Europe on the side of the Jews -- with the aid of Hollywood, the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post.*

This was a war which the Jews had declared publicly against Germany in 1933 and had begun by organizing a world-wide economic boycott of Germany and by mobilizing Hollywood for a full-scale, non-stop vilification of everything German. Viewed from a historical perspective, it was a war between Germans and Jews, and the Jews won. The Germans lost many more of their people in this war than the Jews did. And yet today the Germans still feel guilty about their role in the war. Do you believe that the Jews feel guilty about the German losses in the war? Do you believe that they feel guilty about driving the Palestinians from Palestine, killing many of them, and taking their land?

It's a good thing the Indians didn't have this knack for manipulating us psychologically the way the Jews do. If they did, America would still be the land of the Iroquois, the Cherokees, and the Apaches -- of the Sioux and the Comanches and the Shawnees -- and they'd still be raiding each other and torturing their prisoners to death for amusement.

The point of everything I've said so far is this: the Jews are a far bigger threat to our survival as a people than are the Blacks or the Mexicans or any other alien group because the Jews not only are masters of psychological manipulation but because they have gathered the means for manipulating us into their hands. Those aren't the only reasons, but I'll get to the other reasons later.

I said that we're lucky that the Indians weren't able to manipulate our ancestors psychologically. Really, we're even luckier that there were for all practical purposes no Jews in North America at that time, or they would have had us feeling guilty about fighting the Indians. The Jews waited to come until the fighting was pretty much finished, and they could concentrate on accumulating money without worrying about being scalped. The Indians -- and the Blacks and the Mexicans -- still don't know how to manipulate any but the most soft-brained hymn-singers among us. We are letting the Mexicans and the Blacks wreck our country today **not** because the Blacks or the Mexicans are able to brainwash us, but because the **Jews** are.

Mexicans are not a menace to us because they breed fast and carry switchblades. Blacks are not a menace because there are a lot of them and they have a tendency toward violence. We know how to deal with people who breed fast and carry switchblades. We know how to deal with violent Blacks, no matter how many of them there are. Cleaning up America might be a bit messy, but there's absolutely no question about our ability to do it, if we had the will to do it: if we hadn't been brainwashed into feeling guilty for wanting to safeguard America for future generations of our own people. And you know **who** has brainwashed us.

It may seem really complicated when we look at all of the details: brainwashing in the schools, brainwashing by the government, brainwashing statements to us by all of the most ambitious politicians and all of the most glamorous entertainers and sports stars and all of the spokesmen for the mainstream churches, brainwashing by the big advertisers who want us to buy their products -- and brainwashing by all of the controlled news and entertainment media. They are virtually unanimous: more diversity is good, they all tell us; multiracialism and multiculturalism are wonderful things; Blacks, Mexicans, Asians, and Jews are all very nice people, and you mustn't resist them. You soon will be a minority in your own land, but that's as it should be. Don't resist it. Your ancestors stole this land from the Indians, and so now it is only right that it

should be stolen from you. You have oppressed minorities, and so it is only fair that minorities will oppress your children and your grandchildren. Don't resist. It is un-American to resist. Just let it happen.

We hear this message of surrender and death from many people, many institutions, but behind all of them stand the master manipulators: the Jews. It is a Jewish message, whether it comes to us from Bill Clinton's lips or the lips of a Hollywood actor in a Steven Spielberg film or directly from a column or editorial in the *New York Times.*

And it is a **lethal** message. Those who absorb it are as good as dead already.

Do you remember Amy Biehl, the blonde American girl who went to South Africa in 1993 to help the Blacks there in their fight against **apartheid?** She was full of this message and was just dying to do whatever she could to take power away from the awful, terrible, racist White South Africans, who were her kinsmen, and give it to the wonderful, kind, noble, and deserving Blacks.

Well, Blacks will be Blacks, and so when a gang of them spotted her going about her do-good business in a Black area they stabbed, beat, kicked, and stoned her to death. There was still a White government in South Africa in 1993, and the killing of Whites -- even brainwashed, do-good Whites -- by Blacks wasn't tolerated, and so the Black murderers were caught and locked up.

Now, of course, there's a Black government in South Africa, and so in late July the Black murderers of Amy Biehl were set free again. Amy's parents in California, who are just as much under the influence of the Jewish message as she was, greeted the release of her killers with the statement: "We hope they will receive the support necessary to live productive lives in a non-violent atmosphere. In fact, we hope the spirits of Amy and of those like her will be a force in their new lives." This was the reaction of Amy's parents to the pardoning and release of the gang of Black murderers who had danced and chanted around the body of a dying White girl as they kicked and slashed the life out of her. Were Amy's parents concerned about the danger posed to other White women in South Africa by turning these sadistic Black murderers loose? Not at all. Their only concern was for the Black murderers -- because they have taken to heart the message: Blacks are good; Whites are evil.

And so now I ask you: Who is the real threat to our people: the Blacks who murdered Amy -- or the people who taught her and her parents the message of self-hate which led Amy to go to Africa to work against her own people? Which is the real threat? Which do we need to concern ourselves with first: the Blacks and the Mexicans -- or the people who have taught us the same message of self-hate and racial suicide which was taught to Amy Biehl and her parents?

Now you should understand why I am much more concerned about Jews than I am about Blacks and Mexicans. Eventually we will have to deal with Blacks and Mexicans, of course, and the sooner the better. But we can't hope to do that successfully when so many of our people have fallen victim to the same sort of psychological manipulation that Amy Biehl and her parents have.

Bill Clinton has been running around the country giving speeches to university students and to various civic groups, and he's been preaching the same message to all of them. He's been gloating about the coming non-White majority in America, and he's been telling his audiences that we must not try to stop it. It would be un-American to try to stop it, he tells them. Don't resist. And they've been cheering him. They've been applauding this message, because they've already had it preached to them in church, and they've read it in the *New York Times*, and they've heard it on television.

Unfortunately, not all of these trendy air-heads -- not all of these lemmings -- have had an opportunity to prove their commitment to the cause of White racial suicide the way Amy did. But they believe it. They believe it because the Jews have taught them well. The Jews have manipulated them psychologically. And that is the primary threat to the continued existence of our people, beside which every other threat is insignificant.

And so our task today -- the task of every White man and woman who has not fallen victim to this psychological manipulation, this spiritual poison of the sort which killed Amy Biehl -- is to fight the poisoners, to fight the manipulators, not worry about Black crime or Mexican fecundity. Sometimes, of course, I do speak about Black problems or Mexican problems, but that really is only to illuminate the primary problem, which is the Jews' control of our media of news and entertainment, the media through which they inject their spiritual poison into our people.

And we don't fight the poisoners by wringing our hands and moaning that it's too late, that the Jews are too powerful, that there's no way we can compete against the television networks, Hollywood, the *New York Times*, and Bill Clinton for the hearts and minds of our people.

It is late, but not yet **too** late; the Jews are powerful, but not so powerful that they cannot be beaten. Our people are brainwashed, but many of them can be un-brainwashed. The story of Amy Biehl and her parents is enough to make some of the lemmings wake up, if we use it effectively as a lesson. Because many of the trendy idiots who cheer the message of White racial suicide do so only because they think it is not only trendy but safe. They think that they personally won't have to suffer the implications of that message the way Amy Biehl did. We should be able to convince some of them that if we all continue in the direction we're headed now, there will in fact be many more Amy Biehls, and they personally may be among those victims. Let's help them to understand that.

What is happening to Bill Clinton now, as he sinks further and further into the cesspool of his own making, will wake up a few lemmings. Bill Clinton's prestige as President is tied to the Jewish message of White racial suicide, and as the DNA experts do their analysis of the semen stains on Monica Lewinsky's dress and Clinton's prestige continues to sink, so will the appeal of the message to the lemmings. Let's you and I continue to rub their noses in the connection between Bill Clinton and his message.

Let's not be only spectators. Let's continue to build the listenership of *American Dissident Voices* and the readership of *Free Speech.* Let's continue to spread our message of hope and life and a White future in opposition to the message which killed Amy Biehl.

David Geffen, Steven Spielberg, and Bill Clinton

I referred to Steven Spielberg's new film, *Saving Private Ryan,* in the August issue of *Free Speech.* We talked about the way in which that film -- and every other film about the Second World war which has come out of Hollywood -- have perpetuated the myth -- the **deliberate lie** -- that the Second World War was a necessary war and a good war. I mentioned that the Jews have elaborated on this basic lie with their postwar lies about lampshades and soap supposedly manufactured from the corpses of millions of gassed Jews: poor, innocent, inoffensive, sensitive, blameless, high-minded, talented, violin-playing Jews murdered by the brutal, vicious, sadistic, Neanderthal Germans. That's the standard Hollywood lie perpetuated by Jews like Steven Spielberg. And the Jews use this lie to extort billions and billions and billions of dollars from the rest of the world. Switzerland is their current target, but believe me, they intend to suck the last drop of blood from all the rest of us too.

I've spoken with you on several earlier programs about this extortion racket and about the lies on which it is based. One subject we haven't talked much about is the liars themselves, the extortionists, the individual Jews behind the myth. Actually, quite a bit has been written about these people. On a program a couple of months ago I mentioned one book which gives an overview of the Jews' takeover of Hollywood and their transformation of the motion-picture industry into a propaganda tool for manipulating Americans. That book is Neil Gabler's *An Empire of their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood.* It's available from National Vanguard Books, the publisher of *Free Speech.* Just write to the address at the bottom of the page and ask for a copy of our catalog.

I just finished reading another book on the same general subject which was published last year. It's Stephen Singular's biography of David Geffen, and it's also available from National Vanguard Books. Have you ever heard of David Geffen? He's the "G" in DreamWorks SKG. The "S" is Steven Spielberg, and the "K" is Jeffrey Katzenberg. Geffen is a Hollywood Jew who became a billionaire in the music business: records, tapes, and CDs of rock, rap, and the other things which pass for "music" these days. With his billions he formed a new film production company -- DreamWorks SKG -- in 1994 with his good Jewish friends Spielberg and Katzenberg, and now we're beginning to see some of their products.

Stephen Singular's biography of Geffen is sympathetic. Singular writes sympathetically about rich and powerful Jews generally. What makes his biography of Geffen interesting for us is the view it gives us of the world in which these rich Jews live. It is a world quite alien to ours. Did you ever hear of Sammy Glick? He's the protagonist in a 1941 novel, *What Makes Sammy Run?,* by the Jewish Hollywood scriptwriter Budd Schulberg. I read *What Makes Sammy Run?* when I was a freshman, and the image of Sammy Glick has stuck in my mind ever since. Sammy Glick is the prototypical Jewish hustler; the prototypical hungry, young Jew on the way up; the prototypical Hollywood Jew: crude, crass, grasping, manipulative, vulgar, unscrupulous, very verbal, willing to do absolutely anything to advance his career and get his hands on more money. It's amazing that this Jewish prototype was described so starkly for us by a Jew, Budd Schulberg.

Probably only a Jew could have given us such an insightful portrait. David Geffen **is** Sammy Glick. The only difference is that Sammy Glick was a fictional character, and David Geffen is real. And Sammy Glick was a heterosexual who liked *shikses* -- that is, Gentile girls -- while David Geffen is a flaming homosexual.

And in fact, an amazingly large percentage of the Jews who control the American cultural, fashion, and entertainment establishment are homosexuals -- or at least, they were: AIDS has taken quite a toll of them during the past decade. New York composer and conductor Leonard Bernstein, for example. In 1992, when he publicly announced his homosexuality after donating a million dollars to a homosexual charity, Geffen said he kept a card file of 341 of his friends and colleagues who had died of AIDS recently. Unfortunately, there still are a lot of them left.

The Jewish crowd that Geffen runs around with -- people like fashion mogul Calvin Klein and media mogul Barry Diller -- are referred to as the "Velvet Mafia." One of the favorite hangouts for the Velvet Mafia used to be a disco called Studio 54 in New York City. Studio 54 was run by one of Geffen's homosexual Jewish friends, Steve Rubell, until AIDS caught up with Rubell. The goings on at Studio 54 were really too raunchy for me to describe on this program, but if you have a strong stomach you can read about them in the Geffen biography or in another book published last year titled *The Last Party: Studio 54, Disco, and the Culture of the Night*, by Anthony Haden-Guest.

Not everyone who went to Studio 54 was Jewish or homosexual. Some of the clientele were non-Jewish homosexuals, like Elton John, Truman Capote, and Andy Warhol. Some were heterosexual Jews. And many were wealthy heterosexual Gentiles in the fields of entertainment or politics. The reason I suggest that you might be interested in looking into the world of Studio 54 is that it provides a good sample of the sort of morality and mind-set that prevail among rich Jews and their rich Gentile hangers-on in Hollywood, Washington, and New York. It is an utterly depraved world, a world where **anything at all** goes, so long as it provides kicks.

No one who knows me would accuse me of being a prude or being old-fashioned. I am sure, however, that my conviction that every healthy society must have boundaries of decent behavior comes much closer to the beliefs of most of my fellow citizens than does the completely hedonistic, amoral, anything-goes attitude of these self-appointed Jewish arbiters of American culture, as epitomized by David Geffen, Steven Spielberg, and Jeffrey Katzenberg. In reading of the goings on among Geffen and his friends at Studio 54 -- totally nude men mingling with the clientele, public masturbation over piles of money, and the like; really, I cannot describe for you on the air the sort of depraved, degenerate behavior these people find amusing -- I am reminded of Rome in the first century, under Caligula and Nero, and of Berlin during the Weimar Republic.

If these Jews kept strictly to themselves it would be bad enough, but they have been able to corrupt a whole stratum of all-too-easily corruptible Gentiles in entertainment and politics who have found the Jews' money and power an irresistible attraction. Without any inner moral compass to guide them, actors and actresses and politicians have followed the lead of super-rich entertainment-industry Jews like David Geffen. They form a sort of *goyische* entourage,

attending the Jews' parties, going to their clubs and discos, fascinated by the conspicuous consumption and the outrageous excesses of their Jewish hosts.

Currently the best example of this is the relationship between David Geffen and Bill and Hillary Clinton. The Clintons have been in Geffen's orbit since 1992, when the latter began contributing heavily to Bill's campaign fund. Geffen became Hollywood's single largest financial supporter of the Democratic Party, followed closely by his partners Steven Spielberg and Jeffrey Katzenberg. Another big supporter is Lew Wasserman, chairman emeritus of media giant MCA. Geffen, incidentally, sold his own music company, Geffen Records, which specializes in Black music for White kids, to Wasserman's company in 1990 for $600 million. In addition to his personal donations to the two Clinton Presidential campaigns, Geffen has organized fund-raising events among his fellow Hollywood Jews which have poured many millions of dollars into the Democratic coffers.

And the relationship has been social as well as financial. Often when the Clintons have been in southern California Geffen has thrown parties for them, and they have stayed in one of his mansions. And when Geffen is in Washington, he often sleeps in the White House. And Geffen is never shy about expressing his opinion on policy matters or about giving advice to Clinton -- which helps us to understand why Clinton has made the promotion of special rights for homosexuals such a prominent part of his policy agenda.

Bill Clinton had adopted the morality of "if it feels good, do it" and "anything goes" long before he met David Geffen, of course. Clinton is a product of the 1960s cultural and moral revolution, and his behavior in the White House has been pretty much the same as his earlier behavior in the Arkansas statehouse. His association with David Geffen and the latter's circle of rich Jewish media bosses has merely served to confirm his conviction that his behavior really is smart and fashionable.

In the July issue of *Free Speech* I gave an example of this amoral attitude and the behavior it leads to. It's worth repeating that example in connection with the Clinton-Geffen relationship. As I'm sure you remember, Clinton gave a speech at Portland State University in Oregon on June 13, in which he virtually gloated over the fact that the immigration and welfare policies of the Federal government will result in a non-White majority in America within the next 50 years. He said that any opposition, any resistance, to this darkening of America would be "un-American."

Right after his speech at Portland State University Clinton went to Springfield, Oregon, and gave a speech at Thurston High School. This is the school where a 15-year-old student had blown away 24 of his classmates with a .22-calibre rifle a few days earlier. Clinton told the parents, students, and teachers at Thurston High that he "felt their pain," and he preached against the so-called "culture of violence" which he said had led to so many schoolyard killings in recent months. We must do whatever it takes to end this "culture of violence" which leads kids to shoot each other, Clinton said.

Then, right after that speech, he hopped onto Air Force One for a flight to Los Angeles, where he attended a big fund-raising party being thrown for him that evening by one of Geffen's pals, Lew Wasserman. He accepted almost a million dollars in donations from Wasserman, Geffen, and the

other Hollywood Jews at the party that evening. Now, Wasserman's company, MCA, owns Interscope Records, among a number of other record labels, and Interscope is the world's foremost promoter and distributor of the Black musical genre known as "gangsta' rap." Gangsta' rap lyrics customarily glorify criminal violence, including rape and murder. Tupac Shakur, a gangsta' rapper who was himself killed in a drive-by shooting in Las Vegas in 1997, was one of Interscope's star performers.

So what's the connection? It's this: many observers of children's behavior believe that gangsta' rap, with its glorification of violence, has incited children to commit criminal acts. Because of this there have been a number of protests against the companies, such as Interscope, which promote gangsta' rap. Congressional hearings have even been held, and pressure has been applied to the record companies to stop producing gangsta' rap. In other words, there's no way Clinton could have been unaware that the music being sold by Lew Wasserman's company is considered by many knowledgeable people to play a major role in creating the "culture of violence" that Clinton had decried in his speech at Thurston High School in Springfield, Oregon, just hours before arriving at Wasserman's house and greeting his host with a big hug.

Now, let me emphasize this point. In March two young boys in Jonesboro, Arkansas, 11 and 13 years old, had shot four of their girl classmates and a female teacher to death in what seemed to be a totally senseless killing spree. The whole nation heard about this. Certainly, Mr. Clinton did, because he made televised speeches about it, decrying the "culture of violence" that he said was responsible for the Jonesboro killings, just as he would later blame the same "culture of violence" for the Springfield, Oregon, killings. And you know, this appears to be one of the few times Mr. Clinton has been right about something, because the English teacher of one of the Jonesboro killers, 13-year-old Mitchell Johnson, testified before a U.S. Senate committee in Washington about the influence gangsta' rap had had on the boy. Mitchell's English teacher, Debbie Pelley, told the senators that she had noticed Mitchell's behavior begin changing in the months before the shootings, when he began listening to gangsta' rap recordings. His teacher told the Senate committee: "Mitchell brought this music to school with him, listened to it on the bus, tried listening to it in classes. . . . He was far more into this music than anyone else his friends knew."

Young Mitchell's favorite rapper was Tupac Shakur, according to his teacher. The CDs that 13-year-old Mitchell Johnson brought to school and listened to on the school bus, CDs that glorify rape and murder and are a big part of the "culture of violence" to which young Americans are exposed and which Mr. Clinton has blamed for the plague of schoolyard killings in America -- these gangsta' rap CDs were sold to Mitchell by Lew Wasserman's company, Interscope Records.

Debbie Pelley told the U.S. Senate in her testimony in Washington that the 13-year-old White boy would sing along with the lyrics as he listened to Black rapper Tupac Shakur sing about "coming to school and killing all the kids." Debbie Pelley saw the transformation of Mitchell Johnson with her own eyes; she witnessed the effect of gangsta' rap on him; and she was lucky not to have been killed herself when the 13-year-old did, in fact, come to school and begin killing all the kids. And she testified to all of this in Washington. And yet Mr. Clinton is not ashamed to party with Lew Wasserman and to accept money from him. And the reason he's not ashamed is that he knows he won't be called to account for it. He knows that the Jews who

control the news media won't even tell the public about the connection between Bill Clinton, Lew Wasserman, and Tupac Shakur. They may occasionally criticize him for taking campaign contributions from Chinese gangsters and Indonesian bankers, but they will never criticize him for taking money from Jewish promoters of gangsta' rap. Never, never, never. And so the lemmings, who are willing to forgive Bill Clinton no matter what they find out about how his semen got on Monica Lewinsky's dress -- the lemmings will never even hear about the significance of his taking money from Lew Wasserman and David Geffen.

Part of what's interesting about all of this is what it tells us about America's political elite, which has become thoroughly acclimated to operating in this Jewish environment, this environment of Jewish money and Jewish media control. Well over half of all the money the Democratic Party raises for its candidates comes from the tiny Jewish minority in America: a minority which has accumulated a vastly disproportionate share of America's wealth. And a substantial part of the donations from Jews comes from a relatively few extremely rich Jews associated with the entertainment industry in Los Angeles and New York. And of course, there are strings attached to all of this money. It buys not only sleepovers in the White House: it buys access and influence. It buys appointments to government office. That's one of the reasons that two-thirds of the advisors, speechwriters, legislative assistants, lawyers, press secretaries, and so forth around Bill Clinton in the White House are Jews. Our government, our politicians, accept this situation as normal. It doesn't bother them -- just so long as they get their share of Jewish money.

And even more interesting is the fact that America's popular culture has been shaped to a very large extent by Jews for the past 60 years or so. Today these Jews are men like David Geffen, Lew Wasserman, Steven Spielberg, and the Weinstein brothers: Geffen and Wasserman in popular music and Spielberg and the Weinsteins in films. Not all of the music is gangsta' rap, of course, and not all the films are the sort of obvious filth the Weinstein brothers produce for Michael Eisner's Disney Company -- but it's all poison. Everything that these Jews touch is poisoned by them in one way or another. The whole movement in popular music which has replaced White music with Black music -- which has promoted and popularized Black music among young Whites -- has been orchestrated by Jews. The use of films to condition White Americans to accept racial mixing and interracial sex and homosexuality has been almost entirely a Jewish operation, just as the use of films earlier to incite hatred against Germany and to portray Jews as the world's most deserving victims was a Jewish operation.

Do you think that the type of music David Geffen promotes isn't influenced by the fact that he is a homosexual and a Jew? Do you think that the sort of people who are accustomed to hanging around places like Studio 54 and applauding the grossest sort of degeneracy can still make healthy decisions about the directions American popular culture and American fashion should take?

It's considerations of this sort which make it worth our while to learn about what the David Geffens in our society are doing.

The Fayetteville Murders

It's really too bad Bill Clinton put on such a weak performance in his televised apology to the nation a couple of weeks ago. He could have done much better if he hadn't worn himself out trying to appear cooperative while waffling and dodging questions from the grand jury the whole afternoon before his speech. As it was, I believe his poor performance left a lot of his supporters feeling uneasy.

He certainly left a lot of people who aren't his supporters feeling a bit uneasy about the country's future. Knowledgeable people in other countries already were pretty cynical about the U.S. government. They understand the extent to which it is under the control of the Jews, simply from observing its unquestioning backing of Israeli policy in the Middle East, when that policy is clearly detrimental to American interests. And they certainly haven't failed to notice Washington's obedient support of the Jews' current extortion efforts against Switzerland and other countries from which the Jews are in the process of successfully gouging billions of dollars in World War Two reparations.

Now the cynicism of foreign observers is turning to contempt. Clinton has become a laughingstock around the world. People are amazed that the United States has a President who says he believes that oral sex doesn't really count and who has so little control over his urges that he lets himself get into such an embarrassing mess.

What all of this means is that when Mr. Clinton goes on television, puts on a serious face, and tells the world that his government will not tolerate having its embassies blown up, people are less inclined to take him seriously. Actually, it shouldn't matter, since it's not Clinton but the FBI and other police and military agencies which are supposed to counter terrorism, but in fact, it does matter. Certainly, if I were a terrorist leader wanting to strike at the United States I'd be greatly encouraged to see the U.S. government headed by a clown like Clinton. I wouldn't worry half so much about all of America's Tomahawk cruise missiles if I knew that the man in charge of those missiles is a fool and a self-indulgent weakling.

I believe that we will see an increase in terrorism against the United States during the next two years, and I believe that most reasonable people will agree with me that the weaker image of America caused by Clinton's deplorable behavior will be a contributing factor.

It's really amazing, isn't it? We can put people on the Moon and send robot explorers to Mars, but our political system is a basket case, which seems to permit only moral cripples to rise to positions of leadership. It's the sort of political system you might expect to find in a banana republic or in Africa or the Middle East. Because it's not just Bill Clinton. If the system were sound, someone like Bill Clinton could never have gotten near the White House. Look at the situation we have now, in which all of the media people seem to be in agreement that Bill Clinton's fate depends not on the specific evidence of criminal behavior Kenneth Starr produces in his report to the Congress but rather on how the opinion polls go. It's not the law which really counts here, but public opinion. If the man's approval rating drops significantly, then the Congress will fall on him like a pack of wolves. But if his approval rating stays high, then the

politicians won't try to touch him. It reminds me of the Coliseum in ancient Rome, where the fate of a gladiator was determined by whether he got a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down sign from the emperor, and the emperor made his decision based on the shouts of the mob. It's not just foreign terrorists who've lost their respect for the U.S. government; it's everybody.

Is this an organic development -- which is to say, a natural development -- or is it artificial? There are political theorists who believe that a civilization -- and that includes its government -- has a life cycle which is analogous to that of a living organism: it goes through a youthful period of vigorous and healthy growth, reaches maturity, and then gradually becomes senile and dies. They would attribute the Clinton phenomenon to the senility of American civilization.

Then on the other hand there are the conspiracy theorists, who attribute the decline of American prestige to deliberate sabotage. I take a middle position, about halfway between the Spenglerians and the conspiracy theorists. That is, there certainly is some truth in the Spenglerian -- or organic -- view. This country started off with a much higher quality electorate than it has now. Through the processes of non-selective immigration, dysgenic breeding, and an irresponsible and reckless extension of the franchise to broader and broader classes of the population, an electorate has devolved in the United States which would make the Roman mob in the Coliseum seem like a gathering of distinguished, upright, and responsible citizens. Democracies tend to become senile faster than other forms of government through the process of extending the vote. This process, like giving candy to a baby, goes in only one direction, and that's down. But I believe that it's been a natural process in the United States, for the most part, based on intrinsic weaknesses in the democratic system rather than on deliberate sabotage.

But there has also been plenty of sabotage. Look at the crew around Clinton, for example. What a collection of camel faces! You'd think he was in the Knesset instead of the White House. In particular, every time Clinton blows up a pharmaceutical factory in some other country in order to divert the attention of the public from his zipper problems, the advisers and functionaries around him -- his secretary of state and all of her assistant secretaries; his secretary of defense; his national security adviser and his deputy national security adviser; his new ambassador to the United Nations; his policy advisers, headed by the Israeli agent Emanuel Rahm; his speechwriters; even his soon-to-be new press secretary -- these people could more naturally carry on their deliberations in Yiddish than in English. There's hardly a Gentile among them. Actually, Clinton's former Gentile press secretary, Mike McCurry, will still be around for a few more weeks, but with his Jewish girlfriend Monica Lewinsky so much in the news these days, I guess he decided he needed to replace McCurry with a Jewish press secretary to explain the details of the relationship to the media. I mean, the environment around Clinton is so kosher that if someone from Mars landed on the White House lawn he would conclude that the U.S. population is 90 per cent Jews instead of just over two per cent.

And this all-too-visible domination of our government by Jews isn't even necessary from the Jews' point of view. They have a deathgrip on the country which they can maintain just as effectively from behind the scenes. They don't need all of those Jews out in plain sight, where someone other than a Martian might notice them and begin thinking.

The politicians in Washington express varying views on many different subjects. Some are in favor of unlimited abortion, and some are not. Some are in favor of bigger welfare checks for the drones, and some are not. Some are tree-cutters and polluters, while others will occasionally speak in favor of protecting the environment. Some are for so-called "gay rights," and some are not. But there is not **one** of them who will oppose the Jews on anything at all; not one of them who will say out loud, "Hey, we have too many Jews in this government."

And that's not a natural development. That's the result of a carefully planned and well organized campaign of subversion. We have a gang of politicians who always dance to the Jews' tune, no matter what tune the Jews choose to play, because the system has been subverted so that only such politicians can succeed in it. The Jews' tools for subversion have been the mass media of news and entertainment.

I talk about the Jewish control of the media often, but I'm sure that many people still don't believe what I say on that subject. They can't bring themselves to believe that in a country with so many newspapers, news magazines, radio stations, and television stations, all trying to make money by reporting the news, any small group of people can keep all these media under control; they can't believe that a minority making up only a little over two per cent of the population can censor the news tightly enough to control what Joe and Jill Sixpack think; they can't believe that the Jews are able to use the media in such a disciplined way that they can change the outcome of any election.

Let me give you a very forceful example of Jewish media control which shows just how tight and how vicious that control is. On Monday, the 17th of August, two young, White women were murdered in Fayetteville, North Carolina, near Fort Bragg, the big Army base which is home to the 82nd Airborne Division. The murdered women were 18-year-old Tracy Lambert and 25-year-old Susan Moore, both of them remarkably pretty blondes. Tracy and Susan were driving home after work, late at night. On their way home they were abducted by a group of seven Blacks and mixed-race Hispanics, all members and prospective members of a non-White gang known as the Crips. The prospective members had been assigned to murder one or more innocent persons as a gang initiation rite. If they wanted to be full-fledged members of the Crips, they had to find and murder someone.

They found Tracy and Susan driving home in Susan's car. They abducted the girls by stopping the car and forcing their way in -- what's known these days as a "car-jacking." They locked the two White girls in the trunk of the car, drove them to a vacant field just outside Fort Bragg, made them kneel on the ground, and then, a little after three o'clock Monday morning, shot them in the head. The bullets which killed the girls and which were removed from their heads by the medical examiner had been painted with blue fingernail polish. Blue is the Crips' identifying color. The bodies were found by a farmer early in the morning, just four hours after they had been murdered.

Two of the gang members were arrested the next day in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, driving Susan's car and using Susan's cellular phone. The other five were arrested in the next two days. Two of the arrested gang members immediately confessed. All seven were arraigned on Thursday. This means the news media had the whole story of these sensational, racially

motivated gang murders, with all of the lurid details, by Thursday, August 20. Stories began appearing in the *Observer-Times,* the local newspaper, and in a few other local papers near Fayetteville on Friday. And the story also was reported on the local television news program.

But that's **all.** The murders were not reported **at all** outside North Carolina. I've talked with people all around the country and asked them if they've heard anything about the murders, and none have. I'll wager that this broadcast is the first you've heard of these murders. Now, isn't that remarkable? **That** is disciplined censorship. No one in the mainstream media has broken ranks, even on such a sensational story. And it's not that they didn't know. The information was available on the Internet, to anyone who knew how to look for it, from the Fayetteville *Observer-Times* and other Fayetteville sources. But the word went out that these murders were not to be reported outside North Carolina, and by God, they weren't.

Do you remember another racial killing which occurred in Fayetteville, a little over two and a half years ago? I'm sure you do. A White soldier from Fort Bragg, James Burmeister, got tanked up on beer one night in December 1995, along with a couple of his buddies from the base. While in a mood of drunken belligerency Burmeister ran into a convicted Black drug dealer and the drug dealer's Black girlfriend in Fayetteville, and he shot them to death. He was arrested shortly afterward, and the case immediately -- **immediately** -- became a *cause celebre.* It was a headlined story in the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post,* the *Wall Street Journal, Time, Newsweek,* and every other newspaper and newsmagazine in the country. It was on all of the national television news programs -- **all of them.** The controlled media spread the story around the world with breathless haste. And they didn't drop it. They reported on it over and over and over again for months. Every little detail of the case which came out made new headlines all across America.

They found what they called "racist literature" in Burmeister's room, and that was big news too. No organization. No gang. No gang initiation. Just "racist literature." But that was enough for Janet Reno to come onto television and announce that she was sending in the FBI. Bill Clinton was on television talking about the case and holding it up as a terrible example of "White racism." And the professional hate merchants like Morris Dees and his Southern Poverty Law Center, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and all of the other Jewish groups commented on the case endlessly. **A race killing: how terrible!** That's what we heard over and over again for more than a year. The Jewish organizations which are behind Clinton's plan for a non-White America in the coming decades -- the Jews who scripted that plan for him -- used the Burmeister shooting in Fayetteville as a propaganda club to make White Americans feel sheepish and keep their heads down. "See how awful White racism is?" they screamed at us; "see where it leads?"

But Tracy Lambert and Susan Moore? Forget them. They weren't convicted drug dealers, and they weren't Black. They were just two pretty, young White women trying to get home from work. And their killers weren't White. So they're **not news.** Actually, it's more than the fact that the murder of Tracy and Susan don't fit the pattern that the Jews have been promoting with the media for so long: the pattern of White racists and non-White victims. What has caused news of this case to be stifled is that it fits so perfectly the opposite pattern: non-White murderers consistently hunting down and killing White victims. Janet Reno won't be sending the FBI to

Fayetteville for this hate crime. Bill Clinton won't be on television about it either. And except for those Americans who listen to *American Dissident Voices* or read *Free Speech,* people outside North Carolina won't even hear about it.

And this is not an oversight. This is deliberate. This is planned. The last thing in the world the Jewish media bosses want is for White Americans to hear about these murders, because it'll dawn on some of those White Americans that this is the sort of thing they can look forward to when America has a non-White majority a few decades hence. The Crips, after all, are spread all across the country. They are the biggest criminal gang in America. They are a lethal threat to unsuspecting White people everywhere. They will be an even bigger threat in the future. But that's all right. The Democrats need their votes.

Even in Fayetteville, where the media could hardly have kept quiet about these murders, there has been no mention at all of the Burmeister shooting in connection with them, no drawing of parallels. That's such an obvious thing, contrasting these racial murders with Burmeister's shooting of the Black drug dealer and his girlfriend in 1995 in the same place, but it's clear that even the Fayetteville media are **deliberately** steering clear of making that connection. They don't want anybody thinking of these murders in racial terms. The image they have established in the minds of the lemmings is one of White racists, White haters, attacking poor, defenseless non-White victims, and they don't want reality to intrude on that image.

I don't want to overwork the story of these August 17 Fayetteville murders. But I think that you'll agree with me that it's not an ordinary news story. It's not the sort of story that the media bosses decided wouldn't be **interesting** to the American people. It's not just another one of those ho-hum stories about Black criminality of the sort we have every day. It's an extraordinarily important story, a significant story, a story which provides the opportunity for all sorts of commentary and drawing all sorts of parallels, the sort of story which makes people think.

The media bosses understood that instantly. And with a nationwide criminal gang like the Crips behind these race murders in Fayetteville, it's the sort of story that the media have a responsibility to get to the people, in order to warn them of a very real and growing danger. And that's why the media bosses deliberately suppressed the story. They don't want to mess up the false image of White racists and Black victims they have worked so long and hard to plant in the heads of the lemmings, of the couch potatoes, of the Joe and Jill Sixpacks who vote in elections. They don't want the voters to think. They don't want them to know what's really happening in America. They don't want them to form their own opinions about things. The Jewish media bosses want to continue controlling public opinion and controlling the outcome of elections. They do that by suppressing stories like the Fayetteville murders.

So you see, a big part of America's decline is the consequence of deliberate Jewish subversion, deliberate Jewish sabotage. Through their media control the Jews do change the way Americans see the world. The Jews do change public opinion. The Jews use their media control effectively enough to determine the outcome of elections. If they can hammer the story of James Burmeister's drunken shooting of a couple of Black low-lifes into the consciousness of every American and then successfully suppress the story of the cold-blooded, initiation murder of Tracy and Susan by a Black gang, they can change the way Americans respond to the Jews'

racial programs. They can persuade the lemmings to go along willingly with their plan for a non-White America: an America which they can control and exploit even more easily.

The total suppression of the news of the murder of Tracy and Susan is an exceptionally convincing illustration of the power wielded by the Jewish media bosses and of the destructive way in which they use that power. And it should help us to understand not only why we have a clown at the head of our government -- a clown completely surrounded by Jews -- but also why we must have a full-scale revolution in America to clean things up.

The Russian Economy

Every few months for the past several years I have used this program to warn against the policy of economic globalization, which has been one of the Clinton administration's favorite policies. I pointed out the dangers for America in so-called "free trade." In my past discussions of the subject I focused on America's loss of autonomy, which is an inevitable consequence of unrestricted international trade. That is, when one country is able to produce a class of products and sell them to another country cheaper than that other country can produce them for itself, the industry which produces that class of products will be driven out of existence in the second country. If that class of products is plastic hair curlers, for example, it doesn't matter. But if it's machine tools or some other product essential to an independent economy, the second country loses its autonomy.

In view of what's been happening around the world recently, and the repercussions of those happenings on Wall Street, this is probably a good time to point out that when we allow our economy to become closely linked to the economies of less stable countries, then we lose not only our autonomy but also our own economic stability.

It's absolutely crazy for the United States to develop strong economic linkages to countries in Asia or Latin America. Or perhaps I should say, it's **treasonous.** It's not even good policy to become economically dependent on countries like Russia.

The only situation in which any sort of close economic linkage with another country -- such as "free trade" on any significant scale -- makes sense is when there is a real community of interests. That is a fundamental and obvious truth, but it is completely ignored by the people pushing for globalization. In order for there to be a community of interests between two countries, in the first place their populations must be of the same race. Thus, it has been the sheerest folly to tie the U.S. economy to those of Asia and Latin America. The basic industries which have been driven out of the United States because of competition from these non-White areas of the world, where wage scales are so different -- our machine-tool industry, for example, and our consumer electronics industry -- were essential to our autonomy. And now, with the collapsing economies in Asia and Mexico pulling our economy down with them, we can't simply disengage, because we no longer have autonomy.

With Russia we at least have racial similarity, but there are other reasons why too close an economic involvement with Russia is not good for us now. The most important of those reasons is the men who are now running Russia. The man out front, of course, is President Boris Yeltsin. But Yeltsin is, like Bill Clinton, a seriously flawed man: he's an alcoholic and a skirt-chaser. In fact, he is primarily a clown who also is a good actor, someone who can posture effectively for the television cameras and pull in the votes from the Russian masses. And because of his acting ability he has been strongly supported by the hard, sober men who for all practical purposes own Russia and tell Yeltsin what to do. Unfortunately, the majority of these men are Jews, and many also are gangsters, organized crime bosses.

A few days ago MSNBC posted on the Internet a list of what it called "Russia's Robber Barons: the Twelve Men Who Own Russia's Economy," along with brief biographical sketches of each of these newly made billionaires. It is interesting to note that none of these billionaires had as much as $10,000 to his name ten years ago. They all became enormously wealthy during the so-called "privatization" of the Russian economy after the collapse of communism at the beginning of this decade.

Of these 12 robber barons listed by MSNBC eight are Jews. Eight out of twelve. That is indeed remarkable in a country with only about one-half of one per cent Jews in its population. Not only that, but the Jews are constantly whining in their media about how they're being "persecuted" in Russia. They own the country, and they whine to us about Russian "anti-Semitism."

Of course, MSNBC won't tell you about the Jewishness of any of these robber barons. MSNBC calls them all "Russians." But in fact, Boris Berezovsky, Vladimir Gusinsky, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Vitali Malkin, Mikhail Fridman, Alexander Smolensky, Vladimir Vinogradov, and Anatoly Chubais are Jews, self-acknowledged Jews, bragged about as Jews in the Jewish community publications that we aren't supposed to see. One of the twelve, Vladimir Potanin, is actually a Russian, one is probably an Azerbaijani, and I haven't yet been able to determine the ethnicity of the remaining two. And I should add that although Anatoly Chubais considers himself a Jew, he's actually only half-Jewish.

Before MSNBC's list of twelve "robber barons" was posted, the Russians had their own list: the Seven Oligarchs they call them, all of them new billionaires who have backed Boris Yeltsin with money and media support. The seven are the aforenamed Boris Berezovsky, Vladimir Gusinsky, Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Mikhail Fridman, Alexander Smolensky, and Pyotr Aven, who is also a Jew, and the Russian Vladimir Potanin. That's six Jewish oligarchs and one Russian.

Let me tell you how this bizarre and very dangerous situation came about. When the Bolsheviks overthrew the Russian government in 1917, murdered the Czar and his family, and formed the Soviet Union, there was an extraordinarily high quota of Jews among the communist revolutionaries who formed the Soviet government. Lenin, who was himself only a quarter Russian, had surrounded himself with Jews from the beginning. Lenin's chief financier during the revolutionary period was the Jew Israel Lazarevich Helphand, who used the pseudonym "Parvus." Lenin's right-hand man was the Jew Grigory Apfelbaum, who used the name "Zinoviev." After the revolution the Jew Lev Bronstein, who used the name "Trotsky," became the commissar of the Red Army. The Jew Maxim Litvinov became the best-known Soviet diplomat and the ambassador to Britain. Jews were very thick in Lenin's secret police and in every other branch of his communist government. After Lenin's stroke incapacitated him in 1922, the government was run by a coalition of three communists: Stalin, Zinoviev, and Leo Rosenfelt, who used the Russian-sounding name "Kamenev." Although Stalin, who was a Georgian, was surrounded by Jews almost to the extent Lenin had been, he managed to play the Jews off against each other. He outmaneuvered Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, and all the rest and eventually came out on top. It undoubtedly was to his advantage during this power struggle that the Russian people detested the Jews, from centuries of bitter experience with them.

Before Stalin became the undisputed boss of the Kremlin, the Jews had pretty well monopolized the entire Soviet bureaucracy, and even though Stalin began thinning them out a bit in the late 1930s, the Second World War came along before he had time to do much. And before he got around to continuing his program of de-Judaizing the Soviet bureaucracy after the war, he died -- with a little help from his right-hand Jew, Lazar Kaganovich, who later bragged that he had saved the Jews by poisoning Stalin. So the Soviet bureaucracy remained heavily loaded with Jews right up until the collapse of communism -- although they tried not to be too conspicuous -- usually occupying the second-rank positions, where they wouldn't be so visible.

During the communist period Jews monopolized not only the Soviet government but also organized crime: black market operations, illegal currency transactions, large-scale theft of public property. Undoubtedly the Jewish organized-crime bosses had intelligence, organizational skills, and perhaps more of a nose for money than their Russian counterparts, but what gave them their real advantage over the Russians was collaboration from their fellow Jews inside the government. Knowing what the secret police knew and what the secret police planned to do provided a real edge for the Jewish gang bosses.

Several very informative books on Jewish organized crime in the Soviet Union during the communist period are available. Two that I've read are *Hustling on Gorky Street* by Yuri Brokhin and *USSR: the Corrupt Society* by Konstantin Simis. Both authors, by the way, are Soviet Jews.

Communism collapsed when the communists had bled dry the countries they were ruling and there was no more blood to suck. What would have been most beneficial then would have been the violent overthrow of the various communist regimes by the exploited Russians, Poles, Hungarians, Bulgarians, and so on, with a general massacre of the communists and their collaborators by the people. This also would have amounted to an ethnic cleansing of eastern Europe, putting a final end to Jewish mischief there. But instead, what happened nearly everywhere was that the communists realized the game was up, and they simply switched hats, declaring themselves "democrats" instead of communists. In many cases the same people continued to hold the same jobs in the government that they'd held before -- and they continued to collaborate with the same people outside the government that they'd collaborated with as communists.

So when the "privatization" of the communist economies took place -- that is, the sale of factories, mines, refineries, and other government-run enterprises to private entrepreneurs -- much of the wealth of each country suddenly appeared in Jewish hands. In Russia, for example, instead of giving groups of Russian workers an opportunity to buy shares in the factories where they worked, bureaucrats in many cases arranged "sweetheart" deals with people outside the government they already had been collaborating with. These collaborators got to buy big chunks of the Russian economy at bargain-basement prices. That's how virtually all of Russia's new billionaires -- and many of Russia's new millionaires as well -- got their start in this decade. And that's why at least two-thirds of these new billionaires are Jews -- at least two-thirds -- in a country where the Jews make up only half a per cent of the population. Jews are smart and often are clever businessmen, but in Russia it has been crookedness rather than business efficiency which has led to their sudden success in the post-communist era. They virtually stole Russia from the Russians.

And because organized crime already was in the hands of the Jews, many of Russia's new Jewish businessmen also are gangsters. Jewish billionaire Boris Berezovsky has been described by *Forbes* magazine as the godfather of Jewish organized crime in Russia. He speeds around Moscow in an armored limousine accompanied by an army of bodyguards. He has survived several assassination attempts and is said to be responsible for the "disappearance" of several of his business rivals. Berezovsky certainly seems to be the Jew who has the strongest grip on Boris Yeltsin. He likes to boast that he's the man who got Yeltsin elected to the presidency. Actually all of the Jews in Russia supported Yeltsin. The Jews in the United States did too. Yeltsin plays a role in Russia similar to the role played in America by Clinton.

After Yeltsin's second election in 1996 he appointed Berezovsky to the National Security Council, which supervises Russia's military and police organizations. When it became public knowledge that Berezovsky is an Israeli citizen, however, Yeltsin was obliged to dismiss him. Russian patriots were outraged that an Israeli citizen should be in charge of Russia's national security. Jews, of course, complained that "Russian anti-Semitism" was responsible for Berezovsky's dismissal.

One might ask, how do the Jews get away with it? Why do the Russian people tolerate them? And the answer is that they get away with it in Russia the same way they get away with it in America: they control the news and entertainment media, and with this media control they not only swing elections to whichever candidate best suits them, but they also keep most of the ordinary citizens distracted, confused, and hypnotized. Berezovsky, for example, controls Russia's biggest television network, ORT, as well as a number of newspapers and magazines. Vladimir Gusinsky, who also is the president of the Russian Jewish Congress -- and like Berezovsky an Israeli citizen -- owns Russia's second-largest television network and a number of newspapers and magazines, as well as one of Russia's largest banks. When Jews buy control of the mass media, they always have more than just making money in mind.

I don't mean to lead you to believe that the Jews control everything in Russia. In addition to the Jews there are many Russian criminals in organized crime in Russia, for example. The thug who comes by your shop to collect the weekly "protection" payment from you -- and to smash your shop window if you don't have it -- is more likely to be a Russian than a Jew. But the man who pays the thug to come by your shop is more likely to be a Jew than a Russian. Jews control the rackets, and it is Jewish influence which prevents the Russian government from cracking down on organized crime.

Organized crime by itself takes a huge toll on the Russian economy. Crime is an unproductive activity, and it operates on an enormous scale in Russia. And because so many of Russia's new Jewish businessmen also are involved in organized crime, business in Russia tends to be even more predatory than it is in the West. The concept of serving the community or serving the nation with their business activity is completely alien to these Jewish businessmen. Their only aim is to acquire as much money and power as they possibly can as quickly as they can. Not only do they have no patriotic feeling at all toward Russia, but they are positively hostile to any expression of patriotism by the real Russians. This sort of business attitude, the sort of business climate associated with this attitude, does not result in a really stable economy, of course. The

irresponsible and unpatriotic attitudes and business practices of Russia's Jewish tycoons are the main reason for Russia's present economic collapse.

Unlike the situation in the United States, where every major politician is Politically Correct and every element of the mass media toes the party line, in Russia there are political leaders who do speak out against the Jews, and there are general circulation publications which do criticize them. Some journalists, for instance, like to refer to Boris Berezovsky using his patronymic -- that is, his middle name -- which is Abramovich. They call him Boris Abramovich. They do this not only to embarrass and irritate Berezovsky, but to remind the Russian people that he is a Jew, a *zhid,* not a Russian.

In one way Russia has an advantage over the United States, and that is that the Russian people are much less comfortable. While Jewish billionaires and millionaires buzz around Moscow in their armored limousines flashing their diamonds and furs, most ordinary Russians have a hard time putting enough on the table to eat. The recent devaluation of the ruble and the run on Russia's banks is making things even harder on the Russians, and it may be that not even the Jews' control of the television networks will suffice to save them from the well-deserved wrath of the Russian people.

And that's the whole reason behind Mr. Clinton's recent trip to the Kremlin to hold Mr. Yeltsin's hand. The people who sent Clinton to Moscow don't care at all about the welfare of the Russian people. But they are worried that if the Russian economy gets much worse, the Russian people may take it out on Berezovsky, Gusinsky, and the rest.

And that, of course, is exactly why it is not in our interest to bail out the Russian economy. What Russia needs is a cure for its long-term problem, not another Band-Aid. And the only thing which will cure Russia is a thorough program of ethnic cleansing, which leaves Boris Abramovich and all of his fellow tribesmen hanging from lampposts all over Russia: an ethnic cleansing which is sudden and sharp and absolutely thorough. That is what is in our long-term interest: a Russia under the control of the Russian people again -- our people -- after more than 80 years of alien domination.

The Russian people are, like the American people, quite passive by nature. It takes a lot to rouse them to do the difficult things they need to do -- but the more uncomfortable they become, the more likely they are to take action. Let's not help the thieves who have stolen Russia stay in power by propping up the Russian economy.

You know, some people who want us to keep Berezovsky and his pals in power warn us that if we don't prop up Boris Yeltsin and the Russian economy, the communists will take over again. That may be so. And you know what I think about communists. I believe that they all should be shot. But it will be better for the Russian people -- and for us -- for the Communist Party to regain power in Russia than for the crowd around Yeltsin to keep power.

Communism is based on two fundamental errors: it assumes that people are all born basically the same -- that is, communism is egalitarian -- and it stifles the great driving force of every healthy economy, which is the quest for private gain. And because it is based on error it certainly is not a

system that we want to impose on any of our people, in Russia or elsewhere. But the people around Yeltsin -- the robber barons, the oligarchs -- are eating Russia alive, and even communism, so long as it is Russian communism and not Jewish communism, is better than continued rule by Jewish plutocrats.

It is interesting to note that even the Russian patriots, the Russian nationalists, agree with me on this matter. They are willing to make an alliance -- at least a temporary alliance -- with the communists in order to get the bloodsucking, culture-destroying Jews off Russia's back. Ultimately, of course, we want to see genuine nationalists guiding our people everywhere. If the Russians become hungry enough and exasperated enough to break the grip of the Abramoviches, perhaps similar developments will follow in Bulgaria, Hungary, and the other countries where Jewish Bolsheviks were permitted to simply change hats and declare themselves "democrats" a few years ago when it became unsafe for them to continue wearing their communist hats.

But it really will take a nationalist revolution in Russia to bring that about, and we don't want to do anything to discourage that. Meanwhile, I hope my comments today have helped you understand a little better what is behind Mr. Clinton's recent trip to the Kremlin.

Fashion for Genocide

A month ago I told you about the murder of two White girls, Tracy Lambert and Susan Moore, in Fayetteville, North Carolina, as part of the initiation of new members into the Black and Hispanic Crips gang. I'm still receiving comments about that program. Apparently many listeners -- especially those with Internet access -- checked out the facts as reported in the Fayetteville newspaper, and they were shocked that, just as I said, there was no media coverage of these terrible murders outside the Fayetteville area. They were shocked that virtually all of the mainstream media around the country would deliberately hide the news of these racially motivated murders from the White public -- and these were the same media which had made such a sensation about the killing of a convicted Black drug dealer and his girlfriend in Fayetteville by a White soldier, James Burmeister, in December 1995.

But really, no one who has been listening to my broadcasts should have been shocked. I have commented over and over again about the virtual control of all of America's mass media by the Jews, and I have pointed out many times that the Jews' policy is to disarm the White population morally as well as physically by deliberately creating the false impression that Whites are oppressors and victimizers, and non-Whites are our innocent victims. They want us to feel guilty. They want us to feel that it would be immoral for us to resist any of their schemes for more non-White immigration, for more so-called "diversity" and "multiculturalism," for more racial mixing and racial intermarriage.

That is what the Jewish media bosses are deliberately pushing: the destruction of our people through racial mixing, and they don't want us to put up any resistance. And I am sorry to say, their program is succeeding. When they send their step'n'fetchit Bill Clinton around the country making speeches about how much he is looking forward to an America with a non-White majority, about how any resistance to the government's programs for the darkening of America would be un-American, he is applauded by brainwashed young Whites who have been deceived by this deliberately falsified media impression of Whites as oppressors.

Now you know, I am making a pretty serious accusation. I am accusing the Jewish population as a whole -- and the Jewish media bosses in particular -- of planning our annihilation as a race, of planning to commit genocide against us. And I don't want anyone to think that I am basing my accusation on only the few instances of racially motivated killings I already have cited: their suppression of the news of the Fayetteville murders of two White girls by the Crips and their sensationalizing of the news of the Fayetteville shooting of a Black drug dealer and his girlfriend by a White soldier and of the dragging death of another convicted Black criminal in Texas by three Whites. And so today I'll talk a bit more about anti-White crimes which the Jewish media have deliberately covered up. The details aren't pleasant -- in fact, they are shocking -- but I believe that many listeners need to be shocked.

Let's begin with another crime which occurred in Fayetteville. This is timely because the trial of the criminals began just last week. Here's what happened: Donald Lange, a 25-year-old White soldier at Fort Bragg was leaving an International House of Pancakes in Fayetteville. He accidentally bumped into a group of seven Black soldiers who were going in. The Blacks began

punching Lange while shouting racial insults at him. They dragged him into the adjacent parking lot and stomped and kicked him while continuing to shout racial epithets.

A witness in the trial of the Blacks, Tracye Cochran, was in the parking lot where the assault took place. She told the court last week, "The Black person who threw the first punch was the one who knocked him down. . . . It dropped him down to his knees. He got back up and got hit again. . . . I was walking toward the fight screaming and hollering for them to leave him alone. . . . By then he was just getting hit by people left and right." Another witness, Gina Perez, testified that she saw eight or ten Blacks kicking and stomping Lange as he lay on the pavement. She told of seeing one Black kicking Lange in the face, causing his head to slam into the pavement and bounce back. The Black would then kick him again, over and over. Perez said, "They just kicked him to death. I remember him being on his side, being kicked over and over again."

Actually they didn't quite kick Lange to death. They just destroyed his brain. He has neither moved nor spoken since the beating. His brain was so badly damaged that doctors say that he will never again be more than a vegetable.

Now, if you live outside the Fayetteville area, I'll wager that you've heard not a word about what happened to Donald Lange before this broadcast. Imagine what you would have heard if Donald had been Black and the soldiers who destroyed his life had been White. The networks would have shown Mr. Clinton denouncing the attack on television and calling for new laws against "hate crime." In fact, that's exactly what they had Clinton doing last year when a White teenager beat up a Black teen-ager who had come into his White Chicago neighborhood. Clinton referred to the incident in his weekly radio address and used it as an example of why we must do something about "race hate." But Mr. Clinton has responded to the stomping of Donald Lange with silence.

If Donald Lange had been Black and his attackers White, the media bosses would have had Janet Reno on television announcing that she was sending in the FBI. The media would have been interviewing every professional hate merchant: the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Morris Dees and his Southern Poverty Law Center, and all the rest. The media would have made a real circus of it, and the whole world would have had it drummed into their consciousness: another hate crime against a poor, innocent Black by White racists in Fayetteville.

In order to convince the media bosses that he was doing something to "end hate" after the Burmeister shooting of the Black drug dealer, the commanding general of Fort Bragg ordered a witch hunt among the White soldiers on the base. Every White soldier was checked for tattoos that might suggest a skinhead affiliation. As the media frenzy continued, the witch hunt for White racists in the Army eventually spread to other bases. Now, don't hold your breath waiting for the general at Fort Bragg to start questioning Black soldiers about their racial beliefs and their gang affiliations because of what Blacks from the base did to White soldier Donald Lange. The media pressure just isn't there, and the general has better things to do with his time.

Last month a Black mob in Alton, Illinois, which is a suburb of St. Louis, beat a White man to death who had made the mistake of coming into their neighborhood looking for his stolen

television set. As they were beating and kicking 48-year-old Richard Skelton to death on August 10, the Blacks hooted, laughed, and shouted racial insults, according to a number of eye-witnesses.

Now, it's possible that you may have read a few words about this racially motivated murder -- if you're a careful reader of the small news items in the back pages of your newspaper. But you certainly didn't see anything about it on television or read any detailed news accounts, unless you live in the immediate vicinity of Alton. Even the news accounts in Alton tried to excuse the Black murderers by suggesting that Skelton may have precipitated the attack on himself by using racially insensitive language in asking about his stolen television set. But there is no dispute about the facts. Blacks began beating the unarmed White man. Black bystanders watched and shouted encouragement to the attackers. Others joined in the attack, and soon as many as 25 Blacks were beating and kicking Skelton. They continued kicking him until he was dead.

Again, imagine the response of the controlled mass media if the races of the victim and the killers had been reversed: a Black wanders into a White neighborhood and is beaten to death by a mob of 25 Whites who laugh and shout racial insults as the Black dies. My god, the media would be apoplectic! They would be calling for martial law and a roundup of all heterosexual White males who weren't registered Democrats. Everybody in the world would be hearing about the killing over and over and over again, along with sermons against White racism. But as it is, most of my listeners are now hearing about last month's racially motivated mob murder of Richard Skelton for the first time.

Here's another one that you may have read a few words about if you're a news hound or if you live in eastern New York state. Earlier this month in Poughkeepsie, New York, a town on the Hudson River about 70 miles north of New York City, police discovered the decomposing corpses of seven White women and one Black woman in the house of Kendall Francois. The women had been murdered over a two-year period, with the latest being killed just a month ago. Francois is a 27-year-old Black man who works as a hall monitor in a nearby high school. Affirmative action got him the school job even though he had a previous arrest record. Francois was living with his mother and father and younger sister -- and eight decaying corpses. Police found the dead women lying on beds and in the midst of piles of rotting garbage in various rooms of his house. Francois's parents and his sister, who is employed as a nurse at a nearby hospital, said that they hadn't worried about the stench from the dead women because they thought it was the odor of the garbage which had been allowed to accumulate in the house. Francois had picked up the women, one at a time, taken them to his house, had sex with them, and then strangled them.

Now, in a sense the murders of these women may not have been race crimes. The women were all prostitutes, and aside from the fact that Francois had a preference for killing White prostitutes, we don't really know what his motive was for killing them. And I should add that I believe that any White woman, prostitute or not, who consents to sexual relations with a Black deserves death, so I cannot really condemn Francois for killing them.

The real racial angle to these killings is the media response -- or lack thereof. Do you remember John Wayne Gacy or Jeffrey Dahmer? I'm sure you do, even though Gacy was arrested 20 years

ago and Dahmer more than seven years ago. Both of them also were serial killers who stashed the bodies of their victims in or under their houses. Both received enormous publicity when police caught them -- so much that we still remember them many years later. But they were both White.

Gacy and Dahmer, of course, received extraordinarily heavy media coverage not because they were White, but because their shocking crimes were extraordinarily newsworthy. Francois has received almost no media coverage outside the Poughkeepsie area, not because his shocking crimes were not extraordinarily newsworthy, but because he is Black and most of his victims were White.

Earlier this month a court in Colorado convicted Francisco Martinez of participating in the abduction, gang rape, torture, and murder of a 14-year-old White girl, Brandy Duvall. Martinez and six other members of the Black and Hispanic Bloods gang grabbed Brandy from a bus stop in Denver on the night of May 30, last year. They took the young White girl to the house of one of the gang members and spent several hours raping her and then sexually torturing her with a knife and a broomstick. During the trial one of the gang members told the court how Martinez laughed as he repeatedly rammed a broomstick into the body of the bleeding girl while she screamed and pleaded for her life. Later they stabbed the 14-year-old girl 28 times and dumped her body in a ditch. Then they went home and disposed of the bloody mattress on which she had been raped and tortured.

Four of the Bloods gang members have pleaded guilty, one other besides Martinez has been tried and convicted, and one is still awaiting trial. This case is reminiscent of the Fayetteville murders last month of two White girls by members of the Crips. The Crips and the Bloods are the two largest non-White gangs in the United States. Like the Fayetteville murders, Brandy Duvall's murder and the subsequent trials have received virtually no national news coverage, although Denver-area newspapers did report them.

Once again, imagine the reaction of the television networks and all of the other national media if instead of the Bloods raping, sexually torturing, and murdering a 14-year-old White girl, seven Ku Klux Klan members had done that to a Black girl or a Mexican girl. The gruesome details would be on every television screen in America night after night after night, and there would be no end to the parade of politicians and preachers and professional hate merchants telling us about the evils of White racism. We know that's what would happen, because we have seen it before in far less egregious cases, most recently in the dragging death of the Black convict in Jasper, Texas, this summer.

Now, all of the Black-on-White crimes I've just mentioned -- the stomping of Donald Lange by Black soldiers in Fayetteville until he became a mindless vegetable; the kicking of Richard Skelton to death by a Black mob in Alton, Illinois, when he tried to retrieve his stolen television set; the murder of seven White prostitutes by a Black school monitor in Poughkeepsie, New York; the horrible rape, torture, and murder of 14-year-old Brandy Duvall by members of the Bloods gang in the Denver area after they had snatched her from a bus stop -- all of these either occurred during the past month or came to trial during the past month. And I could have given you twenty more recent examples of horrible race crimes committed by non-Whites against

Whites which have received the silent treatment by the media, except in the areas where they occurred. And these are all crimes which would have received extensive national publicity if they had been White-on-Black crimes.

Anyway, I hope that I've made my point. And my point is that the controlled media are far more likely to publicize White-on-Black crimes than Black-on-White crimes. And this is not just a fluke. It's not that I have carefully selected a few Black-on-White crimes which somehow escaped the attention of the media. No, their way of dealing with interracial crime is systematic. It is consistent. We all understand that. If the Ku Klux Klan does something, the Jewish media act as if the sky is falling. If the Bloods or the Crips do something, they ignore it. There is no denying that. We know it's true.

So why do they do it? If I ask a non-Jewish newspaper writer or television reporter or magazine editor: "Why do you and your colleagues minimize the news of Black-on-White crime? Why are you protective of non-White organizations such as the Bloods and the Crips? Don't you believe that you have a responsibility to warn the White public about the dangers posed for us by non-White crime in general and by non-White gangs such as the Bloods and the Crips in particular?

"And why do your colleagues maximize the news of any White-on-Black crime? Why do you go ballistic if there's any possibility of a White organizational connection, even if some racially oriented literature is found in the White offender's possession? Don't you understand that the Bloods and the Crips are essentially anti-White criminal organizations, while the Klan can only be accused of having members who sometimes do stupid things? Why do you deliberately create the false impression in the public mind that White-on-Black crime -- that's what you call 'hate crime' -- is a big problem in our society, and at the same time you hide from the public the truly horrendous and dangerous problem of Black-on-White crime? Why do you do it?"

I've never gotten really clear and honest answers to these questions. But what is clear is that they all know how they're expected to report the news. They know what the party line is. They know which side their bread is buttered on. It's clear that the top media bosses have set the fashion for reporting interracial crime, and no one who works for them is willing to depart from the fashion.

That fashion, which is almost never stated explicitly, which is only implied, is this: "White people are evil -- especially heterosexual White males. They have persecuted non-Whites for hundreds of years. White people really shouldn't complain if non-Whites sometimes strike back at them. That's only justice. When Blacks and Mexicans organize in gangs, it's only to protect themselves from Whites. But when Whites organize, it's to oppress non-Whites. Whites need to be reminded that they are oppressors. That's why White crimes against non-Whites should be emphasized. And if we're to have a happy and prosperous multicultural society with lots of diversity, which is of course a wonderful thing, then Whites need to mix more with non-Whites . . . so we shouldn't give them any news which might make them reluctant to mix. We shouldn't tell them about Black crimes against Whites, because that might frighten White women away from Black men. It might even lead Whites to organize against non-Whites. In the long run the only sure way to have a peaceful society, in which everyone gets along with everyone else, is to get rid of the White majority: to replace the present White majority with a non-White majority. A

lot of racial mixing and racial intermarriage will help to achieve that, and we should report the news with that aim in mind."

That is the prevailing fashion in the controlled mass media today, whether the media people will admit it or not. That fashion has been set deliberately by the media bosses. And I, curious and inquisitive person that I am, have looked at where that fashion is taking us, and when I have done that I have looked into the face of death: racial death, racial extinction. And I, hardheaded cynic that I am, have decided that the Jewish media bosses who designed the current fashion in reporting the news have in fact designed it with that aim in mind. And I also have decided that it is our responsibility to ourselves, to our posterity, to our ancestors, and to the God of Nature which made us what we are to use any and all means -- any and all means -- to combat these Jewish media bosses and their collaborators in the government, in the schools, in the churches, and wherever else we find them.

A Closer Look at the Enemy

You know, this world we live in is a complicated place. Behind every phenomenon we observe there are many forces at work, some of them obvious and some not so obvious. Trying to separate what's important from what's not important can be a confusing task. Every week when we discuss on this program what's happening in the world around us, and I try to explain events so that listeners can have a clear understanding of them, I must simplify the world. Clarity requires simplification. Understanding demands simplification. A useful explanation requires separating the important things from those which are less important and focusing first on the former. If I tried to explain every phenomenon in the world in complete detail, leaving out nothing, I would succeed only in confusing everyone, especially myself.

So if we want to understand the world we must simplify it. But we must be careful not to oversimplify, or our explanations lose their value. Occasionally my listeners accuse me of oversimplifying, or they are aware of some factor which I have not discussed in detail, and they suspect that I have left it out deliberately because it would contradict some theory of mine.

Here's an old example of the way oversimplification can lead to confusion: After the Bolshevik takeover of Russia early in this century, many anti-communists in America spread the word that a majority of the Bolshevik leaders were not Russians but were Jews, and they warned Americans that there also were many Jewish communists in America who posed a danger of subversion. This was back in the days before the exposure of the Rosenbergs and other communist-Jewish spies and conspirators in America. The Jewish media countered this warning with a deliberate campaign of confusion. They said, "Oh, you used to accuse of us being international bankers and capitalists and of subverting nations with our money. Now you accuse us of being international communists and of being a threat to capitalism. So which is it? Are we capitalists or are we communists? It can't be both, so make up your mind." This response was supposed to make their accusers look foolish, and with much of the public the trick worked.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that Jews are both capitalists and communists -- and neither. They are, first and last, ***Jews,*** and that really says it all, if one understands what a Jew is. The average Gentile thinks that a communist must be someone who is a believer in communist ideology, and a capitalist must be someone who is a believer in the ideology of free enterprise. It doesn't occur to him that for many Jews ideology is not something that one actually believes; it is simply a tool which one uses for deceiving non-Jews. The aim always is to acquire wealth and power, and whether one uses capitalist methods and ideology or communist methods and ideology for this purpose depends upon the situation. Regardless of the methods one uses, one remains a Jew. That's what is important.

And of course, most of the people who were trying to warn their fellow Americans about the dangers represented by the Jews in their midst didn't try to explain that, because most Americans simply wouldn't have understood; it would have been too complicated for them. So the anti-communists simply said: "Watch out! The Jews are communists or are sympathetic to the communists." And that was an oversimplification of the truth.

Here's a more recent example: I have warned Americans that Bill Clinton is a puppet of the Jews, an obedient tool of the Jews, and I have pointed out the fact that most of the important appointments he has made as President have gone to Jews: two Supreme Court justices, his entire foreign policy and national security team, and so on. And I have stated that the Jewish media got him elected in 1992 and then reelected in 1996.

And so now some people have asked me, "Well, if Clinton is an obedient tool of the Jews, why are they now trying to destroy him? Why are some of the people who are in the forefront of those now pulling Clinton down Jews? Why would a Jewess, Monica Lewinsky, turn on him? Don't you know that some of Ken Starr's associates are Jews? Didn't you notice that one of Clinton's most important attackers is Connecticut's Jewish Senator Joseph Lieberman? It has been the Jewish media, like the *New York Times,* the *Wall Street Journal,* and the *Washington Post,* which have exposed Clinton's lies and other crimes. So how can you say that he is a puppet of the Jews? It doesn't make sense."

But of course, it does make sense -- if one doesn't try to oversimplify. I don't want to spend too much time on this because I've already covered much of the ground in earlier broadcasts, but I'll try to add a few more details, so that the picture is still simple, still clear, but not overly simple. The basic facts are these: First, the Jews control the mass media -- or more accurately, they are the most powerful of the conscious elites in the media world; they wield more control over the media than any other coherent and self-conscious group. And because of this media control they are able to exercise a determining influence on the electoral process: in other words, through their media control they are able to control the politics of a mass democracy, where everyone, even the most easily manipulated elements of the population, has an equal vote.

Second, Bill Clinton is a talented but utterly corrupt man. He is a typical child of the 1960s. He grew up believing that the world owed him something. He grew up believing that he was entitled to whatever he could grab. And he grew up cynical. He grew up during a period when the Jews were turning American society on its head, when Jews were breaking all of the rules and getting away with it. Bill Clinton noticed this and learned from it. And Bill Clinton grew up with a talent for manipulating people, a talent for lying to people and getting them to believe him. This suited him perfectly for a career in politics.

And the Jews noticed Bill Clinton. They saw him as potentially very useful to them. He is exactly the sort of man they always are on the lookout for: corrupt but charming; someone who can attract votes but who understands which side his bread is buttered on. They supported him with their media and with their money. Without their support he wouldn't have gotten into the White House. And Bill Clinton reciprocated. He gave them whatever they wanted. He appointed them to every high position in the government, and he pushed their policies and programs. On all of this the record is clear. So why are they abandoning, even attacking, their good friend Bill Clinton now?

Well of course, he never really was their friend: he was their useful tool. And he has become a badly damaged tool as a consequence of his own personal weaknesses. The Jews did not set out to destroy him. He did that himself. Remember, Ken Starr was ready to throw in the towel and give up on investigating Clinton three years ago. If anyone besides Clinton deserves credit for his

downfall it is Paula Jones. When Paula Jones sued Clinton for sexual harassment she opened the Pandora's box from which the affair with Monica Lewinsky eventually came to light. Remember, the Jewish media tried hard not to notice Paula Jones. That Paula eventually was noticed by the public resulted from several factors beyond the control of the Jewish media bosses.

And that's one of those little complications we must deal with in the real world. Despite all their media power and all their money, the Jews are not able to control everything all the time. Sometimes the Jews are compelled by circumstances just like the rest of us. They also have their vulnerabilities.

Paula Jones opened a Pandora's box that the Jews would have preferred to keep closed. But once the box was open, they had to decide what to do about Clinton. On the one hand, they have Al Gore waiting in the wings, and Al Gore is just as corrupt as Bill Clinton, just as willing a tool. But on the other hand, Gore simply doesn't have Clinton's talents. He'll do what the Jews tell him, but he won't be able to charm the voters as effectively as Clinton could. They'd like to keep Clinton, but he's become a bit of a tar baby. And so we have had an opportunity to see another of the world's little complications, and that is that not even the Jews are always in complete agreement about the best way to proceed.

The Jews don't want to become too closely identified with Clinton's corrupt image. Looking a little further ahead than the mass of Gentile voters who still think Clinton should stay in the White House, the Jews understand that it will not be helpful for them to have a very close historical association with the Clinton administration. They don't want Clinton to be thought of as their man, because they have a suspicion that despite his present popularity his historical image will be very bad indeed. For some of them that is the primary consideration, and they'd like to see Clinton go quickly and then muddle through with Al Gore as best they can. Other Jews are still fascinated by Clinton's approval ratings and his ability to charm the lemmings. They don't want to trade him in for Al Gore no matter how much tar rubs off on them. And of course, they also have the consideration that if they all abandon him simultaneously and all begin attacking him, he conceivably could turn on them and lash out at them. Better to keep him mindful that despite the fact that some of them are pulling him down, if he wants to stay out of prison he'd better keep obeying orders. So there are complications in life even for the Jews.

I'll give you one more example of the subtleties that one must deal with in trying to understand the role of the Jews in our society. Last week one of the most powerful Jewish organizations, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith -- the ADL -- held a huge press conference at the National Press Club in Washington and simultaneous press conferences in a number of cities around the country, and they announced that I am the most dangerous man in America. Really: I am the most dangerous man in America! And the organization I head, the National Alliance, is the most dangerous organization in America. Really: not the Mafia, not what's left of the Communist Party, not some violent and well armed militia group, not Louis Farrakhan and the Black Muslims, but the National Alliance.

Well, I long ago decided that any insult from the Devil is a compliment, but still there are some troubling aspects to what the Anti-Defamation League has done, and I'll share them with you, because they can help us understand better the way the Jews operate. When the ADL held its

press conferences last week it handed out press releases to the reporters and politicians. The press release began with a statement by the top ADL commissar, Abraham Foxman, saying, "The National Alliance is an alliance of bigots and bombers thriving on hate," and then it listed a long series of violent crimes and terrorist acts the ADL claims are "linked to the National Alliance and its propaganda." The list begins:

- 1992-1995, Midwest: Authorities say the Aryan Republican Army, a white supremacist gang that required members to read *The Turner Diaries,* committed 22 bank robberies and bombings.
- April 19, 1995, Oklahoma City: The bombing of the Murrah Federal Building is eerily reminiscent of a fictional bombing scene in *The Turner Diaries,* of which Timothy McVeigh was a devotee.
- December 1995, Fayetteville, NC: Two soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg, who were avowed neo-Nazis and reportedly read National Alliance propaganda, murdered an African-American couple.

Et cetera. There's a lot more to the ADL's press release, but you get the idea: I and the other members of the National Alliance are bomb-throwers and bank robbers "linked" to 22 bank robberies and bombings in the Midwest, to the Oklahoma City bombing, to the shooting of a Black drug dealer and his girlfriend in North Carolina, and to lots of other things. Now, as a matter of fact, neither I nor anyone else in the National Alliance had ever heard of the Aryan Republican Army and its 22 bank robberies and bombings, or of Timothy McVeigh, or of the soldiers at Fort Bragg who shot the Black drug dealer, until we saw these people on television news programs, like everyone else.

But we are "linked" to them, says the ADL. How? Did some of these folks listen to one of my *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts? Probably. At least, I wouldn't be surprised. Did some of them read my 1978 novel, *The Turner Diaries?* Probably. At least, I've seen evidence to indicate that Timothy McVeigh did, although I don't know about any of the others. There are a quarter of a million copies of the book in circulation, and probably a half-million readers altogether -- including, no doubt, Abraham Foxman and a number of his associates in the ADL.

So that's how I and the National Alliance are "linked" to bombings, bank robberies, and murders. Very clever. So then, it's fair to say that the Catholic Church is "linked" to Mafia operations, and that the Automobile Association of America -- the AAA -- is "linked" to drunk driving, and that the folks who publish various editions of the Bible are "linked" to the crimes committed by people who quote the Bible as they take an ax to their wives or blow away a neighbor with a shotgun.

"The National Alliance is an alliance of bombers and bigots," says Abraham Foxman. I am not aware of a single instance of a bombing committed by a National Alliance member -- although a couple of years ago a former member in Florida had a pipe bomb he was trying to build blow up in his face. He wasn't a member of the National Alliance at the time, and he didn't actually bomb anything except himself -- but that's enough for Abraham Foxman and the ADL to describe the National Alliance as an organization of "bombers and bigots."

You know, every organization which recruits from the public will occasionally recruit a member who has had or will have a problem with the law, but here's something to remember: the Democratic Party has a much higher percentage of lawbreakers among its members than does the National Alliance. We don't tolerate criminal activity, but the head of the Democratic Party seems to thrive on it -- at least he did before Ken Starr got on his case.

Abe Foxman and the ADL seem to thrive on criminal activity too. Five years ago, in April 1993, search warrants were executed on the Los Angeles and San Francisco offices of the ADL, and police seized hundreds of confidential police files which had been stolen by the ADL. Some of these police files were from investigations of anti-apartheid groups in the United States, and the ADL had given copies to the South African government in return for access to confidential South African police files on anti-Israel groups in South Africa. A lot of the people whose names were in those confidential police files the ADL had stolen sued the ADL for invasion of privacy, and that's still working its way through the courts.

But here's the really interesting part of all this: newspapers and other media took the ADL's press release last week as gospel, and they printed big excerpts from it. It's been in newspapers all over the country. You've probably seen some of these stories yourself. With one exception none of these newspapers even bothered to check with me first; they didn't call me up and ask me if the ADL's allegations were true or if I had any comment on them; they just ran sensational stories with headlines like "National Alliance linked to bombings and murders." And of course, they said nothing about the ADL's criminal activities or its links to the government of Israel. And many of these newspapers aren't even owned or edited by Jews. But they all follow the party line. They know that the ADL is an official Jewish organization, and therefore it cannot be criticized, and nothing it says can be questioned. That would be like questioning the "Holocaust," heaven forbid!

That's a little frightening, don't you think? So here's one of those complications about the way the Jews wield their power. They don't have to own everything in order to have things go their way. A newspaper editor or a television station owner doesn't have to be Jewish in order to slavishly follow the Jewish party line. The Jews own enough of the media -- they hold enough of the policy-making positions -- so that no one, or almost no one, wants to cross them. When an institution becomes corrupt -- and that, unfortunately, is the case with our mass media, just as with our political system -- the Jews can count on using their power to make things go their way. They thrive on corruption. The ADL thrives on corruption. The ADL could not exist in an uncorrupted society.

Finally, here's one other little complication in understanding the role of the Jews. I know and you know individual Jews who are not involved in any political or media activity, individual Jews who simply earn a living and go about their business and don't pay much attention to what the ADL is doing. And so I often have people write to me and ask me why I am so hard on the Jews. They remind me that there are lots of evil people in our society, even in the media, who are not Jews. They remind me that Rupert Murdoch and Ted Turner aren't Jews, that Stalin wasn't a Jew, and that Lenin was only part Jewish. And that's true enough. And that's why we won't be able to dispense with the gallows even when we have no more Jews.

But the people who are focusing on the complications that many of the world's evildoers aren't Jews and that many Jews are not involved in sinister activities -- these people are failing to see the forest because of the trees. When I speak about the role of the Jews in the world today or in the past I do simplify the world. I do simplify the facts, because my aim is for people to see the forest, to understand the forest, at least in rough outline, before they spend too much time studying the individual trees.

And the forest I want people to see, the big picture I want them to understand, even though it is a simplified picture, is this: Without Jews there would have been no Bolshevik Revolution and subsequent selective murder of two generations of the best and brightest of the Russians. Without Jews as an organized community pushing "multiculturalism" and "diversity" and open borders and racial mixing in the United States, White Americans would not now be facing the prospect of becoming a minority in their own country in the near future. It is the Jewish presence as a whole and its effect on our society that we must understand first, before we start trying to understand all of the complicating details.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Last week I mentioned a recent attack on me by a Jewish organization, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. I gave this as an example of the way the Jews are able to use the mass media in America to serve their purposes. The specific point I made was that it is not necessary for all of the newspaper owners and editors and all of the local television station owners to be Jews in order for all of them to slavishly follow the Anti-Defamation League's party line. This is a very important point, a point essential for us to understand if we want to have a free society, and I'll elaborate on it now.

I mentioned last week that when the Anti-Defamation League -- or ADL for short -- handed out press releases on September 24 to newspapers and other media in which they said that the organization I head, the National Alliance, is "the single most dangerous organized hate group in America," and that we are "linked" to bank robberies, bombings, and murders all over the country, virtually all of the media simply printed these wild charges without checking them for accuracy. Of all the hundreds of newspapers which printed the ADL's charges, only one -- West Virginia's *Charleston Gazette* -- even bothered to call me first and ask for my comments. Some of the newspapers, in paraphrasing the ADL's press release, even managed to exaggerate the ADL's lies. For example, the *Tampa Tribune* began its news story on September 25 with the line: "A domestic terrorist group with a following in Tampa poses an ongoing threat of violence, the Anti-Defamation League said in a report issued Thursday." The ADL's words "most dangerous organized hate group" have been transformed by the *Tampa Tribune* into "domestic terrorist group." That's a significant change. "Hate group" is an ill-defined term which you can apply to any organization with whose policies or doctrines you disagree. Groups opposed to abortion, for example, have been called "hate groups" by feminists and their supporters. "Terrorist group," on the other hand, really suggests a group which actually engages in terrorist activity, such as bombings, assassinations, and the like.

Then there's the *Los Angeles Times,* which in its September 25 story based on the ADL's press release stated: "The group's activities [that is the National Alliance's activities] -- including violent crimes such as robberies and bombings -- have been uncovered in at least 26 states." I'll repeat that: "the group's activities -- including violent crimes such as robberies and bombings." The *Los Angeles Times* certainly makes it sound as if I'm the head of an organization which actually commits violent crimes such as robberies and bombings as a matter of course, doesn't it? That was the *Los Angeles Times'* interpretation of the ADL's list of "criminal incidents linked to the National Alliance and its propaganda." What the ADL's list actually suggests is that the perpetrators of various bombings and murders may be "linked" to the National Alliance by having read a book or a pamphlet published by the National Alliance or perhaps by having listened to one of my broadcasts. For example, one of the "incidents" in the ADL's list of "criminal incidents linked to the National Alliance" reads: "December 1995, Fayetteville, North Carolina: Two soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg, who were avowed neo-Nazis and reportedly read National Alliance propaganda, murdered an African-American couple." As I pointed out last week, neither I nor anyone else in the National Alliance had ever heard of James Burmeister before he shot a convicted Black drug dealer and the dealer's girlfriend to death in Fayetteville in December 1995. But it certainly is possible that Burmeister listened to an *American Dissident*

Voices broadcast or read some publication of the National Alliance. There are a lot of our publications in circulation. Burmeister also may have read *Reader's Digest* or the Bible or *Newsweek* magazine, for all I know; there's certainly a lot of criminal activity described in those publications. Anyway, the *Los Angeles Times'* interpretation of the ADL's claim that the National Alliance is linked through its publications to various criminal acts is that we did it: we committed the criminal acts ourselves. The paper said flatly that our activities include "violent crimes such as robberies and bombings." And nobody from the *Los Angeles Times* even bothered to check with me first!

So what am I supposed to do: hire a bunch of lawyers and sue all of these newspapers and perhaps the ADL too? Perhaps I will -- but I doubt that anyone who has actually been involved in a libel suit would suggest such a course. The civil litigation system in the United States has been designed for the sole purpose of enriching lawyers, and because of that the system gives an overwhelming advantage to the litigant who has the most money to spend on lawyers. Perhaps some experienced civil-litigation lawyer who believes this is a worthy cause will contact me and offer his services.

But while I'm waiting for that, let me draw a few conclusions from this nasty business. First, I'll mention that I'm not especially peeved at the ADL about this new report labeling me as the most dangerous man in America. That doesn't mean I won't sue them, but at least I know where they're coming from. The ADL is a professional hate organization. They are hate merchants. That's the way they earn their living: selling hate. Along with a handful of other Jewish organizations -- the Simon Wiesenthal Center and Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center, for example -- the ADL makes its money by persuading Jews and wannabee Jews around the country that they are in great danger from people like me -- but if everyone will just send them a nice, fat check today, the ADL will protect these Jews and wannabees from me. And so the ADL -- and these other hate merchants -- put out deliberately scary press releases to drum up donations. If the newspapers exaggerate things a bit, why so much the better. That's why the press releases tend to be a little deceptive, why they are written in a way calculated to lead to misinterpretation.

The ADL is the oldest and most powerful of these Jewish hate groups in the United States. It was founded in 1913, after a Jewish factory owner in Atlanta, Leo Frank, was convicted of raping and killing a 14-year-old White girl, Mary Phagan, who worked in his factory. The killer was sentenced to death by the court, and there was a great deal of publicity about the case at the time. Powerful Jewish organizations came to Frank's defense, and in behind-the-scenes maneuvering they were able to persuade Georgia's governor to commute Frank's death sentence. This blatantly corrupt act by the governor working in cahoots with his rich Jewish supporters so enraged the populace that a vigilante group of citizens took Frank out of jail and hanged him themselves. The Jews, realizing that they had bungled the Frank affair, organized the ADL for the purpose of handling such matters more skillfully in the future. In the past 85 years the ADL has grown to become the most powerful Jewish pressure group and lobbying organization in America.

Recent ADL lobbying projects have been the promotion of gun control laws and of state laws banning military-style training by patriotic groups. The ADL's biggest project for this decade, however, has been so-called "hate crime" legislation. Hate crime laws attempt to punish a person for what he was thinking before or during the commission of an offense against a member or a

group of members of an officially favored minority. For example, if you set fire to a synagogue because you don't like Jews, you're liable for a much more severe punishment than you would be if you were hired by the rabbi to set fire to a synagogue so the congregation could collect the insurance. Arson is no longer simply arson. Now there's arson, and there's "hate arson." And to decide which it is, the government may look into your personal taste in reading material, check into the type of music you listen to, investigate your political and religious affiliations, ask your friends about any expressions of Politically Incorrect opinions you may have made -- and then present all of this information in court as evidence against you. The whole concept of "hate crime" is Orwellian. It turns traditional American concepts of law and individual freedom on their heads. But because the noisiest group of people pushing for "hate crime" legislation are Jews, no politician dares speak against it. Bill Clinton is the Jews' current point man on Federal "hate crime" legislation.

One category of "hate crime" is "hate speech." In fact, the outlawing of what the ADL people call "hate speech" is their ultimate aim. "Hate speech," of course, is whatever they find offensive or dangerous to their interests. I find a lot of the films coming out of Hollywood these days offensive, and a lot of television programming, but you can be sure that's not what the ADL has in mind when it campaigns for laws against "hate speech." The ADL is especially concerned about the propagation of what they consider dangerous ideas over the Internet and has been working with software developers to develop censorship programs which can be installed on any computer, so that computer users cannot find any Politically Incorrect material on the Internet.

Lobbying to stamp out the Bill of Rights isn't the ADL's only activity. They're also the largest and most effective private espionage organization in America. They have their spies in every community in America where there are Jews or wannabees. Reports go from their regional offices around the country to massive data banks in New York and in Israel, where the ADL maintains dossiers on hundreds of thousands of Americans. For example, if a state legislator somewhere in America makes a speech which a Jewish listener considers unfriendly to Israel, a report goes into the ADL data bank. If a businessman at a Chamber of Commerce meeting makes a joke which might indicate a less-than-worshipful attitude toward Jews, and a wannabee informs the ADL of the joke, that businessman will henceforth have a dossier in the ADL's files. Then if that state legislator or that businessman ever runs for Congress, say, the ADL will search its files for his name, find his record, and launch a campaign against him as an "enemy of Israel" or as an "anti-Semite."

And the ADL has not hesitated to break the law in its spying activity. In April 1993 police obtained search warrants and raided the offices of the ADL in San Francisco and Los Angeles, where they found hundreds of stolen confidential police files. Some of these police files were on anti-apartheid activists in the United States, and the ADL had passed copies on to the South African government in return for South African police files on pro-Palestinian groups in South Africa. This caused a stink even in liberal circles, which ordinarily are pro-ADL. And this business of the ADL's stolen police files is still in the courts in California.

So as I said, I understand where the ADL is coming from. I'm not surprised that they consider my broadcasts dangerous. I'm not surprised that they want to shut me up and are trying to do that with their current smear campaign, claiming that I am "linked" to bombings and murders. I

expect that sort of behavior -- I expect lies of that sort -- from the ADL. What's really disappointing is the enthusiastic collaboration the ADL receives from the politicians and the media. The two newspapers I cited a minute ago, the *Tampa Tribune* and the *Los Angeles Times*, for example, are essentially Gentile newspapers, as far as I have been able to determine. I may be mistaken, but I believe that the editors and publishers of these two newspapers are not Jews. So why do they go out of their way to exaggerate the ADL's lies about me? Why does the *Tampa Tribune* call the National Alliance a "domestic terrorist group"? Why does the *Los Angeles Times* say that the activities of the National Alliance include "violent crimes such as robberies and bombings"? Why did neither of these newspapers contact someone in my office and ask about the ADL's claims before printing them? Why didn't any of the newspapers which carried the ADL's attack on me mention the ADL's history of illegal activity?

Let me tell you what I think about that. I believe that in general there are two factors at work here. I'll call them the corruption factor and the lemming factor. Let's look at the corruption factor first. It's the factor which motivates virtually all of the non-Jewish politicians, but also many non-Jews in the media. It's the factor which has led Bill Clinton to pack his cabinet with Jews and to promote every Jewish policy they have presented him with. It's the factor which has led New York's Senator Alphonse D'Amato to serve as front man for the Jews' huge extortion effort against the Swiss. These politicians don't work for the Jews because they love Jews. Nobody loves Jews. They do it because they're corrupt, because they're willing to sacrifice the interests of their own people in order to serve the Jews if they believe that they can advance their careers by doing that. And many businessmen are just as corrupt as the politicians. They will do whatever they think is good for their business, whatever will give them the biggest profit. And some businessmen are in the media business. They understand that Jews buy more advertising than any other group. They understand that Jews own a bigger chunk of the media than any other group. They understand which side their bread is buttered on.

And so when the ADL attacks me these media businessmen are ready to fall on me like a pack of starved Dobermans in order to curry favor with the Jews. But you know, the interesting thing about these corrupt people, whether they're in politics or in the media business, as soon as they believe that the balance of power is shifting, they'll jump. They'd as soon tear apart the Jews as they would the enemies of the Jews. That's something to keep in mind as our struggle proceeds.

Now, the lemmings in the media are more interesting than the corrupt businessmen. I've dealt with a lot of media people over the years, and one of the observations I've made is that they are the trendiest single occupational group in our society -- even trendier than people in police work. I don't think I've ever met a journalist who had an original idea or who didn't follow the Jewish party line with a truly religious devotion. They all march in ideological lockstep.

I think it wasn't always this way. Back before the Second World War there were a few journalists in America who could think for themselves. H.L. Mencken is one who comes to mind. Nowadays, of course, the party-line journalists shrink in horror and embarrassment from the mention of Mencken's name. Mencken -- gasp! -- didn't like Jews and occasionally said so.

I can't say that I really understand why journalists today are such lemmings, but I am sure that it's more than the fact that Jews are so powerful in the media: I'm sure that it's more than corruption,

as in the case of the politicians and businessmen. I suspect that today's journalists are people who have been more intensely socialized than most of the rest of the population. They are people who have been subjected to stronger group pressures to conform and have been selected according to how well they adapted to these pressures. Perhaps the journalism departments at our universities don't accept students who don't fit the lemming mold. Anyway, journalists certainly do have a very strong tendency to stick close to the herd and to regard with suspicion and hostility anyone who has strayed very far from the herd.

Now, this is an oversimplification, but I believe that the reason so many media people fell in love with Bill Clinton as soon as he appeared on the political scene back in 1991 or so is that they saw him as one of their crowd, their herd. "Bill marched with us for the Viet Cong," they thought. "Bill partied and smoked dope with us. He's one of us."

And they look at me and they think: "This guy Pierce is from the other side of the tracks. Instead of helping us trash the dean's office, he joined the John Birch Society. He doesn't belong to our crowd, so let's trash him too." Anyway, I believe that there's an element of that sort of thinking in the average journalist's mentality.

Now, the bright side of this picture is that people who think like lemmings and have been conditioned by group pressure to have certain views can very easily be conditioned to have quite different views by the simple application of group pressure in a new direction. You won't be able to change an independent thinker's opinions this way, but if you put 100,000 typical journalists in a labor re-education camp and then select out 1,000 of them with leadership potential, straighten out the thinking of this 1,000 with two-by-fours, then put them in charge of the others, and put all except the 1,000 reoriented commissars on a diet of 300 calories a day, in a year every journalist in the camp will be reoriented: skinny, but sincerely reoriented. You can turn them loose with complete confidence that they'll follow the new party line just as slavishly as they followed the old party line, even after they've regained their former weight. That's the way lemmings are.

There's one other aspect of the ADL's operation which merits scrutiny, and that is its program of corrupting police departments around the country. At the press conferences they held in their regional offices last month when they promoted me to "most dangerous man" they had a number of local police officials with them. The appearance of these police officials on the platform along with the ADL's Jews tended to give the press conferences a sort of quasi-official or quasi-governmental atmosphere, and that undoubtedly encouraged the reporters present to accept the ADL's lies without question.

Some of the police officials were there because they have political ambitions. They're planning on running for the state legislature some day, and they want the Jews' backing. Others were there because the ADL has assiduously been cultivating its relationships with police agencies for many years. The ADL offers "anti-terrorist" seminars to police departments and indoctrinates policemen with its hate propaganda under the guise of teaching them how to recognize and combat "domestic terrorists" -- such as William Pierce. The ADL gets away with this despite its own record of criminal activity. The ADL has been able to persuade the cops to overlook its having been caught with stolen police files. That's a little frightening. If we had a government

with integrity, the ADL would be dangerous enough. But with a government like we have in the United States today, every decent citizen must regard with horror the subversion of our police agencies by the ADL.

The Coming of the New Elites

I really appreciate the letters I've been receiving from listeners. Since we don't have anything like Nielsen ratings to judge how many people are listening to our broadcasts, I judge our popularity by the volume of mail that comes in. As long as that volume continues to grow, I'm happy in the knowledge that the number of people listening to our broadcasts is growing. More than that, I'm happy to know that people are not just listening, but they are responding. Because the consistent theme of all of my programs has been that people must stop being mere spectators and must become participants. They must begin speaking out.

Although most of my mail is very positive, I also receive a few hate letters, but I also appreciate these. They tell me things about the mentality of America's enemies. I'm not talking about the occasional letter from a spiteful Jew, in which he tells me how much he hates me, or from a Black nationalist, in which his message is essentially, "Die, White dog! We people of color will destroy you, and then we will inherit the earth." The really interesting hate mail is from the self-hating Whites, who tell me that I am evil for speaking up on behalf of my own race. In particular, I received several letters from these sick, pitiful people after my broadcast two weeks ago on the murders of those two White girls in Fayetteville, North Carolina, by members of a Black gang, the Crips, in an initiation ritual.

You know, I'm not a psychiatrist, although there are times when I wish I were, so that I could better understand people like those who send me these hate letters. I think it's important to understand them because there are many more of our people out there suffering from the same sickness. I mentioned in an earlier broadcast that when Bill Clinton has traveled around the country speaking to groups of students and faculty about his vision of a non-White America in the next century, he has been applauded. Audiences which are mostly White have cheered Clinton when he boasted that the government's immigration policies are leading to a deliberate darkening of America. Sometimes I have been tempted to explain this reaction as simply another manifestation of the lemming phenomenon -- which is to say, most people have no real opinions of their own and will applaud whatever other people are applauding: whatever they think they're expected to applaud. And in fact, I am sure that in most cases that's what it is: simply a mindless reflex by people whose primary concern is to be fashionable.

But some of the letters which I have received in response to my broadcast on the Fayetteville murders indicate something darker and more twisted in the minds of the writers. What I detect is a sort of anguish, a sort of, "Oh, no, you shouldn't tell anybody about that! It's terrible for you to report on things like that!" And they think it's terrible not because two young White women were brutally murdered, but because news of their murders may make some people more hesitant to associate with Blacks, more hesitant to tolerate the growing presence of Black gangs in their communities. It is terrible to them because it is news which doesn't fit the party line that Blacks are always the innocent victims of White oppression and injustice. And it is terrible because it may hinder the great plan to elevate the Blacks and the other downtrodden and oppressed races and make everyone truly equal. And of course, the only way to do that is to get rid of the White majority, because Whites have a tendency to oppress others, and they will oppress others as long as it is physically possible for them to do so.

As I said, I'm not a psychiatrist, and so I don't really know why some people think like that. Probably in some cases it's the consequence of Christian teaching: the lion will lie down with the lamb, the last will be first and the first will be last, and so on. Sometimes these notions are pumped into the heads of small children, and even when they grow up and have a chance to experience the real world, even when they no longer think of themselves as religious, they are unable to shed these early notions. Even though they can see that equality does not exist in the world, they still believe that it should.

And probably there are others who have even darker and more twisted motives for not wanting the news of the Fayetteville murders to get out. For them personally it is gratifying to learn that Blacks have murdered White girls. They see it as a just punishment for our racial guilt. But, as I said, they don't want such news to get out and alarm other White people and perhaps lead Whites generally to take protective measures which will avert further well deserved punishment.

These are the same type of people who believe that I am a high school dropout, have bad teeth, and live in a trailer park with discarded mattresses and appliances in my front yard. In fact, I hear these comments about bad teeth and trailer parks so often that I suspect that the kids are being taught such things in high school these days. They're being taught that Politically Incorrect dissidents are low-class people who are chronic failures and want to keep Blacks down so that we'll have someone to look down on. They believe that when I criticize the role of Jews in our society I do so because I am envious of the Jews' financial success. And while some of the people who make these remarks to me about my bad teeth and my trailer home and my general failure as a human being seem to be pretty uptight -- that is, it seems to me that they have some sort of emotional need to believe these things of me -- others really are quite smug in their ignorance. I suspect that the smug ones are mostly just lemmings mindlessly parroting what they've been taught, and the uptight ones are those with some sort of religious motivation for their hatred.

I never argue with these people, because it's clear that they're not susceptible to reason. They believe what they do because they have a need to believe it. I think I could straighten out the thinking of most of them with a piece of two by four or an oak table leg applied smartly about the head and shoulders twice a day for a month or so while keeping them on a diet of a couple of hundred calories a day -- you know, the way we straightened out the thinking of the conquered Germans after the Second World War -- but not by debating them.

Really, it's only a small minority of the American population that is capable of any sort of independent thinking at all. Most people are so tightly bound by either the need to conform or by religious or quasi-religious hang-ups that they just aren't able to accept any idea or even any fact which is contrary to what they see on television. And that's too bad for them, because only those individuals who are able to accept evidence and to think clearly about it can prepare themselves for the enormous changes which are coming in our society. Only this thinking minority will be survivors; the rest will be victims.

And indeed, great changes are coming. The twentieth century has been the democratic century, the era of egalitarianism, the age of the mass man. The next century -- indeed, the next millennium -- will be the era of the self-conscious elites. Which is not to say that everyone will

be self-conscious or that everyone will belong to an elite. But the people who determine the course of events will. Of course, in a sense that has been the case in this century too. The Jews certainly are a self-conscious elite, and they certainly have had a dominant influence in this century, primarily through their control of the mass media. But they have had to keep their dominance concealed from most people. They have had to rule through deceit and subversion. In the next century the rule of the elites will be much more open. The pretense of democracy and equality will be dropped.

The pretense already has become so transparent that even some of the lemmings are beginning to be disturbed by what is being revealed. America, the greatest champion of democracy, the great powerhouse which has gone about the horribly bloody and destructive business of making the world safe for democracy during most of this century, has a government which currently is the laughingstock of the world. And this is not solely because of Mr. Clinton's inability to keep his zipper up. Clinton, after all, did not get into the White House despite the system. He got into the White House because of the system. He got in because the system is designed for people like him: for clever liars, for skillful actors. It is designed so that the smoothest liars, the liars who can act most convincingly for the television cameras, are the ones who succeed in it. It is designed to weed out anyone with principles or patriotism and keep such people away from public office. Clinton -- or someone else with an equally embarrassing problem -- was inevitable.

And as every other politician scrambles now to distance himself from Clinton and to persuade the public that everything will be A-OK if the public will just vote for him instead in the next election -- as the politicians assure the public that Clinton is simply a terrible mistake, a fluke, who somehow slipped through the system and that the system itself is still in good shape, even some of the slow thinkers in the electorate are becoming a bit disillusioned about the system itself. Even the slow thinkers are beginning to suspect that all of the politicians who now, finally, are claiming to be shocked by Clinton's deceit, by Clinton's bald-faced lies, and are distancing themselves from him, really understood what sort of liar Clinton was all along and only stopped supporting him when it became obvious that there was no chance at all for him to wriggle out of the mess he has gotten himself into -- and of course, after they were given the go-ahead last week by Clinton's former number-one Jewish booster, Connecticut Senator Joseph Lieberman. Even the slow thinkers are beginning to understand that even the politicians who themselves have managed to remain untainted by personal scandal, even the politicians who never have been caught with their drawers down or their hands in the cash drawer, are perfectly willing to tolerate a Clinton, so long as the voters don't find out what's going on. And the brightest observers of the Clinton spectacle have understood that the system itself will not endure much longer. The most sophisticated observers have understood that a system so seriously flawed -- a system whose flaws have been so glaringly exposed -- will be replaced by something different before much more time has passed.

The situation in Russia now presents a striking and persuasive lesson for us in this regard. While the Russian people starve, while Russian workers go unpaid and the shelves of Russian stores remain bare, Jewish billionaires who have sucked the last drop of blood out of Russia scurry to stash their billions in Swiss bank accounts, and at the same time their Jewish brethren in the West tighten the screws on the same Swiss banks in the most arrogant extortion racket the world has ever seen. Even the slow thinkers in the West who are observing these developments must

suspect that the system in Russia will not last much longer. They must suspect that it will be replaced by something different very soon.

More sophisticated observers of the Russian situation see a bit more. They see the likelihood that more than 80 years of exploitation of the Russian people by the Jews will come to an end soon. This exploitation endured while it was concealed from the public, first under the pretense of a "dictatorship of the proletariat" and then under the pretense of a democracy. But it was, in fact, exploitation of the Russian people first by Jewish commissars under a Marxist system and then exploitation by Jewish capitalists under a media-controlled democratic system. The facts of this exploitation were obscured by the Jewish media bosses in the West for a long time, but -- like Mr. Clinton's lies -- the facts have become too obvious to conceal any longer. Boris Abramovich Berezovsky and Vladimir Gusinsky and all the rest of the Jewish billionaires controlling Boris Yeltsin simply have become too obvious, too visible. The fact that they literally stole Russia and that they stole Russia with the connivance of other Jews inside the communist system as that system was being dismantled, simply cannot be concealed any longer.

Berezovsky seems to enjoy the spotlight at the moment, and he is publicly throwing his weight around now and announcing his willingness to back certain Russian politicians, while the Russian people themselves are becoming increasingly exasperated by the spectacle of a handful of rich Jewish gangsters deciding how Russia is to be run while the Russians starve. I cannot predict in detail how the Russian situation will develop, of course, but I think it quite likely that we will see an end to Jewish power in Russia before we achieve that goal in the United States, and I also think it likely that the new rulers of Russia, the new self-conscious elite which comes to the fore there as the present crisis plays itself out, actually will be Russians for a change, and they will rule without the pretense of democracy.

And if Russia succeeds in liberating itself from Jewish control, there may be similar developments in the rest of eastern Europe, where just a few years ago communist butchers were permitted to switch hats, declare themselves democrats, and continue ruling. Pressure from Washington played a big role in preventing the people of these other countries from taking vengeance on their former communist bosses. By substantially diminishing the prestige of the U.S. government, inadvertent though that was, Bill Clinton may have done the people of Russia and perhaps also the other countries of eastern Europe a big favor. Vengeance may yet be taken. This possibility has not escaped the attention of the Jews themselves, and their publications in this country already are full of yammering and whining about how they're being "scapegoated" again, poor dears.

Be that as it may, this era of sham and deceit and pretense, this era of democracy and politicians and rule by the Jewish media, is drawing to a close. The politicians don't understand that; they think that we're just seeing another blip on the graph. The couch potatoes certainly don't understand it. Even the "wise guys," most of the media commentators and the academics and the business tycoons, don't understand that it won't be just business as usual during the next century, with the Jewish media bosses molding public opinion to suit themselves, and the same old political shell game presenting clever liars and skillful actors to the voters to choose from. That racket has been too thoroughly exposed.

It takes more than a mass of credulous couch potatoes and a few clever Jewish media bosses to keep the present system going. It also takes a great many thoughtful and semi-thoughtful people who are willing to let themselves be governed by the system. In the past most of these people had pretty fuzzy notions of what was going on. They accepted the concept of democracy because that was fashionable. It was easier to accept it than to make a real effort to analyze its dynamics. But Bill Clinton, with his Jewish bimbo and his cigar tricks, has given us such a stark illustration of the way the system really works, that it will be very difficult for everyone to go back to swallowing the same old platitudes and clichés again. Of course, the people who believe that all dissidents have bad teeth and live in trailer parks will continue to believe whatever they're told. And the academics and commentators who are slaves to fashion will continue to try their best to be fashionable.

But the number of those who have been permanently disillusioned has reached a point, I believe, where they will begin to have a growing influence on the course of events. They will have a growing influence on the thinking of those able to think for themselves. And from these people eventually will come a new elite of men who are idealistic and yet hardheaded, of men who will understand that the ground is shifting under the feet of the old elite and that something new and different must emerge from the changes now taking place around the world. And they will understand that now is the time, not later, to begin positioning themselves to be survivors rather than victims.

The second-raters will continue mouthing the old clichés and may even still believe the old baloney about democracy and equality, but the select few -- the precursors of the elite of the 21st century -- will free their minds from all of the old cobwebs and will see the future with much clearer eyes than the second-raters. They will see the Jews for what they are, and they will choose not to serve them or even to tolerate them. They will think thoughts that the second-raters are afraid to think. They will, for the sake of example, be able to compare Bill Clinton and his works, on the one hand, with Timothy McVeigh and the slaughter of 168 innocents in Oklahoma City, on the other hand, and they will understand whose deeds have in reality caused the greater amount of death and destruction; they will understand which of the two is the greater criminal, which of these two opponents has acted from worse motives.

And they will understand many other things. While rejecting the lie of egalitarianism and the pretense of democracy, they will understand that the new elite cannot stand on nothing, that it must stand on a strong base, and that base will be their racial community. Only the bonds of blood, of race, will be strong enough to hold in the chaos which is coming. In the struggle ahead only those who struggle for something beyond their own enrichment or personal power will have lasting success. They must be part of a strong group, and they must struggle for group interests as well as their own. The new age will be an age of nationalism, and only those who speak and act for their people will be able to lead in the coming age. But it will be an age in which the actors, in which the clever liars, will have short shrift, because it will no longer be masses of couch potatoes who will be asked to believe the liars, but instead hardheaded men who will not be so easily deceived and who will not feel the need to wear a mask of pretense themselves. They will rule because they are strong and able and have clear minds and actually work to advance the interests of their people.

Perhaps my way of stating that sounds naive and excessively idealistic in this age of lies and corruption and rule by deceit, but that's really the way it will be. Things really are beginning to change. The age of the Jew is coming to an end. And the clear thinkers will be the first to begin acting on that.

The Corruption of America's Police by the ADL

Two weeks ago I began telling you about the corruption of American police officials by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: the ADL. Because this is such an important matter, such an urgent matter, I promised I'd tell you more about it. It is a shocking thing, and I needed time to present the details to you -- details which you can check for yourselves, so that you will have no doubt that I am telling you the truth. It's easy to doubt this truth. It's easy to believe that the ADL is the so-called "human rights" organization that the mass media say it is. It's especially easy to believe this when you see ADL officials palling around with prominent politicians and policemen, when you see police chiefs and U.S. senators receiving awards at ADL banquets.

I'm telling you that the ADL is an anti-American gang of racketeers who break our laws with impunity because they have succeeded in corrupting our politicians and many of our law-enforcement people as well. And now I will prove that charge.

First, however, just as an aside, let's note that the parent organization of which the ADL is a branch is named B'nai B'rith. That name may sound strange to your ears because it is a Hebrew name. B'nai means "sons," and b'rith -- which is often pronounced "briss" by American Jews -- means "circumcision." B'rith -- or briss -- refers to the ritual circumcision of Jewish males which according to Jewish tradition is a sign of their "chosenness" or their special covenant with the Hebrew tribal deity Yahweh. You probably won't find "b'rith" in your dictionary with the apostrophe the way it's spelled by the ADL, but you should be able to find "briss." So in English B'nai B'rith means the Circumcised Brotherhood. But really, it's a criminal brotherhood, whose members are marked by circumcision much in the way many Japanese criminals who belong to the *yakuza* are marked by a missing fingertip, or members of many drug gangs are marked by a distinctive tattoo.

As I told you two weeks ago the ADL was founded in 1913 after a wealthy Jewish factory owner, Leo Frank, was convicted of raping and murdering a 14-year-old girl who worked in his Atlanta pencil factory. The trial of Frank was accompanied by a great deal of very embarrassing publicity for the Jews, and the ADL was organized primarily as a propaganda organization to neutralize such bad publicity: thus its name, Anti-Defamation League. But since 1913 the ADL has been involved in much more than pro-Jewish propaganda. As an arm of B'nai B'rith, which is an international organization with its tentacles in nearly every country on earth, the ADL has expanded its scope of interests and activities to include virtually everything concerning Jews anywhere.

For example, after the success of the Bolshevik Revolution, which resulted in the Jews riding high in Russia, the ADL concerned itself with countering the charge that the Jews had anything to do with communism, which never was popular in mainstream America. After the Second World War, when hundreds of communist spies -- virtually all of whom turned out to be Jews -- were being rooted out of the U.S. government during the so-called McCarthy era, the ADL worked overtime to discredit anti-communists. To the ADL, anyone who was anti-communist

was "anti-Semitic." Arnold Forster, who changed his name from Fastenberg and who was the ADL's general counsel for 46 years, wrote in his 1988 memoirs, *Square One*, about the case of the atomic spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg: "Like so many others, Jew and non-Jew alike, I suffered deep pain when the Rosenbergs were executed."

The ADL had a significant role in the Jewish propaganda effort to portray the flushing out of Soviet agents from U.S. institutions as a "witch hunt." Today most educated Americans who were born too late to experience the late 1940s and early 1950s as adults actually believe the Jewish propaganda myth that it was a dark period in American history, when everyone was looking over his shoulder, afraid of being denounced as a spy by a government informant. The Jews, of course, who had been almost to a man partisans of the Soviet Union, *were* looking over their shoulders. But ordinary Americans certainly didn't feel intimidated by the government's efforts to rid itself of the Soviet influences which had gained a strong foothold during the war.

In 1948, when the Jews made their first big land-grab in the Middle East after the war, forming the state of Israel with land stolen from the Palestinians, the ADL saw its principal new role as a defender of Israel. The label "anti-Semite" henceforth was applied by the ADL to anyone who was pro-Arab or who did not approve of American support for Israel. Being seen as a champion of Israel rather than as a champion of communism helped enormously with the ADL's fund-raising efforts. Among others giving large sums of money to the ADL after 1948 were a number of Jewish organized crime figures, who felt a strong sympathy for Israel. These gangsters, including Jews such as Meyer Lansky, Longy Zwillman, and Moe Dalitz, were engaged in the White slave trade, in illegal drug trafficking, and in nearly every other kind of criminal activity imaginable. The ADL's relationship with Moe Dalitz, one of the most notorious gangsters in America, may suffice to indicate the pattern.

Morris -- or "Moe" -- Dalitz, like many other organized crime figures before the Second World War, got his start in the illegal booze business during Prohibition. Dalitz was the boss of a criminal organization in Detroit known as the "Purple Gang," whose principal activity was smuggling whisky across the Detroit River from Canada into the United States.

The controlled media, through popular fiction and films like *The Godfather*, have given most Americans the erroneous idea that organized crime in America has been almost entirely an Italian affair. Although Sicilians and Italians made up most of the lower ranks of the Mafia and other gangster organizations in the 1920s and 1930s, at the top there were at least as many Jews as Italians. And some of the most notorious and bloodthirsty criminal organizations were entirely Jewish, or nearly so. Murder, Incorporated, is an example of a Jewish criminal gang. Moe Dalitz's Purple Gang is another example.

Dalitz eventually moved his whisky-smuggling operation from Detroit to Cleveland and joined forces with another group of Jewish gangsters there. They moved so much illegal booze across Lake Erie that it become known popularly as the "Jewish lake." It's good to remember that gangsters like Dalitz did much more than smuggle whisky. They corrupted American society and American government. They bribed judges and politicians and police officials on a huge scale. They murdered people: hundreds of people. And when Prohibition ended in 1933 the gangsters

simply switched from smuggling to extortion, loan-sharking, and White slavery. After the war they moved into the drug trade.

Toward the end of the war Dalitz and several other Jewish gangsters, including Bugsy Siegel and Meyer Lansky, began investing their ill-gotten wealth in Las Vegas. Soon they were all casino owners. Dalitz was one of the original owners of the Flamingo, which opened in 1946. Dalitz later took over the Desert Inn and became a part owner of the Stardust Hotel. His gang became known as the "Desert Syndicate." Dalitz and Lansky eventually decided that Bugsy Siegel was cheating them, and in June 1947 they ordered him killed in one of the most spectacular "rubouts" of the postwar period. After that Moe Dalitz was the undisputed "Godfather" of Las Vegas.

Over the years a great deal of Moe Dalitz's criminal income found its way into the coffers of the ADL -- so much so that in 1985 the ADL gave its so-called "Torch of Liberty" award to Dalitz. The award ceremony was a black-tie affair featured on the front page of the *ADL Bulletin,* in which Dalitz was praised as a "philanthropist" and "deep appreciation" was expressed for his financial contributions to the ADL. And of course, the controlled media were discreet about the relationship between Dalitz and the ADL. There were never any headlines in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post* about the ADL's ties to the mob, but anyone who has the time to dig back through the issues of the *ADL Bulletin* at a major library, will find Dalitz on the front page in 1985. Moe Dalitz himself was killed four years later, in 1989, in a gang shootout which also left seven other people dead. But the ADL had plenty of other Jewish gangsters contributing money by then.

The ADL was able to flaunt its relationship with Moe Dalitz and accept tainted money from him and other gangsters -- money which was the product of criminal activity -- without fear of legal repercussions, because at the same time it had been cultivating its relationships with Jewish organized crime bosses, it also had been cultivating its relationships with law-enforcement officials, especially in the FBI. During the post-war period the Jews spearheaded the effort to force racial integration on America, and they were bitterly resented by segregationist organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan. The Klan struck out at the Jews almost as much as at Blacks. The most newsworthy Klan effort in that regard was the killing of two Jewish agitators, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, in Mississippi in June 1964. The Hollywood propaganda film, *Mississippi Burning,* was based on this incident.

To get revenge against the Klan for the Goodman and Schwerner killings -- and also to put the Klan in its place -- the ADL arranged a trap. Working in collusion with the FBI, the New Orleans office of the ADL, headed at that time by Adolph Botnick, paid two leaders of the Klan in Mississippi, brothers Alton Roberts and Raymond Roberts, to initiate a Klan project to bomb the home of Meyer Davidson, the ADL leader in Meridian, Mississippi. On June 30, 1968, two unsuspecting Klan members drove up to Davidson's home, intending to put a bomb on his front porch. They were Kathy Ainsworth, a young school teacher, and Thomas Tarrants. The FBI was hiding in the bushes, waiting for them, and opened fire on them as soon as they got out of their car. Kathy Ainsworth was killed instantly in the hail of bullets, and Thomas Tarrants lay near death after being shot 70 times by the trigger-happy FBI agents. Clearly the plan was to kill both Ainsworth and Tarrants, execution style, as a warning to the Klan not to mess with the Jews. And as I said, the ADL and the FBI together set up this murder trap: the ADL supplied the cash for

the informants and provocateurs, and the FBI supplied the executioners. The killing of Kathy Ainsworth was nothing less than a planned murder by the ADL.

This sort of criminal collaboration between the FBI and the ADL has continued to the present day. The ADL always has been an espionage organization, with much of its activity consisting in the gathering of personal information and the building of dossiers on everyone perceived as hostile to Jewish interests -- and also on tens of thousands of other Americans as well, that the ADL might want to apply pressure to at some time in the future.

The FBI is prohibited by law from investigating people unless it has some evidence that they are involved in criminal activity, but the ADL operates under no such restrictions. The ADL hires people to steal the trash from the curbs in front of the homes of people it is interested in, and it engages in many even less savory practices. And the ADL is generally happy to swap information with the FBI, providing the FBI with confidential personal information on people the FBI is interested in but has no legal basis for investigating. The ADL and the FBI do favors for each other.

Occasionally, however, the ADL's espionage work has gotten it into trouble. In addition to stealing the trash from in front of people's homes, the ADL has illegally obtained confidential information on thousands of Americans by bribing employees in departments of motor vehicles or in police departments, including the San Francisco Police Department. When the San Francisco police realized that some of their confidential files had been stolen by the ADL, they obtained search warrants. The Los Angeles and San Francisco offices of the ADL were raided by the police twice, first on December 10, 1992 and then again on April 8, 1993. In these raids thousands of stolen police files were recovered. The police also raided the homes of an ADL undercover agent, Roy Bullock; and a sergeant in the San Francisco Police Department, Thomas Gerard. Gerard, who had been stealing the police records for the ADL, subsequently fled to the Philippines to avoid prosecution.

Just prior to the April 1993 raids San Francisco Assistant District Attorney John Dwyer told news reporters: "The ADL is the target. Their involvement is just so great. People have called this the Gerard case. Now it's the ADL case. Gerard is just their guy in San Francisco. The ADL is doing the same thing all over the country. There is evidence that the ADL had police agents in other cities. The case just gets bigger every day. The more we look, the more we find people involved."

Although the Politically Correct media in America don't like to publicize news which doesn't "fit," the ADL story was too big to suppress, and you can find extensive news coverage of the ADL raids in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *San Francisco Chronicle* in December 1992 and April 1993, including the statement I just quoted by the San Francisco assistant district attorney.

Among the 12,000 files on individuals and 950 files on organizations the police recovered in their raids, were files on the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee -- the AADC -- and many of its members. ADL employee Roy Bullock had been assigned the task of infiltrating the Arab group, and he had even gone so far as stealing a key to their Santa Ana, California, office. The ADL had an especially strong hatred for the AADC, because it countered the ADL's pro-

Israel propaganda with news reports on Israeli atrocities against Palestinians. On October 11, 1985, the chairman of the AADC, Alex Odeh, was killed by a booby-trap bomb when he opened the door of his office in Santa Ana, California.

It didn't take the FBI very long to figure out who the bombers were, but the three Jewish suspects fled to Israel before they could be arrested. Even though Bullock had the stolen key of the AADC office in his possession at the time of the bombing, neither he nor any of his employers in the ADL were ever charged in connection with Odeh's murder. Also in 1985 Jewish activists used a bomb to kill another target of ADL spying and hate propaganda. He was Tscherim Soobzokov, accused by the ADL of having worked with the Germans in the Caucasus during the Second World War. On August 15, 1985, a bomb exploded on Soobzokov's front porch in Paterson, New Jersey, mortally wounding him.

The ADL used its illegally obtained files in other ways as well, passing some of them to foreign governments. At a court hearing in February 1993, the San Francisco assistant district attorney testified that the file of one American citizen which had been stolen by the ADL had been passed on to the government of Israel. That citizen was Mohammed Jarad, a man of Palestinian ancestry who owned a grocery store in Chicago. When Jarad visited his relatives in Israeli-occupied Palestine in January 1993, he was seized by the Israeli secret police as a result of information supplied to them by the ADL about Jarad's pro-Palestine activity in the United States.

Now the really disturbing thing about all of this ADL activity is not that the organization accepts money from known crime bosses or that it spies on American citizens and turns some of the information over to foreign governments or even that it sets up assassinations or incites terrorist bombings against its enemies. There are other criminal organizations in the United States even more heavily involved in violent criminal activity than the ADL. What makes the ADL more dangerous than any of these others is its ongoing corruption of police officials. In public ceremonies very much like the one honoring gangster Moe Dalitz, the ADL presents awards to police officials and politicians -- including the same "Torch of Liberty" award they gave to Dalitz. The ADL regularly persuades local, state, and national police officials to appear on the speaker's platform when the ADL is denouncing some new enemy of the Jews, just as they had police officials around the country at their press conferences a month ago when they declared me the most dangerous man in America.

The ADL also offers training seminars to police departments to teach them how to recognize and deal with "right-wing terrorists," believe it or not. And the police departments take them up on it; they have their officers sit and listen to the ADL, with its history of un-American and criminal activity, tell them about how to deal with people like me.

Why would any American police official accept an award from the same organization which had given an award to Moe Dalitz and praised him on the front page of its monthly publication? Why would any police official be seen in public with members of an organization caught red-handed with stolen police files? Why would the FBI collaborate with such an organization?

I think that in part it is naivete. Policemen tend to be respecters of authority, even more so than the average citizen. If the media praise the ADL as a "respected civil-rights organization," and if

ADL officials are obviously wealthy and well-connected men, with big offices and lots of secretaries, the police tend to feel that they must be all right. The feeling is that nobody who is rich and powerful and gets good press can be bad. The cops either haven't seen the few media reports where the ADL got caught red-handed or they've conveniently forgotten.

But more often than naivete, I'm afraid that corruption is the reason for the collaboration. Certainly that is the case with the FBI. The FBI hasn't forgotten about Moe Dalitz or the stolen police files or the bombing of Alex Odeh's office. They certainly haven't forgotten about the arranged murder of Kathy Ainsworth. And that's frightening. The ADL alone is bad enough. The ADL teamed up with corrupt policemen all across the country should be a nightmare for every decent American.

The Millennium Bug and "Mainstreaming" the News

Today I want to talk with you first about the so-called "millennium bug." It's also sometimes called the "Y2K phenomenon," which is sort of a shorthand way of saying the "year 2000 phenomenon." Ordinarily I wouldn't waste time on such a topic, when we have so many truly urgent problems to discuss -- but I've received a number of inquiries about the "millennium bug" from listeners, and this indicates to me that there is some real concern, some real worry about it. So I'll begin by saying, don't worry -- or at least, don't worry *very much* about it.

The "millennium bug" is a bug of the computer sort: that is, it's a software problem -- and to a lesser extent a hardware problem. Back in the distant past when the computer revolution began, computer memory -- what we call RAM -- was scarce and expensive. So was program and data storage space. In 1980, when I decided to take the National Alliance out of the typewriter and index-card age and into the computer age, I bought a TRS-80, Model II, computer with the maximum amount of memory its Z80A processor could handle: all of 64 kilobytes. That's kilobytes, not megabytes. It had no hard drive, of course. All data and programs, including the operating system, resided on an eight-inch floppy diskette -- except for the startup program, which was hardwired on a computer chip known as a ROM, or read-only memory chip. And this was all top-of-the-line equipment, the best you could buy in those days. I paid about $8,000 for the computer, an extra eight-inch floppy drive to give me more data storage space, and a painfully slow dot-matrix printer which I had to wire to the computer myself, since there were no ready-made cables available and the pins on the printer didn't match the pins on the back of the computer.

Under these primitive conditions every byte of memory and every byte of program code was precious. I wrote my own programs back then in BASIC, and I was careful to put no unnecessary bytes into my program code. I used every shortcut and abbreviation I could. The professionals who wrote operating systems and the big applications programs for the so-called "mainframe" computers used by the government and big corporations also had to be careful not to waste memory or storage space. One of the shortcuts I used which they also used in writing dates was to write only the last two digits of the year. The programs were written so that they understood that the first two -- unwritten -- digits were "19." Thus 1981 was written as "81."

Of course, everyone understood that when the year 2000 arrived this shortcut would cause problems. We didn't worry much about that back in 1980, because 2000 was still a long way off and saving memory was more important. Meanwhile, our whole society was undergoing a profound transformation as everything became computerized. Cash registers at checkout counters and elevators and traffic signals and the billing systems and keeping of medical records at doctors' offices -- everything was controlled by computers, and many of the programs in these computers used the old shortcuts. So did the ROM chips, which stored date and time information for the computers and which regulated many electrical devices other than computers.

Well, a few years ago the computer professionals began worrying about what would happen when the year 2000 dawned, and all of the computers and ROM chips in the world thought the date was January 1, 1900. Of course, by then computer memory and storage space were much larger, and so were the programs which controlled computers. It was quite easy to begin using four digits for the year in all of the new programs -- and in the new ROM chips. The problem was that there were literally millions of older computers and older programs in use around the world, and the task of upgrading all of them . . . well, that was a problem!

Then the journalists heard about this problem, and they sensationalized it. Then the right-wing cranks -- and maybe a few left-wing cranks also -- got into the act, and the first thing we knew, everyone was predicting that the sky will fall on New Year's Day 2000. According to the crank scenario, at the stroke of midnight on December 31, 1999, the world of government, finance, and commerce will come to an end, for all practical purposes. Computers all over the world will either shut down or begin giving spurious results, and then gradually the lights everywhere will go off because electrical power stations are all controlled by computers these days. Airliners will begin falling from the sky, as their onboard computers and the ground-based air traffic control computers cease functioning simultaneously. Vehicular traffic on the ground won't fare much better. Trains will stop running, and city streets will be blocked by wrecks at major intersections, because the computer-controlled traffic lights will have gone haywire. Telephones won't work, and the food in refrigerators will begin spoiling.

The government, of course, won't be able to function, because without its computers the IRS won't know who owes the government money or how much. Welfare and Social Security checks no longer will go out, and without their welfare checks the Blacks in the cities will begin to riot, kill, burn, and loot almost immediately. Within a few days roving bands of hungry people will be stripping the countryside bare.

The government will respond by calling in United Nations "peacekeeping" troops, declaring martial law, confiscating all privately owned firearms, and packing all White males -- except registered Democrats and homosexuals -- into concentration camps for eventual liquidation. Remember, Bill Clinton still will be in the White House, and this will be his chance to get even with all those people who humiliated him.

Even folks who haven't swallowed this entire crank scenario are worried that something drastic will happen, and the more cautious ones are stocking up on bottled water, canned food, candles, and ammunition. I guess that there always has been a pretty strong streak of superstition and credulity in our people. There's always been a substantial element of the population ready to be deceived by improbable rumors, taken in by popular delusions, or swept away altogether by a general panic. People who believe that in this scientific age we're less superstitious than were our ancestors a thousand years ago are just plain wrong. The White public today may not be quite as ready to believe that the appearance of a comet indicates that the end of the world is at hand or that touching a piece of the True Cross will cure warts or constipation, but that's not because they're less superstitious. Today the superstitions are different, but they're just as irrational and have a grip on at least as many people as did the old ones. Today the credulous believe in equality or in the miraculous powers of democracy -- or in the end of the world as we know it on New Year's Day 2000.

Part of the fascination the "millennium bug" has for many people, I'm sure, is that it does involve the end of a millennium, and much of the old superstition about miraculous happenings at that time lies just beneath the surface for them. Some of these millennialists, of course, believe explicitly in the Second Coming of Jesus. Others may not have such explicit beliefs, but they still have forebodings of some sort of supernatural events connected with the beginning of the next millennium, and these forebodings make them readier to believe the crank predictions of a global disaster when all the computers get the date wrong.

So I'll make my own prediction. The main thing to watch out for on New Year's Day 2000 is crazed millennialists going berserk when the Second Coming fails to occur. Also a few right-wing nuts may launch a premature attack on the government, figuring that without its computers the government won't be able to fight back. But the lights will stay on, and airliners will not fall from the sky. And unfortunately the welfare checks will continue going out.

I'm able to make this prediction with some degree of confidence because, contrary to what some journalists and cranks would have you believe, the computer professionals and the government have been working hard on the "Y2K" phenomenon for some time. The IRS and the Social Security Administration have brought out of retirement a lot of programmers who are familiar with the older programs the government is still using and have been paying them premium wages to check these programs and repair any problems associated with the way they handle dates. The big banks and other corporations who handle their own computer programming have been doing the same thing. And because they understand that their survival depends on it, they will have the problems essentially fixed in time.

Most smaller businesses depend on computer service companies for all of their hardware and software, and most of these service companies also will have the problem fixed for their customers. The people who will have difficulties when the year 2000 dawns are the proprietors of small businesses who switched over to computers themselves more than five or six years ago, much in the way I computerized the National Alliance, and who have been too busy recently to change to newer software. And if they have trouble with their accounting or billing programs in the year 2000, a few of them may go bankrupt, but that won't cause the traffic lights to stop working or the food in your refrigerator to spoil.

All of the newer operating systems and ROM chips which have come out recently are free of the Y2K problem. Windows 95 or any later operating system will be OK, as will just about any hardware or software produced since 1997 -- and much which was produced earlier. So go ahead and stock up on bottled water and ammunition if you want. Being prepared for social disorder is a good idea these days. But there are much more serious things than the "millennium bug" for you to worry about during the next 14 months.

In general those things are the things I've been talking about fairly regularly on these programs: things like the Jewish domination of our mass media of news and entertainment, the corruption of our political system, the decline of the quality of education in America, the breakdown of our judicial system, the problem of non-White immigration, the likelihood of getting America into another war in the Middle East for the benefit of Israel, the continued globalization of America's

economy, the efforts of the "hate speech" crowd to stamp out free speech. Those are all real problems.

Let's use the remaining time today to talk about the media. I mentioned in my broadcast last week that the fact that the Jews make up a dominant group in the media is not the only problem we have with the mass media in America. One problem is the lemming-like behavior of most journalists, their inability to take an independent position on anything. And another problem is that there are some real nut-case liberals in positions of authority in the media, some people who are absolutely crazed by their obsession with using the media under their control to promote truly lunatic ideas of equality, for example.

I've known for a long time that there are certain rules and taboos that all journalists are expected to obey strictly, even though in the past the media bosses usually have been careful not to have these rules actually written down so that they can be scrutinized and perhaps criticized by an outsider. It is forbidden, for example, to portray Blacks in a bad light. If one is casting for a drama which has a villain, one must not choose a Black for the role of villain. Blacks must not be portrayed as stupid or vicious or immoral. The only exception is for productions which are all-Black or nearly so: the sort of films that Spike Lee makes, for example, where the hero and the heroine and everyone else are Black. The same protection from being portrayed negatively also applies to Jews, but even more so. If you need a villain in your production, the safest thing to do is make him blonde, preferably with a German accent.

And in any film or television drama which is set in the 1930s or 1940s and touches in any way on the Second World War or on National Socialist Germany, the Germans have to be the bad guys. It is absolutely forbidden to portray Hitler or any of his followers or his policies positively. One can portray Stalin positively. One certainly can portray Trotsky or Kaganovich or any of the other Jewish-communist mass murderers positively. But not the Germans who were fighting against those Jewish-communist mass murderers. One can't make a pro-German film and then leave it up to viewers to decide whether or not they like it. It will never get to the viewers. They will never have the option of expressing their approval or disapproval. One of the rules is, you must not portray Hitler positively. Period.

Now the rules finally are coming out of the closet -- at least, where newspapers are concerned. Socially conscious editors and publishers are doing their bit for diversity and affirmative action and equality by spelling out the rules for those benighted journalists who aren't bright enough to figure it out for themselves. The old rule that racial minorities, homosexuals, et cetera always must be portrayed positively is on paper now and is being elaborated on in detail. The *Los Angeles Times* has been a pioneer in this regard, but the rules are being enforced at many other newspapers as well.

Among other things, reporters are required to "mainstream" their stories, both in content and in their use of sources. To "mainstream" a story means to make it "fit" the ideological paradigm of the multiculturalists. If you're doing a story on global warming, say, you don't focus on the climatic changes in North America or Europe: instead you tell readers how global warming will affect the lives of people in Bangladesh or Zambia. And you don't go to a White male meteorologist at an American university for your information: instead you get a quote from

someone at the University of Kenya, preferably a Black lesbian meteorologist with AIDS. You score extra points if you can figure a way to let the readers understand that your source is not only Black and female but also is a lesbian with AIDS without being too obvious about it.

One trendy aspect of reporting the news these days, both in print and electronic media, is to poll people: a television crew stops people on the street and asks, "Do you believe Bill Clinton should go to jail for lying to the grand jury?" This is supposed to tell viewers what the average person is thinking. Now, if you want your career to go places, you don't bother to ask White males what they're thinking. You go for "diversity" in choosing the people whose opinions you ask.

The problem with that is that some people will give answers that make them look stupid. So reporters are asked to complete a checklist which includes the two questions: "Am I furthering stereotypes as I seek diversity?" and "Am I battling stereotypes?" And of course, what that means in plain English is that the reporter had better be sure that all of the Blacks he polls come across as brain surgeons or rocket scientists. They'd better not look like or sound like typical Blacks, because that would be "furthering stereotypes." If you're a television reporter, when you do your editing you weed out the Black interviewees who fit the stereotype and keep the ones who don't. If you're a newspaper reporter it's easier: you just clean up the grammar of your Black interviewees. The rules also apply to the selection of illustrations for newspaper stories. You get the most points if you can use a photograph of a racially mixed couple.

And as I said, this is no longer just an unwritten rule that the media must make Blacks and other minorities look good. More and more it's in print, and reporters and editors know they are being graded on the degree to which they distort reality to make it "fit" the crazed vision of the egalitarians, a vision of a just and peaceful society dominated by wise and benevolent Blacks, homosexuals, and feminists and in which White males are kept in their place. Media people actually are given questionnaires to fill out which remind them that their responsibility is not to report the world as it really is but rather as the nutcase egalitarians see it and as they want it to be.

So now we can understand the situation I have pointed out in several recent broadcasts: the refusal of the media to report news of racial crimes against Whites, except locally, and their frenzied enthusiasm in reporting racial crimes by Whites. It's not inadvertent at all. It's not even an unconscious bias. It is a deliberate effort to present the public with a distorted view of the world, a deliberate effort to make the public see the world the way the lunatic egalitarians see it, and that is a world in which Blacks and other non-Whites are the peaceful and inoffensive victims of vicious, oppressive, racist, heterosexual White males. That's their view of the world. It's completely unreal, but it's the view they want the general public to accept.

These people used to be sneakier about their motives, but in the Clinton era they seem to believe that they can let it all hang out. One of them is Mark Willes, the publisher of the *Los Angeles Times.* Earlier this year -- in May -- Willes boasted to the *Wall Street Journal* about having written rules at the *Los Angeles Times* for "mainstreaming" all of the news printed by his paper. He insisted, he told the *Wall Street Journal,* that all of his reporters meet strict quotas for non-Whites and women in quoting people in news stories.

And Willes, so far as I have been able to determine, isn't a Jew. He was, however, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania during the 1960s, when there was a great deal of turmoil on American university campuses. Jews were organizing pro-Viet Cong demonstrations, Blacks were occupying deans' offices and making all sorts of demands, and most university administrators didn't have the guts or the will to deal firmly with the disruptions. I was a professor too at the time, and I remember the reactions of my colleagues. Some, like William Shockley and Arthur Jensen, stuck to their guns and had their classes disrupted and their tires slashed. I left the university, so that I could begin writing about what was happening. But most, including Willes, just went with the flow. They were intimidated, and they adapted. They surrendered morally. And now our whole society is paying the price for this moral failure.

>From my point of view, there are no more despicable criminals in our society than these people like Willes, who went with the flow. These people who suppress and distort the news today because of their own moral failure back in the 1960s are more deserving of punishment even than the Black criminals they cover for.

Additional Reading: John Leo, "Quoting by Quota," *U.S. News & World Report*, June 29, 1998

"Hate Crimes" and the New World Order

There have been a few items in the news during the past few days which have caught my attention, and I want to share my thoughts on these things with you.

One of these items was the reaction to the robbing and killing of a homosexual man in Laramie, Wyoming, earlier this month. I'm sure you've heard about that a number of times by now: the controlled media really have been raising a fuss about it everywhere. Mr. Clinton, of course, commented solemnly to the nation on it and held it up as another reason for enacting the Federal "hate crime" law that the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and other Jewish groups have been clamoring for.

Just to refresh your memory, on October 6 a 21-year-old homosexual, Matthew Shepard, went into a bar in Laramie, picked up two other young men he thought were homosexuals but who were not, and left with them. Shepard's intention was to have sex with his two new-found acquaintances; their intention was to rob him. And that's what they did. They also gave him a vicious beating and left him tied him to a fence. He died six days later.

Let me assure you that I do not approve of such incidents. Prior to the Clinton era -- way back before homosexuality became a government- favored lifestyle -- when I was in military school, some of my classmates occasionally amused themselves by going into bars known to be homosexual hangouts, letting themselves be picked up by a homosexual, then beating him up and robbing him. They called it "rolling a queer." I considered it an especially lowlife sort of criminal activity. And today I believe that, just as our society should not tolerate homosexuals or public homosexual behavior, neither should it tolerate the lowlife criminals who prey on them.

Shepard, of course, knew that he was taking a big chance when he left the bar with two strangers -- especially in a town like Laramie, which is not San Francisco. Media people have been complaining that if two homosexuals hold hands or kiss in public in Laramie, they are liable to be insulted by other residents. Imagine that! Anyway, a homosexual anywhere who goes into a bar which is not an exclusive homosexual hangout and tries to pick up a "date" is asking for trouble, and Shepard found it.

But you know, the only reason this Shepard case is of interest to us is that the media bosses decided that it could be made to serve their purpose, and so they brought their television cameras to Laramie. And when the television cameras arrived, all of the eager-beaver local politicians and the oh-so-righteous preachers hastened to express their shock and horror about the awful "hate crime." And then various hysterical women grabbed their chance to become emotional in front of the cameras as they affirmed their Political Correctness. And then, as I mentioned, Bill Clinton got into the act too.

Now, you know and I know that if Matthew Shepard had been killed by two of his fellow homosexuals in an argument over the affection of another homosexual, we never would have heard of it. Or if his killers had been Black instead of White we never would have heard of it. Let me tell you about another brutal and sadistic killing which occurred just a few days before the

Shepard killing. This one took place in the Madison County, Alabama, jail. A 19-year-old retarded man, Robert Sevigny, was arrested on the charge that he had said some sexually suggestive things to a girl under 16 years old. He hadn't done anything, just used "suggestive" language. He was, after all, retarded, and he was heterosexual. And he had never hurt anyone. He was a gentle and friendly person. While he was in jail the other inmates tortured him and beat him to death. Why? They told police that they had done it because Sevigny was weak and naive, because he didn't know how to defend himself, and it amused them to kill him.

Now, I'll wager that this is the first you've heard of Sevigny's murder, which occurred last month. The reason you haven't heard of it is that Sevigny was White, and the inmates who tortured and beat him to death are Black. I'll guarantee you that you would have heard of it if Sevigny had been Black and the other inmates had been White. Mr. Clinton would have told you about it. Hysterical women would have wrung their hands and cried in front of the television cameras as they proclaimed their shock and horror over the "hate crime."

I'll tell you about something else which happened a few days ago that you haven't heard about. A Black man, Arthur Bomar, was convicted early this month of rape, first-degree murder, and sexual abuse of a corpse. Bomar had driven up behind a car driven by a 22-year-old White university student, Aimee Willard. Aimee was home on summer vacation from George Mason University, which is in Fairfax, Virginia. She was visiting her parents in Philadelphia, when Bomar deliberately bumped her car. She got out to check for damage; he grabbed her, beat her savagely with a tire iron, tore her clothes off, raped her, and then dumped her corpse in a vacant lot.

Now, I don't have to tell you why you didn't hear about that vicious, depraved crime, unless you live in Philadelphia and caught a brief mention of it on the local news, but have heard about the killing of Matthew Shepard over and over again regardless of where you live. But I'll tell you anyway. The reason is that Matthew Shepard is one of them, as is Arthur Bomar, as are the Black inmates in the Madison County Jail, and as also are the hysterical, hymn-singing women demonstrating against "hate" in Laramie. They're all part of the Clinton coalition, all part of the "diverse" crowd which can be counted on to get on whatever bandwagon the media bosses are driving.

Something else, entirely different, which has really been in the news a lot recently is the situation in the Yugoslav province of Kosovo. The ethnic Albanians in Kosovo would like for the province to be detached from Yugoslavia and become part of Albania. The Serbs, who are the ethnic majority in Yugoslavia, are not willing to give Kosovo to the Albanians. So there's been a civil war going on in Kosovo -- and, this being the Balkans, it's been an especially cruel and bloody civil war. The Serbs have been massacring Albanians of all ages and both sexes. And the Albanians are not above castrating the Serbian soldiers they capture and then gouging out their eyes. That's the way wars always have been fought in the Balkans -- at least, since the Turks brought their Oriental methods of warfare to the area during the Middle Ages. Fighting against the Turks for a few hundred years and surviving makes a people hard. So now the Clinton administration wants to send an international "peacekeeping" force into Kosovo to keep the Serbs from killing any more Albanians -- at least, that's what he says -- and the U.S. government is threatening to bomb and rocket the Serbs if they refuse to cooperate. Of course, it's all being

done under the guise of a NATO operation, although it's really the gang of Jews around Clinton who're pulling the strings: Holbrook, Albright, Berger, and the rest.

I don't like it. This business of forcing the Serbs to be nice to the Albanians really is worse than the sending of U.S. and NATO troops into Bosnia in 1995 to stop the fighting between Bosnian Serbs, Muslims, and Croats. Bosnia, after all, is an independent country, and a substantial portion of the people invited the U.S. forces in, more or less. In Kosovo we're proposing to force our way into a sovereign country which doesn't want us in order to make the people there behave the way we think they should. Suppose the rapidly growing Hispanic-mestizo minority in Texas or California decided to start a civil war aimed at returning one of those states to Mexico, and we got rough with the mestizo rebels. Perhaps we should permit the United Nations to come into Texas or California and force us to be nice. Actually, to the Clintonista gang, that's not an unreasonable proposition.

You know, I am not against this meddling in Kosovo because I am on the side of the Serbs. I had an older friend, now deceased, who was an American bomber pilot during the Second World War. He was shot down over the Balkans and managed to make contact with Serbian communist partisans who hid him from the Germans and eventually smuggled him through the German lines to a part of Yugoslavia which was not under German control. Before he left they had a celebration for him, and to entertain him they killed, in an especially sadistic way, some German prisoners they had captured. My friend was horrified, and the Serbs didn't understand why. And just as I did not approve of the torture and murder of German prisoners 55 years ago, I didn't approve of the Serbs raping and then cutting the throats of Muslim Bosnian women five years ago, and I don't approve of their slaughtering of Albanian children today. But, as I said a minute ago, this seems to be the way things are done in the Balkans, and the Serbs also get tortured and slaughtered when their enemies get the upper hand over them.

But you know, we Americans are responsible at least in part for the current hatred and bloodshed in the Balkans. We had this idiotic idea after the First World War that we could erase centuries-old ethnic boundaries, mix people of various ethnicities together in artificial countries such as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia, and make them like it. The same sort of thing was reinforced by the communists after the Second World War, after we made it possible for the communists to impose their will on much of Europe. And so when these people begin unmixing themselves through the process of ethnic cleansing, we bear a substantial part of the responsibility.

And so now we are forcing ourselves on these people again, just as we did after the last two world wars, telling them how to behave. Let's just be sure that we really understand what we're doing. The media bosses and the Hebraic gang around Mr. Clinton would have us believe that we're threatening the Serbs with air strikes and an occupation force in order to save the lives of Albanian children. Baloney! Do you believe that Madeleine Albright really cares about children -- that is, non-Jewish children? She's the one who in arguing for maintaining the embargo against Iraq said that she thought that the lives of half a million Iraqi children who had died because of the embargo was not an unreasonable price to pay for keeping Saddam Hussein uncomfortable.

No, for the Clinton gang the only motivation for imposing its will on Kosovo is to set another precedent for the New World Order. They want the people of the world to become accustomed to

the idea of "peacekeeping" forces and punitive air strikes whenever a country fails to obey orders or to conduct its internal affairs in an "approved" way. Murdered Albanian children simply provide the sort of excuse needed to fool the shortsighted American public into going along for the ride.

What does the American public think about starved Iraqi children? Not much, because the public doesn't have much chance to see starved Iraqi children on television, and when the public does occasionally see them their plight is blamed on Saddam Hussein, not on Madeleine Albright and her crew.

As I said, as much as I disapprove of some of the things the Serbs do, I am opposed to using American pilots or American ground forces to compel them to change their ways. I don't like the precedents being set. We may very well see those precedents applied to California or Texas in the not-too-distant future.

You know, if we are going to be the world's bully -- if we are going to take the position that we have the right to tell everyone else what to do, but no one has the right to tell us what to do because we're bigger than the rest -- then let's be honest about it. Let's just let everyone know that we can push the Serbs around if they mistreat the Albanians, but nobody can push us around if we forcefully put down a mestizo revolution in the southwestern United States.

The most important advantage of honesty is not that it gains us the respect of the rest of the world; it is that it helps us understand what's really going on. The deceit our government has been practicing serves more to keep the American people confused about motives and interests than anything else. It's clear that we can have a proper policy and make proper decisions only when we know what our motives are and understand whose interests are being served by our actions. I'm not really opposed to being a bully, if we do it honestly: if we have as our motive doing what is best for our people, for our European race.

But of course, we can't do that as long as the Clintonistas are in place and as long as most of our mass media are in the hands of the Jews. And as long as that deplorable and dangerous situation lasts, then every patriot must be opposed to the sort of policy the Clinton gang is pushing in Yugoslavia: this policy of telling other countries how they must handle their internal affairs and then bombing them if they don't obey. It is a policy which pretends to offer humanitarian relief to the Albanians but which in fact just strengthens the tyrannical hand of the New World Order crowd.

It is the same sort of bullying policy which led to our blowing up a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan a few weeks ago: a deceitful, bullying policy. We claimed the pharmaceutical factory was a facility for making nerve gas. That claim increasingly appears to be unsupportable. It looks like we destroyed that pharmaceutical factory primarily because we knew we could get away with it -- we knew that the Sudanese weren't strong enough to hit back -- and the Clinton gang believes it's smart to slap the Muslims in that part of the world around every now and then so they won't think about making trouble for Israel.

If we were serious about controlling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, then Sudan certainly is not the country that needs to be slapped around. You know and I know that there is only one country in that part of the world which is a threat to world peace or to our interests and which also has a huge stockpile of weapons of mass destruction.

Iran and Iraq can drop anthrax bombs on each other, or Jordan can nuke Damascus with a stolen warhead, or the Syrians can rocket Cairo with nerve gas -- and it will be worrisome if that happens -- but there's really no way we can prevent it, short of depopulating the entire area ourselves. Iran and Iraq already have used poison gas against each other during their war in the 1980s. The bright side of the situation is that most of these Middle Eastern countries have only local interests, and they have very limited capability for making trouble beyond their immediate neighbors.

The one country which serves as a constant irritant in that part of the world, the one country which provides an incentive for all the rest to acquire weapons of mass destruction, is Israel. Israel is the only country there which has been engaged in military conflict against all of her neighbors at one time or another during the past 25 years. Israel is the only country there which we know has been engaged in the development and manufacture of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons on a large scale and which has major stockpiles of all of these weapons now. And really more significant than these other observations is the fact that Israel is the only country there with global ambitions, the only country there with megalomaniac delusions of grandeur and galloping paranoia, a combination which makes dealing with Israel like trying to negotiate with a certified lunatic who has his finger on the trigger of a doomsday device.

If you're a careful reader of newspapers, you may have noted the dispute between Israel and the government of the Netherlands which has been raging this month. Six years ago an Israeli 747 cargo jet on its way from New York to Tel Aviv crashed into an Amsterdam neighborhood, killing 39 people on the ground. It was the worst air disaster the Netherlands has experienced. If you don't remember reading about it, it's because news agencies in America decided that it was a piece of news you really didn't need to know. Ordinarily such things are kept hushed up permanently, but what has caused this story to flare up recently is that a lot of people in the Amsterdam neighborhood where the crash occurred have been coming down with strange and serious ailments.

The Israeli aircraft had among its cargo 50 gallons of dimethyl methylphosphonate -- DMMP for short -- which is an exotic chemical the only known manufacturing use for which is the production of the nerve gas sarin. Also on board were quantities of the other chemicals which are required, along with DMMP, to produce sarin. The Jews, of course, are angrily insisting that their aircraft was carrying no "dangerous goods" over the Netherlands, that the DMMP on board was intended only for testing and research purposes, and that they aren't responsible for the sickness of the people who live near the crash site.

Now, everyone in the Netherlands involved in the investigation of this crash, as well as everyone in the United States concerned with controlling the spread of weapons of mass destruction, understands that the Jews are lying. They understand that the DMMP and the other chemicals on the Israeli 747 were for the manufacture of nerve gas. They understand that the United States

never should have permitted the export of the DMMP -- and in fact, would not have permitted its export to any country other than Israel. It is the one precursor chemical involved in the manufacture of sarin that is a little tricky to make. Once you have the DMMP, a high school chemistry student can make sarin with it and a few other easily available chemicals. In other words, exporting DMMP to Israel is tantamount to supplying Israel with nerve gas for use against her neighbors or anyone else. Let's remember that Israel is a country which sends its agents into other countries to squirt exotic poisons into the ears of religious leaders it believes are hostile to the Jews.

So let's not put on quite such a big pretense of being worried about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction when we blow up pharmaceutical factories in Sudan or threaten Saddam Hussein with another war. It may be that one of these days we will want to take drastic measures against people who are building stockpiles of nerve gas. It may be that we will want to interfere in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia or some other country. It may be that we will decide that it is proper for us to dictate to all the governments of the world how they should behave. But until we get our own affairs in order and become masters in our own country, we'd better just butt out of everyone else's business.

The Lesson of South Africa

We've spoken several times about the situation in South Africa -- in particular, about the systematic murder of White farmers there by Blacks and the failure of the new Black government to stop the murders.

The slaughter continues. Since I spoke with you about this in June, another 67 White farmers or members of White farm families have been murdered in South Africa. Many of the murders have been accompanied by torture, rape, and mutilation. Altogether nearly six hundred White farmers have been murdered by Blacks in South Africa since the Whites agreed in 1993 to let the Blacks run the country. That's one per cent of South Africa's 58,000 White farmers. Imagine the uproar in America if one percent of any occupational group -- say, White school teachers or White policemen -- were brutally murdered, with racial motivations, by Blacks in a four-year period. Of course, South Africa's White farmers are in an uproar too, but they're receiving virtually no help from South Africa's Black government in dealing with the problem. The government says it has too many other problems to deal with.

And indeed it does. The per capita murder rate in South Africa is now more than ten times the rate in the United States. The HIV infection rate has continued to climb, and now one in every five Black women of child-bearing age in South Africa is infected with the AIDS-causing virus. Car-jackings are up sharply. Burglaries are up. Rapes have sky rocketed. It's a mess.

And of course, the controlled mass media in America, the mass media which were beating the drums for an end to apartheid a few years ago, the news and entertainment media here which were pushing so hard for Black rule in South Africa and telling everyone that we must bring the injustice of White rule in South Africa to an end -- these media which were telling us every day before 1993 how bad things in South Africa under White rule were -- these controlled mass media in America are now strangely silent about South Africa. Now they have other fish to fry.

Last week I spoke at an international conference of nationalists in Thessaloniki, Greece. One of the other speakers at the conference was the foreign secretary of the most important White nationalist group in South Africa, the Herstigte National Party. I spoke with this man, Leon Strydom, about the killing of South African farmers, and the soaring crime rate in South Africa's cities, and the many other problems which are overwhelming White South Africans. I asked him, "What do the White South Africans who voted in 1993 to turn their country over to Black rule think about their suicidal foolishness now?"

His reply was, "But we never voted for Black rule! We never even voted to permit the Blacks to participate in elections. We only voted to continue the process of *reform* in which the government of F W. DeKlerk already was engaged, the process of *modernization* and *relaxation* of some of the stricter apartheid practices. We believed that this would help our relations with the rest of the world and still allow us to remain masters in our own country."

I responded to this explanation by asking him, "But surely the voters must have understood that if they gave DeKlerk the OK to continue along his path of appeasement of the Blacks and the

New World Order crowd, that would lead very soon to Black rule. They understood that, didn't they?" And he told me that most of the voters didn't understand that. They had believed their politicians' promise to maintain White rule. They had not expected DeKlerk and the others to betray them.

I was at first incredulous. How could White people be so foolish? But after I had thought about it for a few minutes, I realized that the average White person, whether in South Africa or the United States, is indeed that foolish. I believe that I tend to idealize White people in other countries, I tend to give them a little more credit for intelligence and moral rectitude than I give to Americans, and that's a mistake. The fact is that the majority of White Americans are quite capable of unwittingly voting for their own destruction, and so I should not be surprised that the Whites of South Africa did exactly that. The majority of White Americans believe the lies of their politicians and preachers, and so it shouldn't surprise us that the Whites of South Africa did the same thing.

In South Africa there were of course the nutcase liberals and the trendy airheads who were happy to see Black rule come and who now can't quite figure out what went wrong when the earthly paradise of equality and interracial brotherhood didn't arrive as promised. But we have exactly the same types in the United States. They're the ones who applaud Clinton when he gives his speech about how it will be a good thing when there is no longer a White majority in the United States in another 30 years or so, and then we can have real "diversity" and real "brotherhood." Our job, of course, is to do whatever it takes to ensure that our airheads never have to ask themselves what went wrong here. Our job is to disempower the trendies and the liberals before they have a chance to take us beyond the point of no return and say, "oops, we made a mistake."

As for the great mass of the people here who are unwittingly headed in the direction of White minority status, the great mass of Americans who don't really want America to become a non-White country but who trust their politicians and their preachers and therefore are headed toward extinction anyway -- as for the great mass of our people, education is the only course for us at this time. Our task is to give our people knowledge, to give them truth, and help at least some of them gather their wits and understand what is happening.

And you know, there is no more illuminating example, no better lesson for White Americans than what has happened and is happening in South Africa. That, of course, is exactly why the controlled mass media here remain silent when White South African farmers are slaughtered, when White South African women are gang-raped, and when many other very educational things happen in South Africa. So today let's briefly talk about some more of these South African things which it would be good for White Americans to know about, to think about, to ponder.

Perhaps the most instructive aspect of the South African tragedy is the betrayal of the people by those in whom they had placed their trust: principally their church leaders and their business/military/political establishment. Let's talk about the church first.

For the Anglo element in South Africa, the church -- that would be primarily the Episcopal Church -- wasn't of fundamental importance. Most of the English-speaking population didn't take their church very seriously, and everyone already understood that the Episcopal Church

establishment was thoroughly rotten, was completely sold out. But for the Boer element, the Dutch-speaking element of the population, it was different. They really believed in their church: that's the Dutch Reformed Church. There was what might be called a compact, a covenant, between the Dutch Reformed Church and the Boer people, and the Boers took their religion very seriously. Like most other Protestant sects, it was based heavily on the Old Testament. The Boers saw many parallels between the Old Testament pseudo-history of the Jews and their own history. They saw themselves as a Chosen People in the Promised Land and the Dutch Reformed Church as their protector and guide. And the Church to a certain degree did fill that role. The Church gave the Boers a scriptural basis for their lives, for their institutions -- including the institution of apartheid -- at least, up until the early 1980s.

I, of course, always have been very leery of churches in general, and I could see, as an outsider, some things in the teachings of the Dutch Reformed Church in particular which worried me: their tendency to identify with the Jews, for example. But whenever I would try to talk about my worries with South African visitors, I would be told that their church was absolutely solid. They had complete faith in their church. And of course, I didn't want to attack their faith, so I would drop the subject.

Well of course, when the crucial time came the Dutch Reformed Church did betray the Boers. Their church sold them out. Their church held them back from putting up any real resistance to the theft of their country. Why was that?

I don't believe that the Dutch Reformed Church in its earlier days was anything but what it pretended to be, and that was a Boer institution. I don't believe there was any long-running conspiracy in the Church to betray the Boers. But as the Boers prospered, so did the Church. The Church's leaders became prominent men, wealthy men. Many of the Boers' political leaders were ordained ministers in the Dutch Reformed Church. They were comfortable men, soft around the waist. They ate well and dressed well and lived well. And when the time came to make a hard choice: a choice between their people or their own comfortable positions . . . well, they made the kind of choice that comfortable people tend to make.

The situation in South Africa at the beginning of this decade was one in which White South Africans were still quite well off, despite the efforts of the New World Order crowd everywhere else to starve them into submission with a trade embargo. The country was big enough and rich enough and with a strong enough farming and industrial base so that it was able to take care of its own needs fairly well. There was no danger at all of the African National Congress or any other Black terrorist group causing any really major problems. Dealing with Black terrorists was hardly more than an ongoing training exercise for the South African military and counter-terrorist forces. What the White South Africans should have done at that time was simply expel all Blacks, terrorists or not, from South Africa -- or otherwise get rid of them -- reorganize themselves as an all-White country, and tell the New World Order crowd in the United States to go to hell.

They didn't do that, for several reasons. One reason was that South Africans had let themselves become dependent on Black labor. Urban Whites couldn't imagine life without their Black gardeners and cooks and housemaids and their Black garbage collectors and so on. They weren't

willing to do their own dirty work. On top of that, White businessmen weren't willing to give up their cheap Black laborers and pay White wages to White workers instead. In many cases it would have meant shutting down mines or factories, at least temporarily.

And the Dutch Reformed Church had sapped the moral strength of the Boers to the point that they just couldn't bring themselves to do what needed to be done. For at least 11 years before 1993 the Church had been back-pedaling on its racial doctrine. The Church would have made the Boers feel guilty if they had taken the hard measures against the Blacks that were called for to ensure the future of their own people. It was easy for the Blacks to contemplate massacring the Whites -- the African National Congress had the slogan "one settler, one bullet" -- but the Whites could no longer contemplate massacring the Blacks without feeling guilty.

The Jews, of course, were pumping their own spiritual poison into the White population through the mass media, urging them in a thousand subtle ways to surrender rather than fight. But it was betrayal by the Boer establishment -- the Boer politicians and Church leaders and big businessmen -- which sealed the fate of South Africa. The comfortable people wanted to stay comfortable. They didn't want to remain cut off from the rest of the world. They didn't want to have to tighten their belts and give up their profits and face a prolonged lean period as the New World Order tightened its sanctions on South Africa even more.

Many of them believed the lies of the Jews that things actually would get better in South Africa if the Blacks ruled and the sanctions were lifted. And so they lied to their own people and told them that if they would just go along with DeKlerk's plan of moderating apartheid, of reforming apartheid, then White rule would be maintained in South Africa. The Boer establishment -- including the Boers' church -- put its own short-term interests above the welfare, even the survival, of the Boer people. Greed prevailed over racial loyalty and racial responsibility.

In this regard it's interesting to note what the Dutch Reformed Church has been up to since 1993. If the Church's leaders expected South Africa's new Black rulers to be grateful to them for pushing their Boer constituents toward surrender, they badly miscalculated. So the Church has continued to try to accommodate itself to its new situation and somehow hold onto whatever it can. Actually, even before 1993 the Church had reversed its former doctrine and had told Boers that apartheid was a sin. The Boers at least had the gumption in 1994 to shoot the preacher, to shoot the former leader of their church, who was responsible for that change, but shooting just one traitor wasn't enough, and the Church kept back-pedaling anyway. Last month, the Dutch Reformed Church tried to merge with a Black and mixed-race church in South Africa and open its membership to all races. The opposition of one of its provincial branches stopped the merger temporarily, but next month, or next year it will happen. And then the Dutch Reformed Church will have Black deacons and Black elders, just the way the Episcopal Church has Black bishops today.

And what about the other traitors? Well, F.W. DeKlerk was rewarded with a Nobel Peace Prize and joined the illustrious ranks of such Peace Prize winners as Henry Kissinger, Menachem Begin, Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu, Elie Wiesel, and Yitzhak Rabin. Other Boer politicians also received their 30 pieces of silver and are holding down sinecures in the new government.

For the big businessmen things haven't gone so well. The horrific crime rate, together with the government's increasingly obvious corruption and growing inefficiency, has taken a toll. White urban professionals, no longer confident that they can protect their families, have been leaving the country in droves. This brain drain has created a critical shortage of management and other key personnel in many businesses and persuaded business owners to look for opportunities elsewhere. South Africa's Jews, in particular, after playing a key role in scuttling the country, are clearing out. Not all of them, of course. There still are some business opportunities in South Africa. Jewish organized crime groups from the former Soviet Union have been moving part of their White slave trade to South Africa. They first bring their White slaves from eastern Europe to South Africa, and then ship them off to brothels in other countries. The new South African government looks the other way.

But in general, businessmen are leaving, and last month the largest business in South Africa, the Anglo American Corporation, announced its plans to move from Johannesburg to London early next year. The Anglo American Corporation, which used to be run by Harry Oppenheimer and is still very much under the influence of the Oppenheimer family and other wealthy Jews, was the company which more than any other pushed South Africa toward Black rule. Even the Boer businessmen in the Anglo American Corporation were in favor of Black rule. All they could think about was getting the trade sanctions against South Africa lifted so they could improve their profits. They pushed other businesses into working to dismantle apartheid also. The bosses of the Anglo American Corporation told the Boer people that apartheid was old-fashioned and unprofitable and that it had to go, that everything would be much better for the Boer people without apartheid.

And now that it hasn't worked out that way, the Anglo American Corporation is pulling out, moving to London, where the big businessmen can remain comfortable and safe, where there is no danger of their suffering the fate of the Boer farmers whom they betrayed.

So that's what has happened in South Africa. In America the rich and the comfortable, those who are part of the religious establishment or the business establishment or the political establishment, also have shown their false colors. The politicians in America, of course, always have been the rottenest of the rotten -- at least, they have been that way since the mass media fell into the hands of the Jews.

And the Christian churches here, which even 60 or 70 years ago were still bulwarks of White American society, have fallen over each other since the Second World War in their scramble to adapt their doctrines and their practices to the Jewish party line. In the 1970s and the 1980s the churches in America were at the forefront of the institutions here pushing for Black rule in South Africa.

And, although they were a little slower than the rest to come around, America's big businessmen -- and I'm talking about White businessmen, not Jews -- clearly have decided that it will be more profitable for them -- at least in the short run -- to join the Jews instead of fighting them. There is hardly a major corporation in America which has not decided to base its business plans on a future non-White majority in America and to adjust all of its policies accordingly. The corporate bosses may vote Republican, and they may not personally relish the idea of their grandchildren

living in a non-White America -- but when it comes to choosing between profits now by going with the flow, or fighting for principles in the long run, the principles come second.

So what's the lesson for White Americans in all of this? Well, the lesson is that those who prosper from treason, or who believe that they will prosper from treason, will be traitors. There will be occasional exceptions to this rule, rare exceptions, but we'd better keep the rule itself in mind and not place our hope on the rare exceptions. If we want to survive as a people, as a race, then we must make treason unprofitable. We must make the preachers and the politicians and the corporate bosses believe that there will be no profit for them in treason. There is no other way.

Well, I'll not carry that thought any further at this time, but you think about it -- and thanks for being with me again today.

Tribes

Today let's talk again about an all-too-familiar subject: the murder of our people by the racial enemies we have taken into our midst. I don't really like to spend time talking about individual murders when matters so much more important and so much more tragic need our attention. But when I have talked about this subject in the past -- when I told you in August about the gang-initiation murder of two young White women by the Black and mestizo Crips gang in Fayetteville, North Carolina, for example -- the enormous response I received showed me that most Americans weren't aware of what is happening in this country.

They were shocked by what I told them. Or at least, they were shocked by the fact that they had to hear about these murders from me instead of from Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather or Peter Jennings. They were shocked that the news of these horrendous crimes against our people was suppressed by the national media. And I was shocked that my listeners were shocked. I had thought that everyone knew about this suppression of the news which doesn't fit. But apparently they didn't, and I suspect that many still don't.

So: two months ago, on October 2, Gary Trzaska, a 41-year-old apartment building owner, was jumped on by three Black teenagers as he walked along the sidewalk in front of one of his buildings in Buffalo, New York. Laughing and gesticulating like a troop of baboons, the three young Blacks knocked Trzaska down and then took turns kicking him as hard as they could. Several bystanders witnessed the attack but were afraid to come to Trzaska's aid. You know how the media would have dealt with that: "White adults assault Black children on Buffalo sidewalk. Janet Reno sends in FBI. Hate crime charges to be filed against White adults. Bill Clinton denounces White racism in special television appearance." Well, the bystanders didn't want to take a chance with that sort of thing. So they played it safe and just watched while the Black teenagers enjoyed themselves enormously as they kicked Gary Trzaska to death, and then ran off down the street, hooting and yelling.

A neighbor, George Boos, told the *Buffalo News*, "I've never seen someone so beat up in all my life. The doctor told me his insides were split open." Members of Trzaska's family told the *Buffalo News* that they couldn't understand why he was beaten so viciously, and they couldn't understand the motive for the killing, since $200 in cash in Trzaska's pockets was not taken by the young Blacks.

Well, the *Buffalo News* did report all of this. The story is in the paper's October 4 edition. Good for them! The problem is that papers outside Buffalo didn't report it. The national media didn't report it. People outside the Buffalo area weren't allowed to hear about it. It is news that just doesn't fit. You see, if a Black convict is dragged behind a truck in Texas by three White convicts, that is news that fits. It's big news. It's news that can be used to make Whites everywhere feel guilty about White racism.

Oh, incidentally, Trzaska was a homosexual. I imagine that because of that the media bosses really hated to have to pass up this story. It could have supplemented so nicely their story about the killing of the homosexual Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming, at just about the same

time and could have been used to prove once again to everybody how beastly people are who don't like homosexuals. But it just didn't fit -- the murderers were Black teenagers -- so the story was killed.

On October 16 three different Black teenagers, in Burlington, North Carolina -- 13-year-old Joseph Jones, 16-year-old Harold Jones, and a 17-year-old Black girl, Dorthia Bynum -- grabbed a 10-year-old White girl, Tiffany Nicole Long, from the sidewalk just a few doors from her home, dragged her behind a garage, and beat her and sexually tortured her until she was dead. One of the young Blacks twisted a piece of television cable around Tiffany's neck to stifle her screams while the other Blacks were torturing her. Police used bloodhounds to find Tiffany's mutilated corpse in a pool of blood behind the garage at 4:30 the next morning. Burlington police who viewed the little girl's body said the murder was the most vicious crime they had ever seen.

When the three Black teenagers who killed Tiffany were brought into court, dozens of the teenagers' relatives and the local NAACP showed up to protest. It's a racist county, the NAACP chairman protested, and the young Blacks wouldn't get a fair trial. The three Black teenagers are retarded, the relatives protested, and shouldn't be held accountable. The police were brutal to them in questioning them about the murder. They're just children, the Black relatives said, and they should be allowed to go home to their parents. With all that fuss one would think that Mike Wallace or *Time* or *Newsweek* magazine would have taken notice. One would think that the whole country would have heard about it, like they did about that Black convict in Texas who was dragged behind a truck. Did you hear about Tiffany's murder? Even one word?

Now, of course, many people around Burlington, North Carolina, did hear about it. Even people as far away as Greensboro and Raleigh read about it in their newspapers. Of course, they were told repeatedly by the local media that what happened to Tiffany was not a "hate crime." There was nothing racial about Tiffany's murder. I mean, how could there be? There were no White racists involved. The last thing the media wanted to do was get all of those North Carolina crackers stirred up. Anyway, news of Tiffany's murder, just like news of the murder of Gary Trzaska, just didn't fit. And of course, there are a lot of other things you haven't heard about in the last couple of months, because they don't fit. But as I said at the beginning of this broadcast, I really don't like to waste time talking about all of these crime details, because I'm afraid we'll end up studying the trees and failing to see the forest.

And I'm a lot more concerned about the forest than I am about the trees. That doesn't mean I'm not sickened when I read about the sort of thing which happened to little Tiffany Long, but the fact is that we are engaged in a war in which hundreds of millions of our people will die, and it's that war on which we need to focus our attention.

You know, the problem is not that Blacks do the sorts of things they did in Fayetteville or in Buffalo or in Burlington. That's the way Blacks are. Rape and murder are their thing. Most of the violent crimes in America are committed by non-Whites. We can't change their nature. We took them out of the African jungle and brought them into our midst, and we'll have to suffer the consequences of that terrible mistake until we remove them from our midst, one way or another.

Unfortunately, there is no peaceful way remaining for us to do that. All that remains to us now is violence and bloodshed and much, much suffering. There will be many more Crips gang-initiation murders, many more White people being kicked and stomped to death on the sidewalks of our cities, many more little White girls being dragged behind garages and sexually tortured to death by Black animals for whom such behavior is natural and normal. As I said, we're in a war, and there's no peaceful way out. It's simply win or lose.

One hundred thirty years ago, right after the Civil War, we could have ended this problem peacefully. We could have sent them all back to Africa. But we put it off, and now we've lost the opportunity for any peaceful resolution. In fact, we've lost the opportunity for a peaceful resolution to a lot of other problems. We let things slide to the point that we no longer can vote our way out. The two-thirds of the population which approves of Bill Clinton and thinks that he shouldn't be impeached just for lying about a few cigar tricks he did in the White House has got the decent, hardheaded people outnumbered now. The feminists and the queers and the welfare rabble and the non-Whites, together with the part of the White population which will vote for anybody who promises them more ball games on TV, can outvote the rest of us. And that's exactly what they'll do, shepherded by the Jewish media bosses. They'll destroy what's left of our civilization. They'll take us straight to hell, because all they care about is hanging onto the perks they're getting from the system. That's really all they care about.

I don't want to sound simple-minded about this. I understand that the next President of the United States may be a Republican instead of a Democrat. But he will be a man who will be elected only if he caters to the same coalition of system dependents, the same bread-and-circuses crowd -- feminists, homosexuals, recipients of monthly checks from the government, and non-Whites -- whose approval of Bill Clinton is currently scaring the Republicans in the Congress away from prosecuting him. And of course, whoever is elected must cater above all else to the Jews. This fundamental political situation becomes worse every year, as the country becomes less White through immigration and differential breeding rates and as the continued decay, the continued destruction, of traditional social institutions and structures yields more and more feminists, homosexuals, and confused, aimless people looking to the government for support.

Of course, if the media reported what's going on: if the White couch potatoes and fashion-conscious yuppies and trendy, liberal airheads had their noses rubbed in what's really happening in America, if the Jewish media began reporting things like the Black gang murders of White women in Fayetteville and the stomping of Gary Trzaska in Buffalo and the torture-murder of Tiffany Long -- if they began giving the same sort of coverage to all of these atrocities committed by non-Whites against Whites that they gave to the killing of a Black convict in Texas last summer and the killing of a homosexual in Laramie this fall, then enough White voters might get their act together to outvote the Clinton coalition. They might get some race-conscious politicians in office who could begin reversing some trends. They could begin by sealing the borders and launching a mass roundup and deportation of aliens. Then they could cut off the vote to everyone who's getting any kind of check from the government. That would be a good start.

But of course, the Jews who control the media understand all of that, which is why they will continue suppressing the news that doesn't fit. The last thing in the world they want is for the

White couch potatoes and sports fans to wake up and pay attention to what's happening. The last thing they want is for the present demographic trends to be reversed. They have the White, heterosexual male on the run, and they intend to keep him running. They intend to run him right into the ground. Then there won't even be any potential opposition to their rule; there will be nobody at all to challenge them.

You know, whenever I say something like that I get a storm of protest from people who tell me that I am wrong to attribute such a scheme to the Jews. They will tell me, "Sure, there are some pretty nasty and destructive Jews running the Disney Company and the *New York Times*, but they are only a small minority of Jews. There are six million Jews in the United States, more than two per cent of the population, and most of them have no connection to the mass media. I know a nice Jewish dentist," these protesters will tell me. "He does good work on my teeth and doesn't charge too much. You can't condemn all Jews just because a few of them are bad."

Well, of course, my real aim is not to condemn all Jews. My real aim is to secure the future for my people, to overcome the dangers that threaten that future. And you know, I cannot do that unless I address the problem of the Jews as a whole. I'll give you an example. Imagine that you are living in a nice, peaceful, clean, safe, White neighborhood somewhere in America where the diversity mongers haven't had a chance to do their wrecking job yet. It's a neighborhood where your wife can walk down the street to visit a neighbor, even after dark, without having to worry about being grabbed by a carload of Crips who need a White victim for an initiation killing, a neighborhood where your children can play outside without your having to worry that they'll end up like Tiffany Long, in a pool of blood behind some garage.

Then the house next door to yours is sold to a Gypsy family, say, and they move in: all 27 of them. Of course, the local Christian minister organizes a welcome party for the Gypsies, just to show that there's no bigotry, no racism, in your neighborhood, and all the airheads and trendy do-gooders in the neighborhood go to the party. You go too, just to find out what you're in for, and you meet all the Gypsies at the party.

And you discover that on the whole they're not an unfriendly bunch. Of course, the men all carry knives, and about two-thirds of them have criminal records, but two of them actually have steady jobs selling used cars. Their kids are dirtier and noisier than yours, but they don't seem really dangerous. One of the older Gypsies is a quiet, dignified sort, and you strike up a conversation with him. He has a good sense of humor, seems to be intelligent and civilized, and you think that perhaps he won't be such a bad neighbor after all.

Within a few days, however, reality begins setting in. Your kids' bicycles disappear from your yard and are never seen again. Someone breaks into your garage, steals all of your tools, siphons the gas from your car, and takes the battery. Trash from the Gypsies' yard blows over into your yard. The noise, especially late at night, is a real problem. You spot the older Gypsy you had spoken with at the church party on his front porch and decide to mention some of these things to him. He sympathizes with you, asks you to describe the tools that were stolen from your garage, and tells you that he will see what he can do.

And sure enough, the next evening when you come home from work he knocks on your door and hands you your set of socket wrenches which had disappeared from your garage. He tells you that he found them in his basement and suspects one of his nephews stole them from you, although he isn't sure. Of your electric drill and your other tools he found no trace, however. And for the next three nights there are no loud parties next door, and you are able to get some sleep. Your children have even made friends with two of the Gypsy children, and one of their little girls seems really nice. Of course, your children have to be treated for head lice regularly as a result of playing with their new friends.

A few problems with your neighbors remain, however. A couple of the young Gypsy women are "in business," with customers coming and going at all hours, and one of the Gypsy men stands out on the sidewalk every night until quite late, selling drugs to people who pull up to the curb. These activities bring some pretty unsavory people cruising through your neighborhood, and one night your wife is knocked to the ground and her purse is snatched as she is walking back from a friend's home in the next block. And then the loud parties start again.

You speak again with the older Gypsy, and again he sympathizes with you, but not quite as much as before. You tell him that he should kick out of his house the two prostitutes and the drug dealer, so that the neighborhood can live in peace with the rest of his clan. Well, no, he can't do that, he tells you. The two prostitutes are the daughters of his favorite son, and the drug dealer is his favorite nephew. Besides, they all need the revenue the activities of these three bring in. Their government welfare checks aren't enough to cover all of their expenses. He is really sorry about the situation, and he wishes he could do something for you, but . . . .

And what you finally understand is that your Gypsy problem cannot be solved by thinking about your Gypsy neighbors as individuals. As individuals some of them are not really bad people. But as a whole they have ruined your neighborhood, taken away your happiness and peace of mind, put your family in jeopardy, and cut the value of your property in half. If you want to solve this problem, it has to be solved as a whole. You begin to wish that you had listened to one of your neighbors who had suggested to you as soon as the Gypsies bought the house next to you that you should burn it down before the Gypsies moved in.

Now, the analogy is not perfect, but it's good enough. Our problem is not just a few bad Jews who own the *New York Times* and make propaganda films, while most Jews are good citizens who must not be lumped together with the bad ones. Our problem is the Jews as a whole. In the first place, they have a lot tighter grip on the news and entertainment media than just the *New York Times* and the Disney Company. If you make a detailed study of the mass media, as I have, you'll find that the Jews effectively control or own most of them: Hollywood films, newspapers, news magazines, television, the music industry. That's how they're able to suppress news of the Fayetteville murders and what happened to little Tiffany Long and to publicize the few White-on-Black crimes so heavily that they've got most voters believing that these White-on-Black crimes are typical of the criminal activity in America.

And as for the majority of the Jews, the ones who're not actually involved in the ownership or management of the mass media, you'll find more of them than you ever imagined possible

infesting all of the lower reaches of the media, so that if you get rid of the Jews at the top, more will simply pop up from below to take their places.

And you'll also find that on all questions pertaining to the welfare of Jews, they stick together as tightly as any Gypsy clan. If you want to, you go to that nice Jewish dentist you know and start talking with him about why the United States should cut off its huge annual subsidy to Israel and start supporting the Palestinians instead -- but after that you'd be well advised not to let him anywhere near your teeth.

One final thing to keep in mind: the media bosses who made the decision to keep the news of those Crips gang-initiation murders of the White girls in Fayetteville quiet and also the news of the torture-murder of little Tiffany Long did these things for a reason. It's not just a whimsical thing; it's systematic. They're doing it for the Jewish tribe, not just for themselves. They're doing it because they understand that we're in a war, their tribe against our tribe, and they don't want us to understand that.

How It Fits Together

We've talked about many subjects on these *American Dissident Voices* programs, but one theme which has appeared in nearly every program has been the role of the Jews, either in our history or in our lives today. To a certain extent that's been unavoidable, because of the influence they have over current events through their control of the mass media and because of their historical role in communism. But it's more than that.

What I've said, in one way or another on several programs, is that the Jewish role in our lives goes far beyond the fact that their control of the news and entertainment media gives them a big influence on popular culture and on the political process. Today I want to talk again about this Jewish role. I want to try to give you an overview of it first. There are about 14 million Jews in the world today, according to the *Encyclopedia Britannica Yearbook* for 1997. Nearly half of those -- about six million -- are now in North America, where they make up just over two per cent of the population but wield far more influence than any other group.

The world's 14 million Jews think and act like one big family -- even though, like most families, they do a lot of arguing and squabbling among themselves. They go to different synagogues -- Orthodox and Conservative and Reform -- or to no synagogue at all. There are atheist Jews, and there are Jews who have converted to Christianity. There are capitalist Jews and communist Jews, homosexual Jews and heterosexual Jews. There are rich Jews and middle-class Jews and even a few poor Jews, but despite this apparent diversity they do a better job of cooperating with each other and looking out for their common interests than any other ethnic group in the world.

Why is this? Why are Jews more racially conscious than anyone else? Why are they so much more ready to collaborate with each other than members of other groups? Part of the reason is in their religion. It is an ethnocentric religion, a racist religion. Whereas Christianity and Islam, for example, are universalist religions, religions for anyone who chooses to believe in them, Judaism is not. Judaism is a religion only for the Chosen People, only for the circumcised sons of Abraham. Jews are defined in terms of their bloodline, not in terms of their faith, which is why non-religious Jews like Freud or Trotsky or even Marx, the father of atheistic communism, are considered just as much Jews as the most pious synagogue-goer, with sidelocks and yarmulke. The non-religious Jews don't believe the hocus-pocus in their Torah, or Old Testament, but they nevertheless are steeped in the folklore and traditions of Judaism. They are as familiar as their religious cousins are with the claims that Jews are a Chosen People, destined to own all of the world's wealth and be waited on hand and foot by non-Jews. And they are familiar with the tales of persecution, from the time of the pharaohs until the time of Hitler: with the tradition of being universally hated by all the other peoples of the world -- which is why they believe they are justified in avenging themselves on non-Jews whenever they have the opportunity.

I'll not spend any time quoting Bible verses to you today, but if you doubt what I've just told you about the religious basis for Jewish ethnocentrism, just read the Old Testament: especially the five books of Moses and the book of Isaiah. Study them carefully. Even the bowdlerized King James translation is pretty clear. If you really want to rub your nose in this subject, do some browsing in the Talmud -- or for a solid scientific treatment, read the books recently written by a

real expert on the subject, California State University psychology professor Dr. Kevin MacDonald. All three of his books are available from National Vanguard Books, the sponsor of this program. Those books are subtitled *Judaism as a Group Evolutionary Strategy, Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism,* and *An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements.* Pretty heavy reading, but very convincing, very thorough.

This tendency of the Jews to stick together, always to favor their fellow Jews over non-Jews, and to work for the interests of their tribe instead of just for their individual interests is a fact: a very enviable fact. It is the primary reason for their extraordinary level of wealth and power through the ages.

You know, there are clubby little groups of White men who cooperate with each other to advance their interests. But those interests are personal and individual, not racial or even tribal. And virtually all of the really influential groups of this sort -- the Council on Foreign Relations, for example, or groups of very rich and powerful men, corporate bosses or bankers, are in fact heavily larded with Jews. They're not racial groups at all, even if they don't have any Blacks or Chinamen in them. They're simply special-interest groups, whereas the 14 million Jews of the world form a huge, self-conscious racial-interest group. They really are unique in this regard.

I wish that our people had the same degree of racial consciousness the Jews do. The Jews understand the power of togetherness. Most of our people don't. And this is largely the reason why we're in the mess we're in today. I'll come back to this point in a few minutes.

The second thing for us to understand about the Jews is their very unusual mode of existence, living nearly everywhere as a small minority among other peoples. If one looks at their history in the Biblical period, they were at most times a people on the move, living as strangers and aliens among other peoples, getting kicked out of one place after another, always on terms of enmity with the Gentile host population. Only for a little over 400 years, from approximately the time of King David until the Babylonian conquest, did they really have a national existence in the ordinary sense of the word, with geographical borders. When the Babylonians dispersed the Jews throughout the Middle Eastern and the Mediterranean world in the middle of the sixth century BC, the Jews adapted amazingly well to being a minority everywhere and a majority nowhere. Five hundred years later, in the first century BC, the Greek writer Strabo commented: "The Jews have penetrated every country, so that it is difficult to find any place in the world where their tribe has not entered and become dominant." Note those words: "There is no place where they have not become dominant." The great geographer and historian Strabo was not the only scholar of the ancient world to make that observation about the Jews. The Jews became dominant by accumulating a substantial portion of the wealth of every country that they infiltrated. And they accumulated their wealth by collaborating with each other and preying on the host population. Their collaboration was based on their racial consciousness, on their conviction that they were a distinct and unique people, superior to the people among whom they lived and deserving of whatever they could take away from their hosts. The Jews in Rome did not think of themselves as Romans who happened to believe in Judaism, but as Jews who happened to live in Rome. And the same for every other country where they lived.

With the sort of attitude and behavior the Jews had they were bound to be hated by everyone -- and they reciprocated. The Jews regarded the hatred they had for their hosts as justified, just as they considered deceiving and exploiting their hosts to be justified; but their hosts' hatred of the Jews they regarded as "bigotry" and "persecution." Their history is a chronicle of one "persecution" after another, right down to modern times. During the Middle Ages they were kicked en masse out of every country in Europe, repeatedly. They pretend today that this supposed "persecution" was the result of religious bigotry on the part of their hosts, but in fact it was simply self-defense on the part of their hosts, the same sort of reaction to their presence that the Egyptians and the Greeks and the Romans and everyone else in pre-Christian times had had. And it was this barrier of hatred between the Jews and the rest of the world which made it possible for them to maintain their identity and their sense of racial self-consciousness. If you want to study some of these details of Jewish history for yourself, there are many good books available. One I have read and found valuable is *A History of the Jews* by Abram Sachar. Sachar was the president of Brandeis University, and of course, he looks at history very subjectively and from a very Jewish point of view. But his history is revealing, and you can find it in most large libraries.

Now, this peculiar mode of existence of the Jews I have described changed to a certain extent shortly after the Second World War, with the theft of Palestine and the establishment of the new state of Israel on Palestinian territory. Today one-third of the world's Jews live in Israel, but this is only made possible because the other two-thirds are continuing their existence as parasitic minorities among Gentile hosts. Without a constant supply of money extorted from Germany, the United States, and other countries, Israel could not continue to exist. Israel would have gone under half-a-dozen times in its warfare with its neighbors during the past 50 years if the United States had not provided massive military and diplomatic support. If all of the Jews in America and Europe sold their television networks and newspapers and film studios and moved to Israel, that flow of blood from their hosts would be cut off, and Israel soon would cease to exist.

The third thing we must understand about the Jews is the way in which they maintain their status as the dominant minority among us today. In Strabo's day it was through their accumulated wealth. They were able to buy influence and special privileges for themselves. It remained that way pretty much for the next 1900 years. Throughout the Middle Ages they made themselves useful as sources of money to kings and popes and emperors. They would suck the wealth from the host population, and then give or lend some of it to the rulers in return for being allowed to keep their privileges. Although they usually were tolerated for their usefulness by the rulers, they were hated intensely by the general population. The Jews bought the tolerance of the rulers, but of course, they couldn't afford to buy the tolerance of the people.

And so until quite recently the Jews maintained a separate existence among the host population, often living in ghettos, not mixing socially with their hosts, generally not engaging in the same occupations, and regarded with disdain if not revulsion by everyone. The great advantage for our people of this mode of existence was that the damage done by the Jews was mostly economic, although they also caused political mischief when it suited their needs. But they had almost no cultural influence on our people. They didn't write books or plays, they didn't paint or compose music, they didn't clog up our universities, they didn't run for public office, and of course, they

didn't have television studios or newspapers or advertising agencies. And so to a large extent they lived their lives, and we lived ours.

That began changing drastically approximately 200 years ago, with the advent of the mass media and mass democracy, and the change accelerated greatly during this century. Jews understood immediately the potential that newspapers and other media gave them for extending their influence from the rulers to the whole population, and democracy made this extension of their influence relevant; democracy provided the tool for transforming influence into power. I've described on other programs the way in which the Jews acquired control of our mass media and, through the media, control of the political process, and I won't repeat that story today. There's an up-to-date summary of Jewish media control in the National Vanguard Books catalog, which is available from the sponsor of this program.

But I do want to emphasize this very important point: the way in which the Jews maintain their position as the dominant minority in our society has changed. It used to be moneylending and bribes, and the pressure was exerted only at the top, on the political leaders of our society; today it's control of the mass media of news and entertainment, and the pressure is exerted at every level of society. Some people still talk darkly about international Jewish bankers -- and of course, there are such animals today, just as there also are international bankers who are not Jews -- but the control of the media is the key to Jewish power today, not control of banking. The most important Jews today no longer are the Rothschilds and Warburgs and Hambros and Sassoons, but instead are the Eisners and Levins and Newhouses and Redstones and Bronfmans and Sulzbergers: the Jewish media bosses.

So now let's look at the details of the Jewish application of influence through media control. Most people have a very limited range of real life experiences. Television and films and glossy magazine advertisements provide an enormous expansion of experience for the average person, by substituting artificial experiences for real experiences. On the television screen viewers experience artificial social relationships, artificial romances, artificial conflicts, artificial life. In advertisements they are given artificial ideals of beauty and fashion, artificial life-styles to which they can aspire. And in their newspapers and newsmagazines they are given a carefully filtered, a carefully slanted, view of what is happening in the world.

And unfortunately most people do not have sufficient powers of discrimination to distinguish the artificial world of the media from the real world of everyday experience. The two worlds merge in their minds, and they can't tell them apart. What people see on the television screen is not just entertainment; it is a collection of artificial experiences which merges with their collection of real experiences and gives them a new and largely artificial basis for evaluating things and making decisions. Cleverly designed advertisements don't just show potential customers what is available and give them the information they need to choose what they want; clever advertising actually creates new wants, new desires, that didn't exist before. The advertisements manipulate people's desires and motivations. In a similar way television entertainment manipulates viewers psychologically. It changes their values and attitudes. It strongly affects the way they see things -- including political issues and political candidates.

Well, I hardly have to tell you that the modern mass media give enormous power, unprecedented power, to whoever controls them -- especially in a democracy. And really, no knowledgeable person who is honest will dispute my conclusion here. There are many people, who are not knowledgeable, who believe that they can watch television without being affected by it, who believe that they make up their minds independently without relying on the artificial reality supplied by television, but most of these people are mistaken, and the experts will agree with me on this. The mass media do shape public opinion, and in a democracy they do control the political process.

So now the only question which remains is this: To what end do the Jews who control the media use their control? What is their aim? What do they want? Now, the Politically Correct answer is that all the Jewish media bosses want is what any other businessman wants. The media bosses are simply businessmen, and their aim is simply to run their businesses at a profit.

Well, I'm sorry, but that simply isn't true. It simply is not a coincidence that everywhere you look in the mass media you see Jews in control. It's not a coincidence that a group making up only a little over two per cent of the population has virtually complete control over the mass media. The unanimity of the mass media on virtually every major issue of our time simply is not a coincidence. It is simply not a coincidence that the media bosses all just happen to have adopted the policy of hushing up Black-on-White crime and publicizing as widely as possible any White-on-Black crime. All of these things are planned and deliberate. They are the consequence of conscious collaboration. Only a fool can believe that it's all just coincidence.

The Jewish media bosses know what they want. It is control -- not just of the media, but of us: of everything. They want to own us and, to the extent that they cannot own us, to destroy us. Unfortunately, I cannot play for you a secret recording of one of their summit meetings, where they discuss their goals and their strategy, a la the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion.* I can only offer you the historical record and common sense. The record, for those who have eyes to see and an open mind, is pretty clear, beginning with the account in the book of Genesis of the takeover of Egypt by Joseph and his brothers so that they could all "eat the fat of the land," on through the ages to the Marxist takeover of Russia early in this century and the attempted takeover in many other countries.

You know, the Germans didn't begin throwing the Jews out of Germany in the 1930s because of Christian bigotry. It was because they wanted their country back. The Germans wanted to run their own universities and schools, their own newspapers and films, their own legal and medical professions.

If you want to understand the historical record, you must study it. I can't go through all of that for you in a half-hour program. I can only point the way. And as for the common-sense aspect of understanding what the Jewish media bosses are up to, we just need to clear the cobwebs out of our heads and realize that every racially conscious group strives for mastery, for domination, not just the Jews. That's Nature's way. That's the way it is in every barnyard and every schoolyard.

And that is why the media propaganda takes the deliberate slant it does: trying to make us feel guilty, trying to kill our sense of racial consciousness while the Jews keep theirs, trying to

persuade us to give up our arms, trying to silence all our dissident voices. Their aim is for us to be racially unconscious, for us to be ashamed of our nature and our traditions, for us to be afraid to organize for our common good, afraid of being thought racists. The deliberate aim of the Jewish media propaganda is to disarm us morally, to make us rootless and defenseless, and then to destroy us. That is what is happening now.

Think about it, and you'll see how it all fits together.

Aesop's Fables and the Rules of Engagement

Last week I gave an interview to a news reporter from a television station in Charlotte, North Carolina. That's station WSOC, channel nine, Michael Eisner's ABC affiliate in Charlotte. The reporter and his cameraman drove up to my broadcast studio in West Virginia. My organization, the National Alliance, has been doing some recruiting in Charlotte, and someone had given a copy of one of our recruiting leaflets to the reporter at a Charlotte gun show. The reporter apparently had checked with his superiors at his television station and been told that the National Alliance is a "hate group," so he had come up to check us out and interview me.

The reporter was an enthusiastic young man of apparently normal intelligence, although clearly a bit trendy, as virtually all media people are. While we were talking off-camera, he told me that he is a recent graduate of Auburn University in Alabama. During the interview we toured our book department, where we stock the books sold by the National Alliance. He noted that we advertise many children's books, and he asked me why.

I told him that decent children's books are becoming increasingly difficult for parents to find in bookstores or libraries, because the multiculturalists have had a devastating effect on the publishing of children's books, insisting that every illustration in children's literature show a racially mixed group, that homosexuals be portrayed positively, that little girls be shown doing typically "boy" things and vice versa. In fact, I said, there has been a real effort afoot to keep traditional children's books away from children. The multiculturalists don't want White children to learn about their own history and traditions. They don't want White children to learn the values and attitudes that are inherent in the sorts of books that White children used to read in America before the Second World War. So the National Alliance searches for good children's books which the multiculturalists haven't gotten to yet and makes them available to parents who want their children to learn these traditional values.

The reporter asked me for an example. I picked from our shelves a copy of a large, colorfully illustrated edition of *Aesop's Fables* which we sell and handed the book to him. The reporter flipped through the pages and asked me, "What's this all about?"

I was surprised by the question, but I answered, "You know, it's the collection of little stories, each with a moral, which have been attributed to the Greek writer Aesop, who lived about 600 BC, although some of his fables are much older than that."

Well, he didn't know. He had never heard of Aesop or his fables, he told me. And I suppose I shouldn't have been surprised. There undoubtedly are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of recent White university graduates in America who have gone through school during the multicultural era and have learned everything they needed to know in order to graduate just by watching MTV regularly. Their trendy parents, who also had a multicultural education, saw no need to introduce them to Aesop or to the Brothers Grimm or to any of those other "hateful" people who wrote children's stories without Black or "gay" heroes and who always portrayed little boys doing "boy" things and little girls doing "girl" things.

When I was a kid one of the special charms that *Aesop's Fables* held for me was the knowledge that Alexander the Great, for example, had read exactly these same stories when he was a child, more than 2,300 years ago. When I read the fable about the dog in the manger or the one about the shepherd boy who cried, "wolf," and thought about the lessons these fables taught, it thrilled me to think that every great man in our history, for thousands of years, had read these same stories when he was a child and had learned the same lessons.

Hey! But not any longer. These fables are what the multiculturalists call "Eurocentric," not to mention "sexist" and "homophobic." So are the morals the fables teach. And so today they are all "no, nos" for White children -- which is why we have a White population in America which is increasingly rootless, cosmopolitan, alienated, and atomized -- a White population which is unable to defend its heritage or to oppose those whose aim is to destroy that heritage, because they have no knowledge of their heritage, and who believe that anyone who values that heritage must be a "hater," a "racist." The professors at Auburn University must be really proud of themselves -- and the professors at nearly every other university in America too. They all are educating citizens for the New World Order -- rootless wonders all -- and certainly the last things these New World Order citizens need to know are the little lessons Aesop was teaching to Greek children 2,600 years ago.

Now do you understand why Bill Clinton is the way he is -- and why a majority of American voters still think he's an OK guy?

Speaking of politicians and voters, I got a big laugh out of what happened to New York's Republican Senator Alphonse D'Amato a few days ago. The poor guy had been counting on holding onto his job as chairman of the Senate Banking Committee by serving as an errand boy for his substantially Jewish constituency. Whatever the Jews wanted, Senator D'Amato fell all over himself in his eagerness to please them. He was the Jews' principal front man in their huge extortion racket for extracting Second World War reparations from the Swiss people. It was D'Amato, as chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, who twisted the arms of the Swiss and told them that if they didn't cough up all of the money the Jews were demanding, he would introduce legislation cutting off the ability of Swiss banks to do business in the United States. D'Amato would do anything the Jews demanded of him. In order to keep his position in the Senate he would gladly throw his Italian grandmother to the wolves, if it would please the Jews. But in the elections this month the Jews chose one of their own, Charles Schumer, to take D'Amato's job. So now D'Amato is out of the Senate, out in the cold without a job.

I can imagine him the day after the election going to his biggest Jewish supporters with tears in his eyes and asking, "But why did you desert me? Haven't I always done everything you asked of me, no matter how distasteful or dishonorable it was?" And I can imagine his top Jewish supporter looking coldly down his long nose at D'Amato and answering with a sneer. "Yes, but vot haff you done for us ***today?"***

So Alphonse D'Amato learned a good lesson about Jewish gratitude. I hope that many others of his type learn similar lessons in the future. I really enjoy seeing the expressions on their faces.

You know, I haven't received a letter from Alphonse D'Amato yet, but I have received letters from many other Americans asking me what I have against the Jews. There are many Americans who agree with me on almost every subject except the Jews. They agree with me that the political system which allowed Bill Clinton to be elected is rotten to the core. They agree with me that the quality of the electorate in the United States has declined to the point that democracy has become a threat to our civilization, not to mention a threat to our race. They agree with me on the pernicious influence of the mass media. They agree with me on the disastrous effect multiculturalism has had on our schools and universities. They agree with me that America's present immigration policy, which favors immigrants from the non-White parts of the world, is ruining the country. But when I tell them that the Jews play a key role in each of these problem areas -- that the Jews are in large measure responsible for what is wrong with our government, for what is wrong with the mass media, for what is wrong with our schools, for what is wrong with our immigration policy -- they run like frightened rabbits.

If I corner one of these people who agrees with me on everything except the role of the Jews, I'll hear from him how each of the evils I attribute to the Jews also can be attributed to non-Jews -- and I'll also hear from him that there are individual Jews who are opposed to each of these evils. And of course, all of that is true.

The Jewish program of extortion against the Swiss and the Germans has depended heavily on corrupt Gentiles like Alphonse D'Amato, for example. And I am sure that one can find individual Jews who believe this extortion racket is excessively pushy and could backfire on the Jews. But the fact remains that it is a Jewish racket. Despite D'Amato's role as front man, it is not an Italian racket; it is Jewish. And the same general considerations apply to all of the other problem areas I mentioned.

In the mass media, for example, there are bad actors who are not Jews. Rupert Murdoch is the most conspicuous of these. And there are a few Jewish columnists and editors and even publishers who are opposed to most of the destructive policies being promoted by their fellow Jews. Nevertheless, no reasonable person can deny that the influence of the Jews in the media outweighs that of any other ethnic group, and the dissent among media Jews is far outweighed by their agreement on virtually every major issue.

Or consider immigration policy. It's not just that the Clinton administration has a Jewess, Doris Meissner, in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is in line with the extraordinarily high percentage of Jews in other positions in the Clinton administration. The key to our present ruinous immigration policy is that Jews as a whole, not just Doris Meissner as an individual Jew, are in favor of it. There are non-Jews who also favor it, and there are a few Jews who oppose it, but in essence it is a Jewish policy, and it is the Jewish support for this policy which keeps it in place, despite widespread public opposition to it.

Or consider the White slave trade, which I have commented on in earlier broadcasts. Corrupt government officials, who are not Jews, in places like Ukraine, make it possible for Jewish slave traders to operate, and in addition to this there are a few Jews who oppose the White slave trade -- not to mention the fact that most Jews are not engaged in the slave trade. But without Jews there would be no White slave trade. That's the most important point -- not that the Jews have

Gentile collaborators or that most Jews aren't in that particular business or even that a few Jews oppose the trade, but that it is a Jewish business, and without Jews we wouldn't have it.

And without Jews we wouldn't have a lot of other problems too. That doesn't mean that we would have a problem-free society, but at least we would have manageable problems, and we could go to work on them without having to simultaneously fight the media and the government. Above all our other problems today looms the problem of Jewish control of our mass media, with the disastrous influence the media have on all our public institutions, from government to schools, and on private attitudes, opinions, and behavior.

To me that seems self-evident, and I really become impatient with people who refuse to recognize the key role the Jews are playing in the destruction of our civilization or who pretend to be confused by the fact that not every single Jew is involved or that non-Jews also are involved. This is a case where too much sophistication simply is not helpful: a case where trying too hard to be reasonable and fair will get us all killed and bring about the end of our civilization.

Can you imagine being involved in a war in which the primary rule of engagement was that you were not permitted to shoot at an enemy soldier, regardless of the fact that he was wearing an enemy uniform, until you had personally observed him shooting at you or had personally questioned him and determined his hostile intent -- a war in which you were required to assume that a soldier in an enemy uniform really was friendly until you had concrete evidence to the contrary -- a war in which your general explained to you that this rule of engagement was justified because most of the enemy soldiers were only support troops, not combat troops, and besides, there were a few soldiers on the other side who weren't really hostile -- a war in which you were liable to be court-martialed for anti-Semitism if you actually began shooting enemy soldiers? Can you imagine being in such a war? Clearly, the only way for your side to win would be for you to shoot your subversive general first and then adopt a new rule of engagement, under which the simple fact that a soldier was wearing the enemy uniform was sufficient evidence of his hostile intent and sufficient grounds for you to fire on him without further ado.

Now, the fact is that we are engaged in just such a war today. It is a war for survival, a war of extinction, of annihilation, a race war to the death. It is a war in which White Americans are being pushed to the wall, are being crowded out of their own land by non-Whites of every sort -- by Blacks, by Hispanics, by Asians, by Middle Easterners -- crowded out of their employment, crowded out of their schools, crowded out of their neighborhoods. It is a war in which there can be no truce, no peaceful resolution, only victory or extinction, because the populations of those who covet our living space continue to grow, while that space does not.

And in this war our generals -- which is to say, our government and our mass media -- are telling us that we must not judge our enemies by the uniforms they are wearing -- which is to say, by the color of their skin or the tribe to which they belong -- but we must ignore their uniforms and judge each of them individually, and we must keep in mind that some of them are pleasant and inoffensive individuals, while there are many very destructive and undesirable individuals among our own people. And especially, we must not judge our generals by the particular Middle Eastern tribe to which so many of them just happen to belong.

And of course, we are losing this war. It is time to shoot some generals and change the rules of engagement. It is time to be a little less confused by sophistries and to call a spade a spade -- and to call a Jew a Jew. And it is time to begin considering as traitors those who wring their hands and assert that there's enough space for everyone, and please, can't we all just learn to share and to get along with each other? It is time, as is proper during a war, to begin dealing with them as traitors.

Before we can do anything else, however, we need first to be able to think clearly about our situation, and then we need to find the courage to deal with it in a reasonable way. Many of our people do understand our situation -- many more, I am sorry to say -- than have the courage to deal with it properly or even to speak publicly about it. Lack of courage is a bigger problem for us than lack of understanding. The fact is that too many of our people are willing only to take public positions which will not subject them to too much criticism, positions which are not too dangerous and won't get them kicked out of the country club.

Of course, what's dangerous depends upon one's station in our society. In many social settings, for example, one can complain about the government's immigration policy, if one doesn't become too specific about the racial aspects of that policy. But almost nowhere can one openly talk about the Jewish aspects of immigration policy without risking reprisals. So that leaves on just a few of us now the burden of continuing to speak out, of continuing to explain our situation, of continuing to build understanding in our people.

So I'll finish today with a recapitulation: There are many of our people -- including educated people, successful people -- who, like the television reporter from Charlotte, North Carolina, who interviewed me last week, have never heard of Aesop and who believe that whatever he wrote wasn't really important. They are ignorant and rootless because they had trendy, airhead parents and went to multiculturalized schools where they were taught by Politically Correct teachers and professors. And of course, these people will raise their own children in a similar way and send them to schools where they will receive similar educations. So in a sense it is correct to say that a great many people are responsible for this deplorable situation, for this increasing rootlessness of each succeeding generation of our people; in a sense the whole society is responsible.

There is more to it, however: this rootlessness, whether manifested as ignorance of the oldest traditions of our people or in some other way, is not a natural or accidental development. It has been planned and orchestrated. It is deliberate. The people who planned it -- the people who continue to orchestrate it -- are Jews. In every society they enter, the Jews immediately begin gnawing on the roots. They understand that only after they have destroyed the people's roots -- only after they have made the society rootless and cosmopolitan -- will they have free rein and be able to manipulate and exploit the people without resistance. They understand this at an instinctive level. That is why wherever you look in a society which has been infested by Jews, into whichever festering sore you peer, you will find the Jews at work destroying roots.

They have many collaborators among our own people, but the plan to cut our people loose from their roots, so we will have no basis for defending our civilization, is a Jewish plan -- just as the racket to extort billions of dollars from the Swiss and the Germans and other European peoples

for wrongs allegedly inflicted during the Second World War is a Jewish racket, despite the collaboration of non-Jews such as Alphonse D'Amato.

The program to weed all traditional books for White children out of libraries and out of school curricula is a Jewish program, despite the fact that one can find individual Jews who claim to support traditional education and traditional culture. One can find organizations run by Jews which support performances of Shakespeare's plays. One can find Jewish Mozart societies and Jewish Beethoven societies. Perhaps one can even find a Jewish Aesop society if one looks hard enough. But as surely as Aesop is being removed from our culture, so are Shakespeare and Mozart and Beethoven. The Jews appropriate our culture and our traditions before they destroy them. But destruction always is their ultimate aim, and the Jewish mass media are the principal agents of destruction. That is what we must remember. That is why we must change the rules of engagement.

What We Owe Sam Dash

Something very interesting happened on Friday of last week. Samuel Dash, a high-profile Jew lawyer that Special Prosecutor Ken Starr has employed for the past four years as a high-priced consultant during his investigation of Clinton's illegal behavior, suddenly torpedoed his employer in a sneak attack that severely damaged the effort to impeach Clinton and remove him from office.

Let's look at the details. Samuel Dash gained his high profile 25 years ago, when he was the chief counsel of the Senate committee investigating the Watergate scandal. He had close ties to people at the *Washington Post*, and it has been widely assumed that he orchestrated the torrent of leaks from his investigating staff to the media. It was these leaks to the media day after day, for month after month, virtually all of them damaging to Nixon and his allies, which unraveled the Nixon presidency. In any case, Dash played a key role in the process which eventually forced Nixon to resign from office in 1974.

When Ken Starr hired Dash in 1994 as a member of his staff to investigate Clinton's criminal activity, the reasoning seemed to be that as a well-known Jewish Democrat, Dash would give "balance" to Starr's team and deflect charges from Clinton supporters that the investigation was a partisan effort by Republicans and Christian conservatives out to "get" Clinton. And Dash was not the only Jew working for Ken Starr. Starr, a naive, straitlaced preacher's son, really seems to have a blind spot where Jews are concerned -- as in fact, a great many other Christian conservatives do. In Starr's case, perhaps the fact that he is married to a Jewess has had something to do with his leaving himself open to Jewish sabotage.

Starr was paying Dash $3200 a week for four or five hours of work -- until Friday of last week. On Friday, the day after the opening of impeachment hearings by the House Judiciary Committee, Samuel Dash announced that he was resigning from Ken Starr's staff because Starr wasn't being fair to Mr. Clinton and had acted unethically in giving his opening statement to the Judiciary Committee on the previous day. Dash had given Starr no warning of what he intended to do, and it caught the special prosecutor completely by surprise. It didn't catch the media people by surprise, however, because rumors already had been buzzing among them that Dash was involved in secret meetings with Clinton's people in the days before his resignation last week, and so they were expecting some interesting developments. Other members of Starr's staff had exactly the same suspicions. One of them was quoted by *Newsweek* magazine this week saying that Dash had become a "traitor" who "willfully aligned himself with the other side." Starr was especially surprised, because he had showed to Dash the report he intended to give to the Congress, and Dash had agreed with all of Starr's conclusions.

What was really interesting was to see the Republicans backpedaling and the Clintonistas gloating after Dash sandbagged Starr. The Republicans already were nervous about continuing with the impeachment process against Clinton after the lemmings had shown in the election results earlier this month that they were more interested in getting back to their ball games and funny papers than in having the law enforced. When Dash denounced the prosecution of Bill

Clinton as "unethical," many Republicans ran for cover. It's clear that they're looking for a quick and easy way out now, rather than giving Clinton the punishment he deserves.

Now, the really interesting question is, why did Dash do it? Why at this time torpedo the investigation that he had been a part of for four years? Why was he so eager to let Clinton off the hook that he would betray the man who had hired him as counsel and risk charges of unethical behavior himself?

Now I'll tell you what I think. I can't prove it, but if I am correct events soon will prove me right. I think that the bigshot Jew lawyer Samuel Dash made a secret deal with Bill Clinton on a matter of great importance to Dash's fellow Jews. Dash would launch a treacherous, surprise attack on his employer, Kenneth Starr, and take much of the steam out of the impeachment process if Bill Clinton would make a firm commitment to find any convenient excuse for getting the war against Iraq started quickly: any plausible excuse. As I prepare this broadcast, the war still hasn't started. It may have begun before I'm actually on the air. But if it hasn't I have a strong suspicion that Mr. Clinton soon will seize any pretext, no matter how flimsy -- he will invent a pretext -- for claiming that Saddam Hussein is defying the United Nations again. The Jewish media will back him up, of course, and the slaughter will begin.

Now, that's just my hunch, my suspicion, as to Samuel Dash's motive for doing something which is otherwise inexplicable. The Jews really do want this war. They desperately need this war. And they certainly don't want to have to fight it themselves. Well, we'll see. Meanwhile, we get to see that grinning piece of filth in the White House become cocky again in the knowledge that he's beat yet another rap -- probably.

You know, it's my belief that it behooves us always to try to find something good in our situation, no matter how bad it seems. We ought to look for an advantageous aspect in every disaster that befalls us and see what we can do to make it more advantageous. That's the only way for us to keep our courage up; it's our only hope for improving things. And certainly, if we assess our situation objectively today, it is a full-fledged disaster. We Americans -- we White Americans, we European Americans -- are largely a population of mindless, spineless lemmings with a government consisting entirely of criminals, and we are all -- people and government -- under the control of a tribe of alien, bloodsucking parasites who use us and abuse us at their pleasure.

Perhaps that summary of our situation sounds too harsh, too extreme -- but I believe that it's pretty accurate. Just back off for a minute and look at what already has happened to us. At the beginning of this century we were the undisputed masters of all we surveyed. There was no possibility of Black thugs terrorizing White children in our public schools, no possibility of mestizos pouring across our southern border and taking over the southwestern United States while we did nothing to stop them, no possibility of Jews using our popular media to blatantly persuade our trendy young women that it's fashionable to go to bed with Negroes, no possibility of having someone like Bill Clinton in the White House. And today we have all of these things.

That's a very crude summary of the transformation in our situation which has occurred in this century, but it's accurate. Every one of these changes actually has occurred. I've spoken with you

on many broadcasts about how these changes occurred. I've spoken with you about the gradual takeover of our mass media by Jews, about the way in which they consolidated their control of Hollywood and of Madison Avenue and of our most influential newspapers and magazines. I've spoken with you about the way in which this Jewish control of our media has been used to change our attitudes and values, to weaken us, to make us more tolerant of every sort of evil; I've spoken with you about the effects of the media, the effects of propaganda on our people. I've spoken with you about how the American electorate has been degraded as it was extended to broader and broader segments of the population during this century. I've spoken with you about the fundamental flaws in democracy itself. And it's important to understand all of these things, to understand this disaster. But, hey, I promised you a bright spot we could focus on.

So how's this for a bright spot: Clinton, after being exposed for what he is, after having the incontrovertible proof of his criminality displayed for all to see, gets to remain President. This lying draft dodger gets to become a war hero by being our fearless commander-in-chief while we use our cruise missiles and smart bombs to wipe out all of those camel jockeys and towel-heads in the Middle East -- and their women and children too, of course: little towel-heads will grow up to be big towel-heads who will then be a new problem for those nice, democratic, Jewish allies of ours in Israel. Clinton gets to stay in the White House for two more years, begins getting good press again, and then gets honorably discharged with all of the perquisites the system provides for ex-presidents.

That ought to knock some wind out of those who think the system is still basically sound and we ought to give it a chance to work. That ought to wake up some of the wishful thinkers who still believe we can vote our way out of this disaster. Seeing Clinton get away with everything he's done and watching his popularity rating with the lemmings shoot back up ought to help us straighten out our thinking about political matters.

Those Americans who still think of themselves as patriots -- those who still think -- ought to learn something valuable from this obscene circus we have been witnessing in Washington. They ought to stop believing that the Republicans or any other political party can rescue them from the Democrats. So if we can't vote our way out of our current disaster, what can we do?

Well, one thing that we cannot do at this time is shoot our way out. I just don't believe that any scheme based on illegal activity or on a violent confrontation with the government can succeed at this time or in the near future. The Pentagon's cruise missiles and smart bombs can be used against us just as easily as against Iraqi women and children. I know that there are some Christian patriots who believe that their faith will give them an advantage over Washington's forces of godless democracy, but that'll work about as well as the faith that many Blacks in Africa have that their witch doctors can make them immune to bullets. And there are some militia people who are looking forward to a major disruption of Washington's forces in the year 2000, when, they believe, the government's computers will stop working. But that's also wishful thinking. Any disruption of government capabilities in 2000 will be very minor and ultimately inconsequential.

The best thing that one can hope for in that direction is that there may be a few leaders in our armed forces who have some sense of honor left and who will decide that they cannot

simultaneously obey Bill Clinton as their commander-in-chief and also satisfy their obligations to their country. In fact, a few lower-ranking officers already have said as much in public statements recently. But you know, the Jews and the democrats began worrying about that sort of thing a long time ago, and they've pretty well done the same sort of wrecking job on our military leadership that they've done on our universities. Ever since the end of the Second World War the only way one could rise in the leadership ranks of our armed forces was to be a paragon of Political Correctness. If we had a few top generals today of the George Patton stripe -- and 60 years younger, of course -- Clinton and his whole crew of Jews, lesbians, and sniveling, 1960s-style trendies would have been dragged out of the White House, put up against a wall, and shot long before now. And then a similar cleansing operation would have been repeated at the Capitol and then at the Justice Department and at a dozen other government buildings. As it is, I'm not confident that there's a general left on active duty who still has a sense of honor. They're all politicians these days: all Eisenhower types. When a country decays, all of its institutions decay.

I'll repeat what I've already said: the biggest benefit to America to come out of the Clinton affair is the clear and forceful demonstration that it is not just Clinton but the system itself which is rotten and which must be replaced. That demonstration has had no effect on the lemmings, of course, other than persuading a few more of them that there's no point in voting, but in the long run the lemmings don't really count anyway. What the patriots should have learned -- what the independent thinkers should have learned -- is that we must stop wasting our time on various reform schemes and instead prepare for revolution.

And how does one prepare for revolution in our situation? I have been told by people who should know, by trained psychologists, professors of psychology, that everyone acts in accord with his perceived self-interest. Perceived self-interest is what motivates people, whether they are professors or generals or businessmen or office workers or housewives.

And for a long time I resisted believing that. I wanted to believe that there was something else in our people, something finer, something nobler. I wanted to believe that a patriot, for example, is a person who is motivated by a sense of history and tradition and a deep love for his people and for what is right. But I now accept the view of the psychologists that patriots are pretty much like the rest of the population, just with different opinions. They say patriotic things, but when decisions must be made about what to do, they act in accord with their perceived self-interest -- in most cases. Undoubtedly there still are a few zealots among us, a few Eric Rudolphs and Timothy McVeighs, who will do what they believe is right rather than what seems advantageous. But one cannot make a revolution with a handful of zealots. What we must do is persuade a substantial number of patriots -- and more generally, a substantial number of thinking people -- that their self-interest will be better served by revolution than by supporting the system or by sitting on their hands.

I'm not talking about persuading a majority. We're not looking for votes. But we must persuade a few hundred thousand thinking people -- a few hundred thousand people who now are involved in keeping the system going in one way or another -- we must help them understand that their interests really lie in getting rid of the present system and building something new and fundamentally different.

How does one persuade a general who is receiving a salary of $120,000 a year plus really a lot of very nice perks from this system that it will be to his advantage to do away with it? How does one persuade a university professor who has a secure and comfortable position in a system that demands only Political Correctness from him that he should turn against that system? How does one persuade a businessman who has learned how to turn the system to his advantage, despite its corruption, and to make a good profit from it that he should begin rocking the boat? How does one persuade the office worker or factory worker, who despite everything is still living pretty comfortably, that he should bite the hand that is feeding him?

We have observed over and over again in history that strong governments are not overthrown from within, no matter how immoral and oppressive they are. Only weak governments are overthrown from within; only weak governments are susceptible to revolution. Unfortunately, there's not much that you or I can do to weaken this government at this time. Bill Clinton is doing a much better job of that than we can. Our job now is simply to help people see the system's weakness, to help them understand that continuing to put their faith in a weak system will not serve their interests well. That job is more difficult when people are feeling comfortable and secure, easier when they are uncomfortable or frightened.

This is a difficult time, despite all of the help Bill Clinton is giving us. This is a time when it is very difficult to persuade people who have a short-range perception of where their interests lie. This is a time when we are able to persuade only those who have a fairly long-range view of things, those who include in their own self-interest the interests of their children and their grandchildren: those who really care what sort of world their children must live in. And you know, there still are a fair number of our people out there who do care about things like that, people who do think beyond what's in the refrigerator and how much they can charge on their credit card this month.

Even among our political generals, there are those who deeply resent having to take orders from a slimeball like Bill Clinton -- of that I am certain -- and I suspect that among these there are a few who do think ahead to the long-range implications of our situation. Among our most Politically Correct professors, who with their careers in mind always remember to genuflect to the campus feminists and homosexuals and diversity-mongers, there is a great deal of cynicism -- of that I am certain, because I speak privately with some of them -- and I also am certain that some of these cynical professors do understand where this society is headed in the long run and are not happy with that prospect. And I could make a similar comment about even the most profit-hungry of our businessmen, who are now going along in order to get along.

And so we don't want to write these people off, no matter how disappointing their performance may be to us today. Perceptions change as conditions change, and we should be doing whatever we can to help these people extend their perceptions and understand what the future holds. More than that, however, we can reach out even now to the people in our society who already have a broader sense of self-interest, a sense of self-interest which already comprehends the interests of their grandchildren and which considers more than credit-card balances. There are people now who still judge their self-interest in aesthetic terms and spiritual terms as well as financial terms.

The lemmings may be able to listen with equanimity to Bill Clinton pontificate from the White House or to look at his smiling face on television for two more years as he tells us even more lies, but that prospect really grates on people who have any sort of aesthetic sense. The world these more sensitive people live in is diminished, their lives are diminished, by having to share their world with Bill Clinton. And that's good, because that puts them in a more receptive frame of mind when we try to persuade them that we need to organize the best of our people and do something fundamental about the system of which Bill Clinton is a part. Perhaps we ought to be grateful to the Jew lawyer Samuel Dash for that.

The Holocaust Shakedown

Imagine that a robber walks into a bank, points a pistol at a teller, hands her a bag, and demands that she put all the money from her cash drawer in it. At first she protests, but then, after he threatens to shoot, she fills the robber's bag with cash. And then imagine that, as the robber walks out of the bank with his bag of loot, the bank guard opens the door for him, smiles at him, offers to hail a cab for him, and tells him to come again soon. After that it's not difficult to imagine that he probably will.

That's about the way it's been with the Jews recently. Two years ago they put a gun to the head of the Swiss people collectively and demanded billions of dollars in reparations for Swiss bank accounts they claimed had been owned by Jews who disappeared during the Second World War. The Swiss initially protested that unclaimed Jewish bank accounts from the 1930s and 1940s amounted at most to a few million dollars, not to billions, and besides the war ended more than 50 years ago and claims should have been filed long ago. The Jews threatened to shoot, figuratively speaking, by having their bought politicians in the United States prevent Swiss banks from doing business in America. Eventually they walked away with $1.25 billion in loot, with the Swiss apologizing for not having coughed it up sooner.

After that sort of success with the Swiss one could hardly expect the Jews to give up extortion and go straight. So anyway, they were back again soon, with demands against the Volkswagen Company for having used Jewish workers during the Second World War and providing them only with room and board but not paying them union-scale wages. One might think that these Jewish workers would be grateful to Volkswagen for keeping them alive during the war, feeding them, and giving them a roof over their heads, when so many German civilians had only bombed-out ruins to live in. Well, if you thought that, you just don't understand Jews. The Jews told the Volkswagen Company that if it ever wanted to sell any more cars in America, it had better cough up -- soon. And the bought politicians and the media bosses in America began rattling their sabers and talking loudly about sanctions of various sorts against Volkswagen. And so, like the Swiss banks, Volkswagen coughed up the money.

Then the feeding frenzy started, just as I told you it would two years ago, when I predicted that after the Jews had cleaned out the Swiss they would go after other victims in a long list. Volkswagen wasn't the only company which had used involuntary labor during the war. The Jews went after Daimler-Benz and BMW and Siemens.

And Switzerland wasn't the only country where Jews could claim that Uncle Abe had stashed some of his loot sixty years ago, before the war. So they sued banks in France and in Britain and began moaning and whining in the media that the banks were being "insensitive" to poor, deserving "Holocaust survivors," who suddenly had remembered Uncle Abe's millions and needed it -- now. And then they remembered the insurance companies in Italy and Switzerland and Britain and elsewhere from whom they could claim that Uncle Abe once had had a life-insurance policy. Then they remembered that the Swedes owed them gold, and the Danes and the Norwegians. Even the Poles, whom the Jews had ruled as Bolshevik commissars for nearly 50 years after the war, owed them, they claimed.

The racket has worked the same in every case: pay us, or we will have our bought Gentile politicians pass laws making it impossible for you to continue doing business, and our people in the media will paint you as monsters who want to hang onto the profit you made when poor Uncle Abe and Aunt Sara were crammed into gas chambers, and then the gullible Gentile lemmings won't buy your products. If you give us any trouble or resist our demands we'll make an example of you, the way we did with the Swiss banks. Just pay us the few hundred million dollars we're demanding now, and we'll leave you alone. Otherwise, it'll end up costing you a lot more.

And it has worked every time. Not one banker or businessman has stood up to them and flatly refused to pay. Not one president or prime minister has said to them, "All right, Jew boys! You try a boycott against my country, and we'll organize a boycott against Israel. We'll round up all the Jews in our country and send them packing." Not one has called the Jews' bluff. They've all calculated that it is cheaper to pay the gangsters than to fight them, and so they pay. Honor means nothing to these businessmen and politicians. Principles mean nothing to them. All they care about is continuing to make money, continuing to stay in office.

With this sort of attitude predominant among the Gentiles, one can hardly blame the Jews for turning to extortion on a larger scale than ever before. They are successful at it; therefore they continue to do it. And they don't limit themselves to Europe or to those who allegedly cooperated with the Germans in their demand for reparations. A few months ago they filed a claim against Britain for $600 million they claim the British government confiscated from Jews between 1940 and 1942 when the British governed Palestine. Remember, the Jews were waging a guerrilla war against the British prior to 1948, when the British finally gave up and pulled out, letting the Jews slaughter the Palestinians and establish the Jewish state of Israel on Palestinian land. The Jews were kidnapping and murdering British soldiers in Palestine and assassinating diplomats. In 1946 the Jews used a terrorist bomb to blow up the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, which was the British government headquarters. This Jewish forerunner of the Oklahoma City bombing killed a large number of British civilians and military people. And now the Jews are demanding $600 million in reparations from the British!

And of course, the Jews also are expecting payoffs from American companies. Both Ford and General Motors had subsidiaries working in Germany when the Second World War began. The Ford plant in Germany made military vehicles for the Germans throughout the war, and the General Motors subsidiary, Opel, did the same. And so now the Jews are claiming that both Ford and General Motors owe them a great deal of money because of that. The Jews already have filed a class-action suit against Ford in a Federal court in New Jersey, seeking hundreds of millions of dollars in wages plus interest for Jews who worked in Ford's German plant during the war. And because the businessmen who run Ford and General Motors today are the same sort as those who run the Volkswagen Company, they undoubtedly will pay off the Jews rather than risk having the media portray them as "insensitive" types who profited from the so-called "Holocaust" and now refuse to share their loot with the poor, deserving Jewish "survivors." Two hundred years ago the American motto was, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." But in those days Americans were made of sterner stuff -- and I assume that our people in Europe were too.

Cash isn't the only thing the Jews are going after. They have decided that a substantial portion of the art treasures of Europe really belonged to Uncle Abe too 60 years ago and ought to be returned to the Jews now. It is true, of course, that during the war the German government had a keen interest in bringing as much Germanic art as possible back under German protection. They bought all the Vermeers and Rembrandts and Holbeins and Dürers and Halses and other Germanic art works as they could from owners in the conquered countries and brought them back to Germany. And when the works the Germans were interested in were in the hands of Jews, they often brought pressure to bear and obtained the works at low prices. The Germans, however, generally weren't interested in modern art -- certainly not in Jewish paintings by Chagall or Modigliani, for example -- and a great many such modern paintings ended up in the hands of Jewish art dealers. In fact, the Germans often had agreements with Jewish art dealers, swapping the modern paintings they weren't interested in for the Germanic paintings they were interested in. The biggest of these Jewish dealers, Georges Wildenstein, was in Paris, and he acquired an enormous number of modern paintings during the war. After the war he brought them to New York and later sold hundreds of them to museums and private collectors around the world. The Jews currently are engaged in a huge treasure hunt for those paintings now in Gentile hands which formerly belonged to Jews. The facts that most of these paintings were acquired by their present owners from Jewish dealers such as the Wildensteins and that many of them were legally purchased from their Jewish owners during the war are glossed over. All of these paintings are characterized by the Jews as "art stolen from victims of the Holocaust by the Nazis," and they want it all back now.

There's an interesting double standard here. A messy divorce in the Wildenstein family attracted public attention last year to the Jewish family's business dealings in Paris during the war, and another Jewish family claimed that the Wildensteins have artworks that actually should be returned to them, because they were forced to sell them at fire-sale prices during the war. The Wildensteins told them to buzz off: the statute of limitations for such claims expired long ago, the Wildensteins asserted. Of course, no Gentile owner dares make such an assertion. But in fact, there are statutes of limitations for most claims. Dormant bank accounts typically become the property of the government after being unclaimed for 20 years or so, but when the Swiss brought up that legality two years ago, the Jews went into their "persecuted victim" act, feigning outrage that the Swiss should try to let a mere law stand between the Jews and what they were claiming in reparations.

Whenever the Jews, in order to remind the world for the six-millionth time of their "victim" status, have accused some elderly German or Pole or Ukrainian or Lithuanian of having mistreated Jews 55 years ago during the war, there is no question of a statute of limitations. If anyone mentions that legality, Jewish shrieking in all of their media quickly drowns him out. For an injury, real or imaginary, done to a Jew by a Gentile there is no statute of limitations, no matter how much time has passed. The Jews still celebrate every year in their Purim festival the revenge their ancestors took on the ancient Persians 2,500 years ago through their control of a corrupt king.

Yet when the Polish government asked the government of Israel a few months ago to extradite a Jewish mass murderer, Solomon Morel, so that he could be tried in Poland for genocide, the Jews refused. "There's a statute of limitations for extradition," the Israelis told the Poles, "and

you're too late." Morel was the Jew-communist commissar of a concentration camp in Poland after the war, and he had tortured hundreds of Poles and Germans to death. When he saw the possibility of retribution looming, Morel, like thousands of other Jewish criminals before him, fled to Israel. The horrifying atrocities committed by Solomon Morel have been described in the 1993 book *An Eye for an Eye* by John Sack.

This same double standard applies to every sort of interaction between Jews and non-Jews. It is a fact that in wars people suffer losses. Usually, within a few years after the wars are over, people try to get on with their lives, and they consider what is past to be past. If other people behaved the way the Jews behave, then every Englishman whose family residence got hit by a bomb during the "blitz" of the Second World War would be clamoring now for the German government to reimburse him for the repairs that his grandparents had to make 55 years ago -- plus interest, of course. And if it's all right to go back 55 years for claims, why not go back 135 years and let all of the Americans whose ancestors' homes and farms in Georgia were burned by General Sherman collect damages from the U.S. government now -- plus interest, of course? Or why not go back 220 years and demand that Tony Blair's government pay reparations to all of those Americans whose ancestors suffered property loss from the Redcoats during the First American Revolution -- plus interest, of course? I mean, if the Jews are allowed to keep score, without regard for time, why shouldn't everyone else? Why not set up some sort of World Court for Reparations? I imagine that there are a lot of Palestinians who would like to file claims against the state of Israel.

The fact is that we would have international chaos if everybody behaved the way the Jews do. So this raises two interesting questions: Why do the Jews behave the way they do? And why do we let them get away with it?

Well, I've already given an answer of a sort to the first question: the Jews behave the way they do because we let them behave that way; it's just like the case of the bank robber, who will keep coming back until the bank guard stops being nice and shoots the robber. But there's really more to it than that. No one else is even inclined to make the sort of demands on the rest of the world that the Jews do. The Jews really are different. Their religion provides a few clues in this regard. It is a religion which tells them that all the property of the Gentiles really should belong to Jews, that the Jews are entitled to it. It's as blatant as anywhere in the 60th chapter of the book attributed to their prophet Isaiah, where they are told to keep their gates open all the time, so that all the wealth of the Gentiles can be brought to them. "Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles," the Jews are told. And if you think that doesn't really mean what it sounds like it means, you should look into the Talmud, where the Jewish sages, the Jewish interpreters of the Bible, explain to the rest of the Jews what it means. The Talmud tells the Jews that only Jews are human beings, that the Gentiles are just animals created by the Jewish tribal god Yahweh to be used by the Jews, like other animals are used. Because Gentiles are merely animals, they can't really own anything, and it is the duty of the Jews to make sure they don't.

Now all of this Biblical stuff and Talmudic stuff is very old and quaint and might seem irrelevant to a lawsuit against the Ford Motor Company by the Jews today. But this old and quaint stuff is the basis of the Jews' religion today. The religious Jews really believe it. And the non-religious Jews, the atheist Jews, behave as if they believe it. And I think that in a certain sense they do. I

think this belief is in their blood. I think that this is what accounts for their almost incredible arrogance in their dealings with non-Jews.

And of course, there's not just belief: there's also calculation. They understand that the success of their current effort to swindle the rest of the world out of every cent they can depends on three factors: it depends on their control of the mass media; it depends on the unprecedented degree of political corruption which exists almost everywhere in the Western world, on the unprecedented degree of democracy; and it depends on the confused and demoralized state of Gentiles everywhere.

There never before has been a time when the Jews have wielded as much open power as they do today. No previous government in the United States has had as many Jews in positions of power as the present Clinton government. And that's pretty much the way it is everywhere in Europe too. The Jews around Clinton are mirrored by high-ranking Jews around Tony Blair in Britain. In Russia, the Jews not only hold most of the key posts around the alcoholic and ailing Boris Yeltsin, they have one of their own as prime minister. And nearly everywhere except in the United States the Jews have succeeded in having laws passed making it illegal for a patriot to tell his countrymen what the Jews are up to. In Britain, in France, and in Germany hundreds of patriots are rotting in prisons today because they dared to speak the truth about the Jews. In Switzerland the Jews succeeded in having similar laws passed before they began extorting money from the Swiss. Only in Russia today are any significant number of patriots speaking out against the Jews and daring the government to try to silence them.

And I suppose it seems reasonable to the Jews that when they have so much power they should use it to their advantage. They should go for everything they can get. The opportunity may pass. And they are going for it, everywhere and in every way. It's interesting to note that this display of unbridled greed and arrogance has made even some of their fellow Jews a little nervous. Charles Krauthammer, a Jewish writer for the *Washington Post*, the second most powerful Jewish newspaper in the United States, wrote a column last month which begins with the words, "The pursuit of billions in Holocaust guilt money has gone from the unseemly to the disgraceful." Krauthammer refers to the whole racket as a "Holocaust shakedown." It's not that Krauthammer doesn't think the Jews should have all the money they can get from the Gentiles. It's just that he's appalled by the reckless display of naked, unprincipled greed as more and more Jewish shysters -- that's what Krauthammer calls them -- trample each other in their current feeding frenzy. What if the Gentiles notice? What will the Gentiles think?

Now, the unfortunate fact is that no non-Jewish writer for a major newspaper would dare to write what Krauthammer wrote -- not even in the United States, where it's still legal to write such things. They're all afraid. For two generations the Jewish media have conditioned them by instantly and loudly accusing anyone who opens his mouth of being a "racist" or a "hater" or an "anti-Semite." They've been conditioned to run for cover whenever they hear one of those accusations. And that is the answer to our second question, why do we let them get away with it?

Their media control keeps the couch potatoes confused and unaware; the corrupt politicians who have come to characterize our democracy are always ready to front for them and betray the people whose interests they are supposed to be representing; and those among us who are

perceptive enough and independent-minded enough to understand what is happening are nearly all too cowardly to speak out. So it is easy enough for me to predict that the Jews will keep coming back for more -- and more -- and more -- until they either have it all, as in Russia today, or what Charles Krauthammer is concerned about happens, and the Gentiles notice. But really, the former outcome is much more likely.

The Limits of Toleration

There are several interesting things in the news that we could spend half an hour talking about on today's program. There is the story of the bribery of African officials on the International Olympic Committee by businessmen in Salt Lake City in order to have their city chosen as the site of the Winter Olympics in 2002. We might look into the question of why it was specifically the African members who were bribed, why it was generally known in Olympic circles that the African members had their hands out for bribes, but no one in the controlled media would discuss this fact before the scandal broke recently. And in fact, the controlled media still are very reluctant to tell us which members of the International Olympic Committee were asking for bribes or to show us their faces. But, you know, I've found it difficult to become very excited about the Olympics -- or surprised about any hypocrisy or crookedness associated with the games -- ever since basketball became one of the official Olympic sports.

We could talk about the recent revelations that the United Nations Special Commission's weapons inspection teams in Iraq were, in fact, being used for espionage purposes and were funneling information to Israel and the United States which had nothing to do with the search for weapons of mass destruction and everything to do with the attempt by Clinton and his controllers in Israel to undermine Saddam Hussein's government. When Saddam Hussein complained that the weapons inspectors were engaged in spying before he threw them out of Iraq last year, all of the controlled media laughed at him and dismissed his charges. After weapons inspector Scott Ritter, a former member of the United Nations team in Iraq, admitted recently that, yes, his weapons inspection team had been secretly passing information gathered in Iraq to the government of Israel, the plot began coming unraveled. But it looks like all that'll change as a result of this exposure of the corruption of the United Nations by Israel and the United States is that the very oily head of the Special Commission, Richard Butler, will lose his job, and it will go to some other oily crook in the pay of Israel and the United States. But you know, just like the case of bribing the International Olympic Committee, I can't get very excited about any revelation of hypocrisy or crookedness in the United Nations. It's what I have come to expect of that crew.

Unfortunately, it's what I've come to expect of everyone in public office these days. I am especially conscious of that expectation as I watch the U.S. Senate proceeding with the trial of Bill Clinton. What a bunch of nervous nellies these senators are, all scared half to death by Clinton's popularity polls! Some of them clearly are hoping to grab a few minutes of the spotlight during this historic process and then to capitalize on the exposure in the next election, but they're still afraid to stick their necks out very far, because of those polls. Others are wheeling and dealing behind the scenes, trading their agreement on various details of the conduct of the trial for promises of future advantages: advantages for themselves, that is, not for America -- no, certainly not for America, judging from the evident satisfaction in the Clinton camp with the way things are going.

Perhaps that sounds a little cynical, but I believe that it is only realistic these days. Corruption, lying, and hypocrisy are the fundaments of public life in America. The way to the top is not through personal integrity and patriotism and the ability to serve effectively; it is through a

candidate's skill in charming voters and in lying without getting caught. And although Bill Clinton's extraordinary recklessness in lying has resulted in his present problems, he cannot be blamed for the general lack of integrity in public life today.

Bill Clinton is only one turd floating in the moral cesspool which our society has become. The fault is ours for bathing in this cesspool, for not minding the stink, for tolerating every sort of corruption so long as we can still charge whatever we want on our credit cards.

I was a guest on a syndicated radio talk show last week, and I was reminded once again of the extent to which morality in America has been changed, has been subverted, over the past 50 years or so. I was discussing multiculturalism with the host, a man named Mike Gallagher, and I pointed out that multiculturalism inevitably leads to alienation, to the loss of a sense of community responsibility, and eventually to the destruction of the society. The host, of course, resisted coming to this Politically Incorrect conclusion.

Then we began receiving calls from listeners. One of them was a man who gave a prissy, little lecture about how race isn't the problem today -- that is, multiculturalism isn't the problem -- it's bad behavior by some people in all races. Weed out the bad-behaving people in all races, and then we can all live together as happy consumers in a multicultural society, he said.

Gosh, I've heard that argument a lot from people who are scared to death of being called "racists," and so they resist thinking about any explanation for the breakdown of our society which involves race. Of course, we always had some bad-behaving people among us even when we had a White society. But at least we had a society, a community, a nation, with a commonly accepted system of values and standards. In the sort of multicultural chaos which the media and the government are promoting today, almost nothing is commonly accepted.

Another caller, a woman, inadvertently brought this out. She expressed the opinion that the best way to avoid conflict and violence in our society is for everyone to be "less judgmental." This is a code phrase for the moral relativists. The essence of moral relativism is that everybody's ideas, everybody's life-style, everybody's sexual orientation, is just as good as everyone else's. There are no absolute standards, no fixed values. Therefore, we should not judge other people whose standards or values at the moment are different from ours. We should not judge Bill Clinton. We should not judge homosexuals. And so on. And this relativistic way of looking at the world applies not only to behavior: it also applies to art, to music, to literature, and to everything else.

This do-your-own-thing ethic has been pushed hard by the controlled media since the 1960s, and it has had a profoundly destructive effect on our society. It's a soft, fuzzy, feminine sort of ethic which is easy to push to absurdity, but logic isn't a strong point for the moral relativists, and they don't let that discourage them. They just drift morally with it and feel quite comfortable. It's an ethic which relieves them and everyone else of responsibility. No guilt, no tension. It's like a drug. And it fits in perfectly with the push by the media and the government toward multiculturalism, toward more diversity.

For the non-judgmental crowd the society that exists in Haiti, for example, is not inherently inferior to our society. The Haitians, to be sure, have a different life-style, a different way of

behaving, but that doesn't mean that our way is better, the non-judgmentalists will tell you. Oh, my goodness, no! Therefore, there's no moral or cultural or social reason why we should object to the presence of the growing number of Haitians in the United States -- or Jamaicans or Vietnamese or what have you.

You know, the moral relativists are right about one thing. Everything is judged relative to a set of standards. And in the bad, old days before multiculturalism became Politically Correct, the standards by which we judged everything were ***our*** standards: which is to say, they were White standards, they were European standards, they were the standards which evolved with our people over thousands of years, standards which developed and changed and adapted themselves to make us a more fit race and allowed us to survive and prosper and to become the masters of the whole world.

But, hey, that's racist, isn't it? I mean, how dare we assume that our values and our standards of behavior are superior to those of the Haitians or the Vietnamese? That's the message the multiculturalists, the diversity-mongers, the egalitarians, the non-judgmentalists, threw at us after the Second World War. It's an easy enough message to refute, of course. Our values and our standards are better -- for us. Fifty years ago we didn't care what values and standards the Haitians and Vietnamese had -- at least, most of us didn't care. The Christian missionaries and a few others felt that they had to meddle in the affairs of the Haitians and Vietnamese and get them to exchange their values, their politics, their religion, their life-style for ours. Which just goes to show that our values and standards aren't perfect; otherwise none of us would have felt the need to try to persuade the Haitians and the Vietnamese to change their ways. We would simply have kept them off our turf, out of our society, and not worried about their behavior or their art or their music or whatever.

But, as I said, that's a racist attitude. And so while the Christian missionaries were meddling with the morals of the Haitians and the Vietnamese, the media bosses in America -- which is to say, the Jewish missionaries -- were meddling with our morals, using television to persuade us that racism is wrong and that, therefore, it is wrong for us to assume that our traditional, European values and standards are the best values and standards -- even for us. They used soap operas and comedy shows to persuade us not to be judgmental, to persuade us that our homogeneous, White society ought to be replaced by a multicultural society, to persuade us that we needed more racial and cultural diversity, to persuade us that everyone's values and ideas and life-style and behavior and sexual orientation were as good as everyone else's. And they also persuaded us that our standards in art and literature were no better than anyone else's, and so the trash-art and trash-literature they and their hangers-on were producing were as good as anything we ever had produced. With music they went further and persuaded us that other races' styles in music were better than our own.

And it's not that the Jewish media bosses were trying to do the same thing with us that the Christian missionaries were trying to do with the Vietnamese and the Haitians. The Jews weren't teaching us their values and their standards. They were just teaching us to abandon ours. The aim was to confuse us, to disconnect us from our roots, to leave us morally disarmed. If we protested their program of persuasion, they began wailing about the so-called "Holocaust." "Oi, veh," they cried. "See where your European morality led: to the gas ovens; to soap and lampshades made

from the corpses of murdered Jews. Aren't you ashamed of yourselves for wanting to keep such a morality?" And you know, many Americans were ashamed. They were ignorant of what had really happened in Europe and why it had happened, and so they didn't know how to respond to the Jewish version of events. The Jews, with their control of the media, had a monopoly on information. And many Americans already were so confused, so disconnected from their own traditions and values, that they let themselves be buffaloed by the Jews. They let themselves be persuaded that it was better to be non-judgmental.

And so here we are, and what a mess it is! The majority of Americans believe that Bill Clinton is an OK guy. They believe that everybody's culture is as good as everyone else's, and that a multicultural society "enriches" our lives by exposing us to Haitian and Vietnamese values and life-styles. They think that the *Blade Runner* environment which is developing in many of our larger cities is normal and healthy. They believe that there's nothing really wrong with homosexuality. And they're not bothered by the political corruption all around them: that's just lawyers and politicians and businessmen "doing their thing."

So I guess that what I'm about to say will sound very old-fashioned to many people, but I'll say it anyway. The values and standards that we had back before the Second World War, our White values and standards, our European values and standards, were infinitely better for us than the absence of any common set of values today, infinitely better than today's do-your-own-thing ethic. There were many flaws and weaknesses in our old set of standards for judging things and in our old way of behaving; I've already mentioned the activities of the missionaries, our regrettable proclivity for trying to change other people's values to suit ours rather than simply keeping our distance from people who are fundamentally different. And there were many other flaws as well. We were far too tolerant of people in our midst whose values were wholly alien to ours, and I'm thinking especially of the people who were busy taking over all of our media of mass communications, all of our news and entertainment media. But the so-called "Holocaust," the effort on the part of some of our people in Europe to protect themselves from the Jews, was not the result of any flaw in our system; rather, it was the consequence of a basically healthy tendency in our system.

The real weakness of our value system is that it was not able to cope well with alien influences. It was too fragile, too susceptible to damage. What we needed was another thousand years or so by ourselves, without outside influence, to strengthen and fine-tune our system, to adapt it more nearly perfectly to our own nature and to our environment. The problem is that with our technology we changed our environment too quickly for our values and standards to adapt themselves in a healthy way. We made the world in which we lived shrink too rapidly. When our ancestors all lived in Europe, essentially by themselves, holding an eastern frontier against the Mongols and the Turks and keeping the Jews confined to ghettos, our values could cope.

When we developed new modes of travel and navigation and began exploring and conquering the non-White world, we left ourselves open to all sorts of problems, because we hadn't had to deal with so many alien influences before. And then we let the Jews out of their ghettos, which was a big mistake.

And so, once again, here we are, everyone doing his own thing and being non-judgmental. You know, the reason we used to have a common set of values, the reason we used to be judgmental, is that these things were necessary for our survival. Every time in our daily lives that a decision had to be made, we didn't have to spend all day thinking about it; we didn't have to keep reinventing the wheel over and over. We made judgments based on our common set of values and standards. These values and standards were developed through trial and error over thousands of years. They didn't work all the time -- they weren't perfect -- but they worked a lot more often than not. They gave us an enormous advantage over any group of people without common values or with values not so well suited to the environment, to the living conditions. They made it possible for us to survive.

If you think that we're surviving just fine now without values -- or with the utterly unnatural Politically Correct values which have replaced our natural values -- then you're suffering from very serious nearsightedness. You're focusing too much on your current credit card spending limit and failing to see many other things of much greater importance. While our values were giving way to Political Correctness and we were learning not to be judgmental, our people -- White people -- in the United States declined from more than 90 per cent of the population to just over 70 per cent today. And as Mr. Clinton is so fond of telling us, we'll become a minority within the next few decades. That is, we will if we remain non-judgmental and continue sitting on our hands.

And if you're one of those non-judgmental types who is not worried by that prospect because, really, the civilization the Haitians and Vietnamese will give us after they've finished wrecking ours will be just as good as ours ever was, then you're obviously a person who thinks Clinton is an OK guy, and you're tuned to the wrong station. I'm not talking to you.

I'm talking only to the people who are so Politically Incorrect that they still think that we ought to do everything we can to preserve our civilization, our values and standards, because they're better for us than anyone else's possibly could be. More than that I'm talking to the people who want us to survive as a people, as a race, because they understand that our civilization is superior for us because we built it; our ancestors built it, not someone else's ancestors. And I want to tell all of you Politically Incorrect listeners, all of you judgmental listeners, that we need to bring our judgmentalism out of the closet again. We need to stand up for the values and standards that served us in the past.

We understand that our system wasn't perfect. We understand that we need to improve it. We need to get rid of the weaknesses that allowed the promoters of Political Correctness to confuse us and morally disarm us. We need to understand that back in the 1960s, when the enemies of our civilization turned our moral world upside down and produced monsters like Bill Clinton, our toleration for these people was a mistake.

Toleration -- in moderation -- may be a virtue when we have our own civilization and our own world, because it permits our values to evolve and adapt to changes in our environment. It permits us to fine-tune our system. And it allows us to have both individual freedom and a society able to protect itself from its own sociopaths as well as its external enemies. But there must be no toleration for the things we permitted to happen in the 1960s. There must be no

toleration for the likes of Bill Clinton. There must be no toleration for multiculturalism or its proponents.

Time to Water the Tree of Liberty

Today we'll talk about a subject we've spoken about often in the past, and that is freedom, especially its prospects for the future. Unfortunately those prospects are quite dim at the moment. I'm afraid that most people wouldn't agree with me on that, and I think that's because most people equate freedom with comfort, with having plenty of money to spend. As long as they can go to the mall and charge whatever they want on their credit card, as long as they can watch whatever ball game they want on TV, they believe they're free. More than that, if their TV tells them they're free, they believe it.

Not everyone, of course. But for most people what is real is what they see on TV. If they don't see it on TV, then it doesn't exist -- or at least, it certainly isn't important. If it were anything to be concerned about, then certainly Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather or Peter Jennings would tell them all about it, with the proper expression of concern on his face and a serious tone of voice, so that everyone would know it was important.

Take the people of Canada, for example. They really are not very different from the people of the United States -- except perhaps just a shade more authoritarian in personality on the average. When our ancestors down here told King George III to go to hell, that we weren't going to pay his taxes any longer, the ancestors of the Canadians kept their mouths shut and continued paying their taxes. As a result they never really had the sort of iron-bound guarantees of freedom of speech and freedom of the press that people in the United States have had. But they always assumed that they had those freedoms anyway. If you ask the average Canadian today whether or not he is free to say what he wants and read what he wants, he'll tell you, "Of course!" And he'll believe it.

As a matter of fact, Canadians do not have those freedoms. Canadian publishers may not publish any book deemed Politically Incorrect by Canada's Jewish minority, and no Canadian bookstore may display or sell such a book. When the Canadian police find such books, they seize them and burn them.

Did you ever see the film *Fahrenheit 451* or read the 1951 novel by science-fiction writer Ray Bradbury on which the film is based? In 1951 our freedom was in much less immediate jeopardy than it is now, but Bradbury saw the ominous trends even then, and he wrote about a future in which books were illegal because many of them contained facts and ideas which upset people, facts and ideas which caused people to worry and to think, facts and ideas which made people uncomfortable. So the government outlawed all books, and people received all of their information and entertainment through television, and then no one was uncomfortable. Squads of thought police sped around the cities on trucks which looked a lot like fire engines, looking for concealed books. Whenever they found any, the books were doused with kerosene and burned on the spot, and the owners of the books were arrested.

Now, the Canadian thought police are not as obvious about their mission as Ray Bradbury's thought police in *Fahrenheit 451* were, but their mission is, in fact, exactly the same. I'll tell you about a recent run-in I had with the Canadian thought police. The sponsor of this broadcast,

National Vanguard Books, is in the business of publishing and selling books, among other things. We sell books to people all over the world, including people in Canada. But whenever a Canadian orders a book from us we have to sneak it into Canada, so the thought police won't grab it at the border. Sometimes we are successful, and sometimes we aren't.

A couple of years ago the problem wasn't so bad, and the thought police mostly seized copies of my novels: novels which make some people uncomfortable. But children's books and history books and scientific books usually got through. But their list of banned books -- books the Jewish minority in Canada don't want the Canadian people to read -- has been growing. Now the thought police will seize almost any book which has anything in it that might be considered Politically Incorrect. In September we sent a package of books to a customer in British Columbia. The thought police in Vancouver opened the package and seized two items, which, according to the Jewish list of illegal books they go by, are classified as "hate propaganda." The two items seized were a copy of a magazine published by National Vanguard Books called *Free Speech* -- a magazine dedicated to the preservation of that precious commodity; and a scientific book titled *Heredity and Humanity* by Roger Pearson.

Dr. Pearson is a well-known anthropologist who has taught at several American universities. He was the chairman of the anthropology and sociology department at Queens College and then chairman of the anthropology department at the University of Southern Mississippi. He currently edits several scientific journals. He is the author of a well-known anthropology textbook. But anthropology is one of those fields of study which has been subjected to the scrutiny of the enforcers of Political Correctness. Like history, anthropology deals with various types of people, their characteristics, and their relationships, and these days in order for a history book or an anthropology book to be deemed Politically Correct the author must be very careful what he writes. He must be very careful never to suggest that all types of people are not equal in every way. Dr. Pearson wasn't sufficiently careful. He was more interested in the truth, more interested in accuracy and factuality, when he wrote *Heredity and Humanity* than in being Politically Correct. And so the Jews have put his book on their *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, along with our journal *Free Speech* and thousands of other books which they believe might make some people uncomfortable or make them think. When the secret police in Canada find such a book, they seize it and burn it. Usually they're very secretive about this sort of thing, in contrast to the book-burners in Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*, but in the case of our customer in British Columbia we were able to obtain the police documents listing the seized items and classifying them as "hate propaganda."

You know, when the Jews in Canada got their book-burning legislation enacted, they did it under the pretense that it was to protect children from pornography. They got a whole regiment of publicity-hungry Christian preachers to beat the drums for this legislation under the pretense that it would keep sexual material out of the hands of children. So the report form the thought police use in listing and classifying the books they seize has nine separate classifications for the police to check, nine little boxes to check at the bottom of the form, indicating the type of book. Those classifications are: sex with violence, sex with degradation, sexual assault, sex with bondage, sex with juveniles, incest, bestiality, necrophilia, and -- the last category -- hate propaganda. But, you know, it's only that last little box that really counts. That's what this Canadian legislation was all about. It wasn't to keep books on necrophilia out of the country. The Jews don't care whether or

not you read books on necrophilia or bestiality. The entire purpose of the law they got their ever-obedient Christian servants to push through the Canadian parliament for them was to allow the thought police to classify Politically Incorrect scientific books by anthropology professors as "hate propaganda" and keep them out of the hands of Canadians who might be made to think if they read the books.

This is by no means the first time our books have been seized by the Canadian thought police, and National Vanguard Books is by no means the only publisher whose books have been seized. These book burnings take place every day in Canada. It's just that this time we were able to get our hands on the thought police's documents, where they actually claim that Professor Pearson's anthropology book *Heredity and Humanity* and our journal *Free Speech* are "hate propaganda." Truly the situation in Canada today is much worse than it was in Europe in the Middle Ages, when the Church maintained its *Index* of prohibited books. The books the priests and bishops burned were virtually all books dealing with religion in some way, books they felt threatened their monopoly on that subject. The books the Jews burn today are almost any books which might cause some of the couch potatoes to think -- and then, perhaps, to rebel. And of course, the Church didn't try to make a secret of its book burning.

As I mentioned earlier, most Canadians have no idea that this book burning is going on in their country. They are too busy with their ball games and funny papers. But even if it were explained to them in detail -- even if the Canadian thought police roared around in fire engines looking for Politically Incorrect books to burn in public the way they did in *Fahrenheit 451* -- would the sports fans and mall shoppers of Canada really care? No more, I suspect, than the contented and comfortable television viewers in Ray Bradbury's 1951 vision of the future, a future in which book-burning was a respectable profession. By the way, if you have any doubt that what I have told you is actually happening in Canada today, send me a stamped, self-addressed envelope, and I'll send you a photocopy of the Canadian thought police document I obtained after their latest seizure of our books. If you're a Canadian, you may want to show this document to any friends you may have who're interested in such things as freedom. Who knows? Maybe I'm wrong in assuming that Canadians are all sheep. Perhaps there are a few Canadians still willing to water the tree of liberty with the blood of tyrants.

And what about the slightly more rebellious population of the United States? Would they care? The Jews in the United States are proceeding on the assumption that they will not -- that is, that a majority of the voters will not, even if a few dissidents kick up a fuss. Certainly, the voters who make up the Clinton coalition -- the Democrats who elected Bill Clinton twice and who still think he shouldn't be impeached -- couldn't care less about preserving freedom of speech. Some of them, in fact, are positively hostile to free speech and are collaborating actively with the Jews in an effort to stamp it out.

Feminists, for example, are prominent in the Jews' campaign for "hate speech" legislation in the United States. Part of their zeal may be the touchy-feely feminine notion that people in general ought to be protected from "offensive" speech, which is any speech which hurts their feelings. A more important reason, however, is that feminists, like homosexuals and members of other government-favored groups in the population, want to hang on to the special status which 35 years of so-called "civil rights" legislation has given them, and they are afraid that any criticism

might endanger that status. They understand that their present favored position in society is entirely artificial, entirely dependent on government support and government enforcement, and they are afraid that if dissenters are allowed to speak and influence public opinion, the government might be persuaded to stop enforcing feminist demands for special privileges. Blacks and welfare recipients are not as alert to these issues as the feminists and homosexuals are, but most of them have at least a dim understanding that they do have a community of interests tied to government support and government enforcement, and they would agree that free speech poses a threat to those interests.

And, alas, among the non-Jewish, non-feminist, non-homosexual, non-minority part of the population there are far too few Patrick Henrys these days. Two generations of watching Jewish television not only has softened the spines and the minds of heterosexual White males but, in fact, has convinced a substantial portion of them that it is more important for people to be comfortable than to be free. Many Americans have a vague notion that there's some sort of Constitutional right to feel good, to not be offended, and that when this Constitutional right to not be offended conflicts with the right to free speech and a free press, then some sort of compromise ought to be made. Really! That's what a lot of White American males believe!

They believe that, because that's what television has been teaching them subliminally for two generations. And added to that during the past five or six years, since domestic terrorism has gained more relevance, is the notion that free speech is really a little dangerous: everyone will be safer if we accept some limitations on free speech. That unspeakable piece of filth we have in the White House has explicitly encouraged that notion. After the Oklahoma City bombing Bill Clinton was on television telling everyone that people who criticize the government are to blame for such acts of terrorism. And a lot of White males who these days think and act like old maids took his warnings to heart.

So with the American population thus softened up, thus prepared to give up their freedom, the Jews are pushing their *Fahrenheit 451* program forward. All of the big Jewish organizations are involved. The Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith have been most noticeable in their campaign to censor the Internet, for example. The Jews of the Anti-Defamation League have just gotten a big pat on the back from the media Jews for developing what they call a "hate" filter for computers. Parents, they say, can install the filter program on their children's computers so the kiddies can't read "harmful" or "offensive" material on the Internet. And down here, just as in Canada, the Jews have a rabble of braindead Christians running interference for them, under the delusion that they are helping to protect children from exposure to sex.

Of course, parents are entitled to censor their own children's use of the Internet as much as they want. But with the Jews that's just a toe in the door. They also are peddling their filter to public libraries and to school officials, so that they can censor the Internet reading of all library users and school students. And the Anti-Defamation League is persuading some big software manufacturers to bundle its new "hate" filter with other software that is pre-installed on computers before the customers buy them. Of course, it's easy enough to deactivate such censorship software -- unless you're one of those millions of technically illiterate Americans who has never been able to figure out how to program your VCR.

Of course, the Jews, including the Anti-Defamation League, protest loudly that they're all in favor of freedom. They don't want to stop anybody from reading anything he wants. They're 100 per cent in favor of the First Amendment, they'll tell you. They're horrified by the very idea of burning books. They just want to protect children. But it's not true. This sudden and uncharacteristic interest of the Jews in protecting children from pornography is phony. What the Jews want for the United States is exactly what they already have imposed on Canada, on Britain, on France, on Germany, and on a dozen other White nations. That's why they have their number-one step'n'fetchit, Bill Clinton, making speeches about the need for "hate speech" legislation.

Now, to be sure, the Jews have other allies in their censorship plans besides corrupt politicians like Bill Clinton and the feminist-homosexual-minority special privilege groups and the couch potatoes who always are ready to trade freedom for the promise of more comfort or more security. There are White gentiles who have been sold on the idea that multiculturalism is here to stay. Some of them who are in business actually have a vested interest in multiculturalism and growing diversity in the population. They are happy with these trends because they profit from them. Others may have no vested interest in multiculturalism, but they are too soft-minded to think about the hard decision which will be required to reverse these trends. And they realize that a multicultural society is a fragile and unnatural thing, like a house of cards. Any breeze of dissent can cause it to collapse. And so they believe that it is necessary to protect it from dissent, from any speech which may offend any component of the multicultural society and result in destabilization. Perhaps they are not by nature enthusiastic enemies of freedom, but they nevertheless are willing to sacrifice freedom in order to avoid the bloody disintegration of this malignantly multicultural monstrosity of a society which is supplanting the White society we had in America prior to the Second World War.

You know, there are interesting and occasionally even amusing developments in the Jews' program to take away our freedom. Some of their feminist and homosexual allies, whose motivation is to protect their privileged status from criticism, have targeted Christian groups for censorship, because of the Christian opposition to abortion and homosexuality. Some of these Christian groups are perfectly willing to censor other people and, in fact, already have let themselves be used as dupes in the Jews' phony drive to protect children from pornography on the Internet, but they are not happy about being censored themselves. A current instance of this infighting involves The Learning Company, a large manufacturer of computer software, on one side, and on the other side the American Family Association, a Christian group which emphasizes so-called "family values" and disapproves of homosexual behavior.

The Learning Company has a program called CyberPatrol, which it developed at the behest of and in collaboration with the Anti-Defamation League. Installed on a school or library computer, it prevents students or library users from accessing any Internet site which the Jews of the Anti-Defamation League consider Politically Incorrect. Of course, the Jews have blocked both of the Internet sites at which you can access this *American Dissident Voices* program or see the books distributed by the sponsor of this program, such as those seized and burned by the Canadian thought police. But in order to keep their feminist and homosexual allies happy they also have blocked Internet access to the American Family Association. Many Christians are unhappy about this Jewish censorship of the American Family Association and are currently organizing a

boycott of all software, children's books, and other materials published by The Learning Company but are being very careful not to mention the word "Jew" in their boycott efforts.

I believe that a boycott of The Learning Company -- and every other company which collaborates in any way with the Anti-Defamation League or other Jewish enemies of free speech is a worthy endeavor, but it's nowhere near enough. To protect our freedom, to keep the United States from following the same path that Canada is on, we need to water the tree of liberty with a great deal of blood. The time for that watering is close at hand.

Clinton's War

Today let's talk about Bill Clinton's new role as war hero and commander in chief. You know, when I told you a little over two weeks before Clinton launched his new war against Iraq that war was imminent -- that I was sure he had made a deal with the Jews to use any pretext at all for starting a war, in return for Jewish lawyer Sam Dash's effort to sabotage Ken Starr and derail the impeachment process -- I couldn't imagine that Clinton would choose such disastrous timing for his attack. I knew the man had catastrophically poor judgment -- I mean, he's the jerk who when he was governor of Arkansas used to send out Arkansas state troopers to scout up women and bring them to his hotel room, who used to let his brother Roger deal cocaine out of the office next to his in the governor's mansion in Little Rock, and who after he became President used to unzip for action right in the Oval Office -- but even I am surprised by the recklessness and foolishness of his timing in attacking Iraq.

Five weeks ago, when Sam Dash sandbagged Ken Starr, the pollsters and vote-counters were all predicting that even if the House Judiciary Committee voted for impeachment, it would never pass the full House. Clinton might have attacked Iraq then and gotten away with it. But he thought maybe he would wait until he could manufacture a good pretext for a war. And as he waited, the so-called "moderate" Republicans on whom he had placed his hopes, declared one by one that they would vote for impeachment. By the beginning of last week, even his strongest supporters conceded that he would be impeached and would be tried by the Senate. And so with only hours to go before the impeachment vote, he starts a war.

Well, I guess that's sort of a Democratic tradition, but still nearly everyone was surprised when he did it. I mean, that's such breathtaking ***chutzpah*** that even some Jews were embarrassed. They were not happy that the war against Iraq that they had been scheming for and urging for so long would be seen as merely a cheap trick to save Bill Clinton from impeachment.

But of course, that's exactly what it is, and that's obvious to everyone with an IQ above 70. That doesn't include the yahoos of the American Legion and similar groups, who like to put on all their medals, salute the flag, and proclaim their loyalty to the commander in chief. But the politicians and media people are not that stupid: crooked, but not stupid. Nevertheless, I was worried right after the attack on Iraq last Wednesday that they would be afraid to say anything against Mr. Clinton's new war. Some of them, of course, were publicly expressing their support for the attack immediately, saying things like, "We should have attacked Saddam a long time ago." And no one wanted to be denounced as an "anti-Semite" for saying anything against the Jews' crusade to destroy Saddam Hussein.

On the other hand, it was easy to see that the brighter ones had figured out that there was no way they could support commander-in-chief Clinton without the stink rubbing off on them. The Jews might be grateful to them at the moment, but in the long run it would look so bad that they didn't want to be associated with it, and so they began a tortured routine of praising the war without mentioning Mr. Clinton. And the impeachment process, which had been derailed for a few hours, was put back on track.

Right after the attack the Republican politicians all were saying darkly that they hoped Clinton had a good excuse for what Congressman Bob Livingston called his "unique" timing. And all Clinton could come up with is that he had to attack before the Islamic holy month of Ramadan, which began on December 20, four days after he started the war. He said it would be very offensive to Muslims everywhere if he started the war during Ramadan. When two or three leading Republicans -- Mississippi's Trent Lott, for example -- suggested that he had started the war in an attempt to postpone impeachment, he pretended to be offended. He said, with a phony tone of wounded dignity, "I don't think any serious person would believe that any President would do such a thing." Of course, that's exactly what every serious person did believe. But as I had feared, the politicians didn't have the courage or the honesty to stand on that position, and Lott and the others who had questioned the timing quickly backed down.

One Congressman, who was afraid to let his name be used, told the *Washington Times* that he had found a great deal of cynicism among senior military leaders in the Pentagon about their commander in chief. They were in daily contact with the White House in the weeks before the war began, and the generals and admirals had noticed that the White House's eagerness to begin bombing Iraq grew in intensity as one undecided Republican after another declared that he would vote to impeach. When the Congressman discussed the timing of the war with the military leaders, they laughed with contempt. They all had the same question: "Why now?" They all considered Clinton's stated excuse to be a pathetic lie.

Clinton hadn't built a coalition against Iraq, he didn't have a clear war plan and hadn't given the Pentagon time to develop one. There was no strategic objective for the attack. Furthermore, on Sunday, December 13, Clinton had told the Pentagon to prepare to launch an assault against Iraq that week. That was two days before the U.N. report claiming that Iraq was not cooperating with weapons inspectors was sent to the White House, late Tuesday night. Clinton waited until receiving the UN report to actually start the bombing, but it was clear to everyone in the Pentagon that that was phony, that he already had made up his mind on Sunday, three days earlier. They were all convinced that they had been ordered to go to war solely to postpone Clinton's impeachment. That's what the top military leaders of our nation believed when they began firing cruise missiles into Iraq on Clinton's orders.

One person in the know who spoke out was former chief U.N. weapons inspector Scott Ritter. He's certainly no friend of Iraq, and he resigned last August in protest against what he believed was an insufficiently aggressive effort to discover Iraq's weapons facilities. But hours before Clinton attacked Iraq last week, when Ritter knew the attack was coming, he told the *New York Post* that Richard Butler, the U.N. official in charge of weapons inspection, is collaborating with Clinton and his Jewish advisers rather than doing his U.N. job honestly and correctly. Ritter said, "What Richard Butler did last week with the inspections was a set-up. This was designed to generate a conflict that would justify a bombing." Ritter said that officials in the U.S. government told him that when the weapons inspectors were sent back into Iraq on November 19, after Saddam had capitulated on November 14 to head off an imminent U.S. attack and said he would not interfere with the inspections, the inspectors were secretly instructed to provoke a crisis that could be used as a pretext to begin the war. Which, of course, is exactly what I told you would happen, in my broadcasts of November 21 and November 28. Richard Butler went along with the scheme and produced a phony report saying that Iraq was not cooperating, but

Clinton, seeing impeachment looming, couldn't even wait for that report. And the International Atomic Energy Agency, also monitoring the situation in Iraq, reported that the Iraqis were doing everything they could to comply with the weapons inspectors.

Ritter told the *New York Post,* "You have no choice but to interpret this as *Wag the Dog.* You have no choice." You know, I'm not the one who said that. It was our former chief weapons inspector, Scott Ritter, who personally knows all of the people involved and knows exactly how the system works. His statements are in the December 17 edition of the *New York Post,* but you'll have to have sharp eyes to find them anywhere else. Most of the media chose to ignore him.

And in case you don't already know, *Wag the Dog* is a recent Hollywood film in which a fictional President of the United States deliberately starts a war to divert attention from a scandal which arises when he has sex with a teen-aged girl in the White House.

This war against Iraq doesn't reveal anything new about Bill Clinton. We already knew that he was a man without a trace of honor or patriotism, a man who would do anything at all to protect himself from impeachment, a man who would start a war without a moment's hesitation if he thought it might be advantageous to himself personally. We also knew that he was a man with extremely poor judgment. Perhaps he really believed that no one would question the timing of his attack on Iraq and that he could brazen it out. The frightening thing is that he might have succeeded if he'd attacked earlier -- or even invented a better excuse for attacking when he did.

What this new war does is cast a little more light on the character of the system of which Bill Clinton is a part. You know, there's not a politician in Washington who doesn't understand exactly why Clinton unleashed the cruise missiles and smart bombs on Iraq. That was the time for every public official -- especially the members of Congress -- to speak out loudly against this criminal use of America's armed forces against another country to serve Mr. Clinton's personal and private needs. Every member of the Congress should have denounced Clinton's attack on Iraq instantly. The impeachment process should have moved ahead on an emergency, around-the-clock basis, followed by an immediate trial in the Senate, even during the Christmas holidays, to remove a criminal President from office before he could do any more damage and further dishonor the United States.

And you know, a great deal of damage has been done -- and I'm not talking about the bombing damage in Baghdad. The rioters who have been smashing up American embassies in half-a-dozen countries represent the feelings of most of the world's people about the United States -- certainly the feelings of young people, of university students, everywhere. When one 20-year-old protestor last week called America "the spawn of all evil," he was speaking for all the rest. Of course, the American Legion, the Rotary Club, the idiots in the Junior Chamber of Commerce don't understand this, but when Saddam Hussein or someone else somewhere finally is provoked into unleashing real weapons of mass destruction on Israel or the United States, the cheering will be heard around the world, not just in the Middle East.

You know, I watched the first part of the impeachment proceedings on television last Saturday, and the image which sticks in my mind is all the Democratic Congressmen walking out of the Capitol in protest during the voting and holding a little pep rally in support of Clinton in the

Capitol parking lot. They were all spouting the familiar baloney, expressing fake outrage that the Republicans weren't supporting the commander in chief when the country was at war, shouting that everyone should stop picking on poor Mr. Clinton and let him get back to work on the job he was elected to do, and so on.

Now, as I said earlier, these Democrat politicians aren't that stupid. They understood just as well as the Republicans did why Clinton was bombing Iraq. But they had their eyes on the latest polls, which showed that 60 per cent of the voters were opposed to impeachment and three-quarters of them supported Clinton's war against Iraq. And it is clear that that's all that was important to these Democrat Congressmen. These representatives of the American people certainly weren't going to take an unpopular position and risk losing votes. Whatever the rabble wanted they would try to give the rabble -- anything except real leadership.

And I don't mean to imply that the Republican politicians are basically different. It's just that they had their eyes on slightly different polls: they were more interested in what Republican voters wanted rather than what the electorate as a whole wanted. They knew that a majority of Republicans supported impeachment. But they wouldn't speak out against Clinton's war, because they also knew that a majority of Republicans were of the same mind-set as the American Legion and the Rotary Club. And failing to speak out against Clinton's bombing of Iraq, refusing to condemn him for it, is seen as condoning it -- and rightly so.

Perhaps I'm being too stuffy about this business of bombing other countries as a way of dealing with sex scandals. Perhaps I should take the attitude of the generals and admirals in the Pentagon and regard it all as a game, good for a laugh now and then, and just go along with it. Perhaps I should applaud the bombing of Iraqis, simply because they're a pretty greasy bunch. Saddam Hussein certainly is a greasy-looking fellow. I wouldn't trust him as far as I could throw him. Perhaps it would be a good thing just to declare open season on greasy-looking people everywhere. I'm inclined to believe that the world would be better off without them. But I also believe that when we start getting rid of greasy types, we should begin with that greasy bunch around Mr. Clinton. We should tie Madeleine Albright and Sandy Berger and William Cohen and the rest of the bunch to the next batch of bombs we drop on Baghdad.

Well, that's just wishful thinking, of course -- and the fact is, it's not really a game we're involved in: it's the most serious possible business, and every serious person, every person with any shred of a sense of responsibility, must concern himself with it. Just think: we have a system which allows a politician with nothing more going for him than charm and acting ability to become President -- and commander in chief of the world's most powerful military force wielding an awesomely destructive arsenal. We have a system which puts a constitutional psychopath in a position to push the doomsday button. What happened last week is not some science-fiction scenario. It's not something scripted in Hollywood. It was real. Clinton ordered the generals and admirals to start a war, and they did. They knew what Mr. Clinton's motives were, they laughed up their sleeves at him, they understood that they would be putting our military people at risk and using our forces to kill Iraqis for no better reason than taking the impeachment heat off Clinton for a while. And the Congress understood this too. But no general or admiral resigned in protest, and no Congressman made a big issue of it. When the bombing was over, the officers in the

Pentagon didn't even act embarrassed. All they talked about is what percentage of their targets they succeeded in destroying.

You know, this business of bombing Iraq is a lot more than killing a few dozen Arabs and destroying some Iraqi real estate. It may not seem serious to the American Legion types, because Iraq isn't big enough to hit back -- at least, not in a conventional way. But we did wage unprovoked war on Iraq. And it's getting to be a habit. We also attacked Sudan and Afghanistan a few months ago. Those countries, like Iraq, are sovereign nations. People around the world notice these things. They draw conclusions from these things. Corrupt leaders at the top of other countries will continue to collaborate with the United States as long as the United States remains militarily and economically powerful, but even these corrupt leaders are appalled at the behavior of the U.S. government. There is no respect at all left. Clinton and the U.S. government as a whole are a laughingstock everywhere. The leaders may not laugh in our faces yet, but they all laugh behind our backs.

And younger people everywhere despise us intensely. A few years ago we were considered to be a dangerous bully. Now we are considered a dangerous bully who is completely out of control and unpredictable, an utterly irresponsible bully. The moral imperative to put us down, to protect the rest of the world from us, becomes stronger every time Clinton does something like he did last week. That sort of criminal irresponsibility may not seem important to the Clinton supporters whose primary interest is keeping their welfare checks coming, but there are a few serious, thoughtful people left in the world, and they understand that it cannot be tolerated.

The problem that serious Americans have is not so much that their President is willing to start a war to delay his impeachment, but that doing so doesn't hurt his popularity. Clinton can be replaced. Replacing the electorate will be a more difficult task, a much more fundamental task -- but nevertheless a necessary task for America's long-term survival. When the rabble -- the welfare class and the perverts and the racial minorities -- make up only a small minority of the electorate, many people are inclined to tolerate them. When they become a majority, they no longer can be tolerated. I've spoken before about the shortcomings of a democratic system of government, but Bill Clinton has made a more striking demonstration of those shortcomings than I ever could.

You know what I'd like to happen now? I'd like a long and bitter trial of Clinton in the Senate, with the Democrats and Republicans tearing each other to pieces for the next three or four months. At least, that should keep the politicians out of trouble and off our backs for a while. And then I'd like to see Clinton acquitted by one or two votes, so that for the next two years he can provide further demonstrations of the unsuitability of democracy as a system of government in the 21st century. What I'm afraid of is that the Democrats and Republicans, understanding that they all feed from the same trough and that it is not to their advantage to make any more of a public spectacle of the system of which each of them is a part, will try to get the trial over as quickly as possible. And of course, the polls will encourage them to do just that, not so much because the voters want to save the system from further embarrassment, but because they want to get back to their ball games.

I hope that some of the generals and admirals in the Pentagon who laughed at Clinton's excuse for bombing Iraq will become serious now and begin thinking about their responsibilities to their country and will understand that they cannot be faithful to those responsibilities and continue to serve the system at the same time.

Choosing a Barbie Doll

Usually I like to deal with hard news on these programs: demographic statistics which need to be brought to our attention, crime stories which have been suppressed by the controlled media, unreported aspects of the sleazy business of government in Washington, the names and doings of the powerful men responsible for much of what's wrong in the world today. I like to deal with facts -- facts that we can check for ourselves, because credibility is such an important aspect of every program, of everything we talk about. And the reason credibility is so important to us is not that what we talk about is far-fetched or hard to believe -- most of it is commonsense stuff clearly backed up by facts -- but what I tell you also runs directly against the way the public has been conditioned to think these days. Much of what I say is not Politically Correct, and for that reason much of the public is afraid of it, terrified of it, doesn't want to believe it, will look for any excuse not to believe it. So I try to make all of my conclusions very hard for listeners to evade. I try to talk about things in a way that people will be forced to believe them, whether they want to or not.

It took me a long time to accept the fact that there really are people who don't want to know the truth. In fact, that is the case with the majority of the public. Most people want to believe what makes them feel safe and comfortable. Whether it's true or not really isn't important to them. I mean no offense to women when I say this, but that always has seemed to me to be an essentially feminine attitude: being more concerned with the social acceptability of an idea than with its truth or falsity. Yet that's the way most people, men as well as women, are these days. We're living in an emasculated age.

You know, when I told you that people are terrified of Politically Incorrect information, I wasn't exaggerating at all. The sponsor of this program, National Vanguard Books, mails out its book catalogs to thousands of people every month. The catalogs cost money, and so care is taken to send them to people who will be interested in the books and tapes described in them, but occasionally a catalog is received by a person who is allergic to Politically Incorrect ideas. What often happens then is that the recipient, instead of simply flipping through the catalog, noting that it is nothing a Clinton booster would be interested in, dropping it in the trash, and forgetting about it -- instead of this his heart begins racing and he breaks out in a cold sweat. He thinks to himself, "Omigod, suppose the neighbors saw this sticking out of my mailbox! They might think that I don't love our President. They might think that I'm on the wrong side of his popularity polls. They might even think that I'm some sort of racist or anti-Semite, because there are books in here which are not at all Politically Correct." And then, with his heart pounding and barely able to breathe, he calls his lawyer.

I'm not kidding you: we receive certified letters, return receipt requested, from lawyers demanding that we remove so and so's name from our mailing list immediately and never send him anything again. How much do think that cost the poor, frightened slob who received our catalog in the mail? I don't know about your lawyer, but mine would charge a hundred bucks to send out a certified letter like that for me. But there are lots of Americans who are so terrified that other people will think them Politically Incorrect that they're willing to pay. And despite the

example I just gave of the reaction of a Clinton booster receiving a book catalog in the mail, there are anti-Clinton people who are just as frightened.

The real significance of this sort of frightened reaction by some people to the National Vanguard Books catalog is not that there are people out there whose ideas and opinions are different from mine. The significance is the fear. I really believe that many -- perhaps even most -- of these frightened people don't really have ideas or opinions at all. Ideas aren't important to them, aren't real to them. What's important is being accepted, fitting in, being approved. I think that's always been important to most people. To women, in particular, it's always been more important to be approved than to have a correct understanding of the world around them. Today more men than ordinarily are behaving like women in this regard. And the fear really is stronger and more widespread than it used to be.

Let me share with you a really disgusting story I read last week. It was published in the January 19 edition of the *San Jose Mercury News.* That's San Jose, California. The writer, Katherine Corcoran, is a staff member at the newspaper, a White woman, and she relates the soul-wrenching experience she had after her seven-year-old daughter went to a San Jose toy store with her aunt, looking for a Barbie doll. The little girl wanted to take a White Barbie doll off the shelf, but there was a Black Barbie doll in front of the White doll, so she moved the Black doll out of the way to get to the White doll. And then it occurred to the seven-year-old that she had just committed a "hate crime." She went home to her mother in tears, confused and frightened, and asked her mother whether moving the Black doll aside showed that she was "prejudiced." The girl's mother described all of this in the newspaper story she wrote. She quotes her daughter: "In the toy store today, Auntie let me pick out whatever Barbie I wanted. And I moved a Black Barbie on the shelf out of the way to reach the White Barbie behind her. Does that make me prejudiced?" And as I said, this was not a casual question. The little girl was crying, terrified that she might actually have shown herself to be "prejudiced."

And when the mother heard this question she herself froze in terror. She didn't know how to answer the question. She was afraid to answer simply, "No, dear, choosing the White doll instead of the Black doll doesn't mean that you're prejudiced." She couldn't give that answer because it would be dishonest. That answer would comfort her daughter at the moment, but it might lead the little girl into relaxing her vigilance and wandering even further down the path of Political Incorrectness. It might, heaven forbid, reinforce her preference for White over Black.

On the other hand, if the mother answered the girl's question honestly -- if the mother answered, "Yes, you vicious, little White racist, by shoving aside the Black doll you revealed your horrible, racist prejudice in favor of your own race" -- if her mother answered that way, then her daughter might not be able to handle the psychic trauma. The mother's own words in the newspaper were: "If I said yes, I feared I would scar her self-image for life. Her eyes pleaded with me not to confirm the worst." Believe it or not, that's exactly what this silly woman wrote in the newspaper: "If I said yes, I feared I would scar her self-image for life." And yet, the mother was sure that "yes" was the honest answer, because she knew that all of us Whites have the original sin of racism in us, a sin which we are obliged to struggle all our lives to overcome and to pay all our lives in order to atone for.

For the remainder of a long, hand-wringing article, the mother agonized over how to deal with this terrible dilemma. The whole thing is surrealistic, like the sort of dream one might have after falling asleep with a really bad case of heartburn. But, unfortunately, that's the way a great many Americans think these days. They really do get torn up over such things as how to be sure that they are raising their children to be both Politically Correct and self-contented.

The mother writing in the *San Jose Mercury News* relates the stories of several other parents who encountered problems similar to her own. Not one of these parents expresses anger toward those who brainwashed their children to the point that any realization that they instinctively prefer their own kind frightens them and makes them feel guilty. Not one parent considers grabbing a shotgun and going out to hunt the media bosses who did this to their children. Instead they all cringe and grovel. The mother writing the story finally decides that what her daughter needs is still more brainwashing -- more children's books full of multiculturalism and diversity, more Steven Spielberg films, et cetera. She coaxes her daughter to believe that the only reason she reached for the White doll instead of the Black doll was not that the White doll was the one she could identify with because it looked like her, but that she liked the lipstick on the White doll more than the lipstick on the Black doll. That rationalization made the mother and daughter both feel much better. And then before the daughter could backslide, the mother went out and bought her a Black Barbie doll, a mestizo Barbie doll, an Indian Barbie doll, etc. The mother concludes: "I decided if my daughter was going to play with Barbies . . . they at least would be diverse. Her play world now includes Arab, Native American, Latina, and African-American Barbies." And that mother obviously feels quite proud of the way she dealt with her daughter's problem. I felt sick after reading her story.

It's easy to think ahead eight years or so to the time when this woman's daughter is in a racially integrated high school and begins dating. When she has a choice between dating Black boys or White boys, she will remember her mother's response to the Barbie doll dilemma. Her mother undoubtedly will be proud of her when she brings her first Black boyfriend home for dinner.

You know, there used to be a time when I thought that the only way we could save our race and our civilization was to have a civil war and shoot everyone who thought like that and then start over again with the survivors. Of course, we still need a civil war -- there's no getting around that -- but it won't be necessary to shoot everyone who feels angst and guilt when his or her daughter opts for a White Barbie doll. These people are not ideologically opposed to the survival of White civilization. As I mentioned earlier, they don't have an ideology, except to be Politically Correct, whatever that happens to be at the moment. The people who need to be shot -- who must be shot -- are the current arbiters of Political Correctness, the people who planned for seven-year-old White girls to feel guilty if they revealed a preference for White Barbie dolls. Shoot those, and the rest will adapt. They will assimilate whatever attitudes and opinions are presented to them. That's the way most people are. That's the way they've always been.

And the people who're like that are not just those with double-digit IQs. Many of these people are quite bright and competent. Either they were born feeling guilty about something, or they are susceptible to having a guilt feeling implanted in them, which the arbiters of Political Correctness then can manipulate. This is something which I guess witch doctors and priests have understood since prehistoric times and taken advantage of, which is why the concepts of guilt

and redemption play such a large role in many religions. Unfortunately, the people who have wormed their way into our media of mass communication and gotten a deathgrip on them understand this too.

It's really tragic when we see how the media have manipulated people like the mother who writes for the *San Jose Mercury News*, but sometimes it's almost funny watching some of the academic lemmings in the grip of Political Correctness squirm when they're presented with a similar dilemma. A recent case is that of Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery. He'd always been a hero to the Politically Correct establishment after his World War Two victory over the Germans in North Africa. After the war he toured Britain's colonies in Africa and filed a report with the government which was quite at odds with the aim of the liberals in the government to dismantle the British Empire, and so his report was stamped "secret" and filed away for 50 years.

The statutory 50 years being up a few weeks ago, it was released to the news media by Britain's Public Records Office. Montgomery not only was in favor of strengthening the Empire and opposing the spread of communism in Africa -- both goals anathema to liberals -- but he expressed his frank opinion of Blacks, including the supposedly "civilized" ones, and their capabilities. The Black African, Montgomery wrote, "is a complete savage and is quite incapable of developing the country himself."

Now, Montgomery's opinion of Blacks was not at all uncommon in the 1940s, when he wrote his report, and people were not afraid to state this opinion in polite society. In fact, it was the majority opinion among Britons who had had any experience at all in the British colonies in Africa. During the past 50 years, however, the controlled media, the churches, and other boosters of Political Correctness succeeded in making that opinion Politically Incorrect, and so when Montgomery's comments on Blacks were made public recently, everyone still alive who had had any contact with him tried desperately to put as much distance as possible between himself and Montgomery. His surviving relatives expressed their shame and embarrassment. One of Montgomery's biographers interviewed by *The Guardian* this month sniffed that "his reputation is irredeemably damaged." Montgomery's entire reputation, of course, is as a military leader and strategist, but to the Politically Correct zealot it is quite inconceivable that one can be a "racist" and also a person with superior qualities of any kind.

And this sort of thing has happened over and over again. When H.L. Mencken's private papers were published a few years ago, there was the same sort of ducking and running for cover on the part of everyone who ever had said anything nice about Mencken or his work. They were scared to death that Mencken's frank views on race and on the Jews would cause people to think that they were themselves Politically Incorrect. They were terrified of guilt by association.

Almost every public figure or writer of note before about 1950, except communists or clerics, who had anything to say about race would scare the pants off today's Politically Correct lemmings. Read what the humanitarian doctor Albert Schweitzer had to say about the Blacks in Africa that he lived among and spent his life trying to help. Read what President Teddy Roosevelt wrote on race. Or Abe Lincoln. Or any of a hundred others I could name without even having to do any real digging in my library. This has made history a political minefield for Politically Correct writers and teachers -- and it is the principal reason why history is being

phased out of high school and university curricula, except for bowdlerized -- really falsified -- versions which have been carefully cleared of mines. I mean, how is a Politically Correct teacher to explain to students that nearly everyone they had thought of as a great inventor -- Thomas Edison, for example -- or a great industrialist -- Henry Ford, for example -- or a great pioneer of aviation -- Charles Lindbergh, for example -- or a great military leader -- George Patton, for example -- or you name it was really a terrible racist? How is this to be concealed from the students when they read the details of these historical figures' private lives, when they read what these people actually thought on racial matters? Hey, a history professor could get himself into real trouble in a hurry. Better just not to study anything that happened before about 1960. Who needs to know all of that old stuff, anyway? Most of it is terribly Incorrect, Politically speaking.

The most popular radio show ever broadcast in America, which started in 1929, eventually became a TV series, and ran until 1960 -- 31 years altogether -- was *Amos 'n' Andy*. It was a show with White scriptwriters and White actors playing the roles of Blacks and using Black dialect. It was not in any sense an anti-Black show; in fact, it treated its Black characters with affection; but it was a comedy show, and it did not portray Blacks as dignified statesmen or brain surgeons or rocket scientists, so by the 1960s it had been condemned as "racist" and taken off the air. If the *Amos 'n' Andy* show were revived today, any company which signed on as a sponsor would be hit immediately with boycotts and demonstrations. Politicians and church leaders would be giving outraged speeches on television about how "hateful" and "racist" it was. And all over America tens of thousands of Katherine Corcorans -- remember, she's the silly woman who wrote in the *San Jose Mercury News* last week about her seven-year-old daughter's traumatic experience with Barbie dolls -- tens of thousands of Katherine Corcorans and their fully "sensitized" husbands would be wringing their hands and agonizing over how to explain to their kids why they couldn't watch *Amos 'n' Andy* on TV, why it would be "prejudiced" of them to laugh at the characters.

It's interesting to note that although *Amos 'n' Andy* spent its last days as a TV show, it was primarily TV which brought about the great sea change in America in the 1960s which made it impossible for *Amos 'n' Andy* or any other Politically Incorrect programming to remain on the air. Television as a brainwashing medium first became significant around 1950 -- or perhaps a year or two earlier. In 1950 there already were ten million black-and-white television receivers in the United States. Even in the early 1950s every self-respecting lemming family which wanted to keep up with the Joneses believed that it had to have a television receiver in the house, so that every evening the little lemmings and their parents could gather around the tiny, flickering, monochrome screen to have their attitudes and opinions adjusted. But it was the advent of color television at the beginning of the 1960s which made television the powerful and universal medium of mind control that it quickly became.

Without television Katherine Corcoran's little girl could have reached for the White Barbie doll without a trace of angst. Without television Field Marshall Montgomery's admirers wouldn't have to be apologizing for him. Without television Bill Clinton would be simply another crooked lawyer in Little Rock, defending small-time drug dealers.

Of course, it's really misleading to blame television as a medium for Political Correctness. That's like blaming Smith and Wesson or Colt for drive-by shootings. The ones to be blamed are the

members of that Hollywood tribe who got their dirty hands on television right from the beginning, elbowed everyone else aside, and with an unfailing tribal instinct began using the new medium to inject their spiritual poison into our people. But, you know, that's a subject we've talked about often enough already on *American Dissident Voices.*

We ought to conclude our talk today by resolving that we will not continue sitting on our hands while that filthy tribe poisons the souls of seven-year-old girls: that we will do whatever we must do to end their control of the minds and souls of our people.

When the Barriers Come Down

During the ongoing impeachment and trial of Bill Clinton one of the things we hear most often from the media is that this is a historic event. If Clinton is convicted by the Senate and removed from office, it will be the first time such a thing has happened -- something for the *Guiness Book of Records.* This led me to think about other records which are being set these days.

For example, if Clinton is removed from office and then is tried and convicted in a Federal court for perjury or obstruction of justice, he could become a member of a record-breaking U.S. prison population. I looked at some of the figures provided by the U.S. Census and published in various almanacs. I don't have the very latest figures, but in 1996 there were 1,185,000 persons confined to state and Federal prisons in the United States. With a total U.S. population in 1996 of 265 million, that's just under half a percent of the population in prison, which is a record. And that's not even counting another half-million inmates currently in local and county jails.

In 1930, at the beginning of the Great Depression, the total population of the United States was 123 million people, and 117,000 of those people were in state and Federal prisons. That works out to less than one-tenth of one percent of the population. In other words, in the bad, old days of chain gangs and lynchings and poverty and Al Capone and so on, we had only one-fifth as many people in prison, on a per capita basis, as we have today.

Now that is about as stark a demographic statistic as you'll find anywhere, and it's a very interesting statistic as well. The total population of the United States slightly more than doubled during the 66 years between 1930 and 1996, while the prison population increased by more than a factor of ten. Why? How could that have happened in this kinder and gentler age? Isn't that contradictory to everything we've been taught about the country becoming more and more enlightened and with a hundred times as many so-called "entitlement" programs and job-training programs and rehabilitation programs and Head Start programs and so forth now as then? How does that square with the government's recent claims that crime of all sorts is falling these days? Murders are down, they tell us. Robberies are down. Then why does the prison population keep increasing?

You know, a lot of scholars have studied this phenomenon and written books about it, but their aim seems to be to obscure the Politically Inconvenient facts rather than to get at a real understanding. I mean, how is an academician trying to write a book about crime and punishment to explain this amazing statistic in a Politically Correct way? In 1930 the head of the country was that arch-capitalist and enemy of the workers Herbert Hoover, who believed in locking them up and throwing away the key. Today it's that fellow who "feels the pain" of every Black rapist, crack dealer, and welfare thug who votes Democratic. In 1930 we had mostly White juries, who did not look kindly on criminals of any sort. Today we have the O.J. Simpson trend in judicial affairs. In 1930 we had racism and apartheid. We didn't believe in coddling criminals. We made them serve their time. So how could there possibly be more than ten times as many people behind bars today as then?

Now, I know what some of you're thinking. You're thinking that we have more Blacks in America now, and they make up most of the prison population. But you know, Blacks only increased from 9.7 per cent of the U.S. population in 1930 to 13 per cent today. That by itself can't account for the 400 per cent per capita increase in the prison population.

So, I'll explain it for you. There has been an enormous increase in the percentage of lawbreakers in America primarily because the social institutions which used to keep antisocial activity in check have been destroyed: deliberately destroyed. And this has gone hand in hand with the growth of liberal attitudes and liberal public policies. An example: In 1930 there was a very strict policy of racial segregation almost everywhere in the United States, in the North as well as in the South. Blacks did not live in the same neighborhoods as Whites, they did not eat in the same restaurants, they did not go to the same schools, and for the most part they did not work in the same offices and shops as Whites. Blacks found loitering in White neighborhoods, even in the daytime, were subject to arrest. Blacks and Whites, in other words, did not mix socially, and so Blacks did not have much opportunity to commit crimes against Whites. Furthermore, Blacks understood that if they did commit crimes against Whites and got caught, there would be no mercy and no leniency. Punishment would be sure, swift, and severe.

Furthermore, there was no social familiarity between Blacks and Whites. Blacks of any age customarily addressed Whites as "sir" or "ma'am." Blacks may not have loved Whites in 1930, and Whites for the most part made no pretense of loving Blacks, but Blacks did respect Whites, and Whites expected to be respected by Blacks. The net result was that far fewer crimes against Whites were committed by Blacks, and so far fewer Blacks were in prison for offenses against Whites.

Now, the really interesting thing is that under these racially segregated conditions Blacks also committed far fewer crimes against other Blacks. Why was that? Well, it was because Blacks had much more of a Black community, much more of a Black society of their own in America in 1930 than they do today. They had their own schools, with their own teachers and principals. They had their own colleges. They were not flattered or pampered or given all sorts of unrealistic expectations with the resulting frustrations. They understood their limits, what they were permitted to do and what they were not permitted to do, what was expected of them and what was not expected. And they adapted to their condition moderately well. Individual Blacks didn't compare their condition to that of Whites and become resentful and frustrated; instead they compared their condition to that of other Blacks. Their crime rate still was far higher than the White crime rate, but it was much lower than it is today.

Then the liberals, the egalitarians, set about removing all of the limits, setting aside all of the firm rules, abolishing the barriers between the Black society and the separate White society. They told the Blacks that they didn't have to respect or obey Whites any longer, that they were just as good as Whites, just as capable, and that they could enter White society and have everything the Whites had. I don't have time to go into this whole process in detail, but you know much of it already. The Roosevelt administration really began the process in earnest in 1933, and then the Second World War gave the liberals a wonderful opportunity to push it much faster. Blacks were hired by the millions by defense industries during the war, uprooted from rural areas

and concentrated in cities. And they were put to work in defense plants right alongside Whites and paid far more money than they ever had seen before.

There was, of course, White resistance. In February 1942, just a few weeks after the war began, White residents in Detroit responded to the government's program of moving thousands of Blacks into the city and providing special housing for them by organizing a posse of 1,200 armed men to block the entrance to one of these Black housing projects. In June 1943 26,000 White workers at Detroit's Packard Motor Plant went on strike to protest the hiring of Blacks for factory jobs that had belonged exclusively to Whites. The strike turned into a riot, in which 29 Blacks and 6 Whites were killed. The government sent in Federal troops to protect the Blacks. And of course, Detroit was not the only American city where the Roosevelt government's program to break down the barriers between the Black and White societies met resistance from Whites.

The problem everywhere was that the Whites had very little effective leadership. The working-class Whites, who were most immediately threatened socially and economically by the government's programs to integrate their neighborhoods and workplaces, were abandoned by the middle-class and upper-class Whites, conservatives as well as liberals, because the latter didn't feel immediately threatened. Then as now, these educated and well-to-do Whites had only contempt for working-class Whites. Socioeconomic class consciousness was much stronger among them than race consciousness. It never occurred to them that one day the government would do to them what it was doing then to White workers. They were astoundingly short-sighted in this regard.

After the war, under Truman and Eisenhower and Johnson and Kennedy, the government continued breaking down the barriers, continued forcibly integrating the Black and White societies. Despite the 14th and 15th Amendments, Blacks in many parts of the South were not permitted to vote until after Lyndon Johnson's Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the energetic use of Federal police power to enforce it. This led to a huge increase in the number of Black elected officials in the South. And of course, there was the forced racial integration of the public schools everywhere, often accompanied by bizarre programs such as forced busing for racial balance. And then there were various forced housing schemes intended to break up racially segregated neighborhoods. And there was "equal employment opportunity" -- which, in fact, often was racially biased hiring and promotion in favor of Blacks, under the guise of "affirmative action." Et cetera. As I said, I don't have time to go into a detailed record of the way in which the government broke down the separate Black and White societies and forced them together into a single multicultural society.

There was intermittent White resistance to this forced integration program -- rioting in South Boston over forced school integration, rioting in Oxford, Mississippi, in 1962 when the government forced the University of Mississippi to begin admitting Black students, and so on -- but remarkably less resistance than might have been expected. Again, this was due to a lack of White organization, a lack of White leadership: the affluent and educated Whites, the Whites who might have provided effective leadership, opted out of the struggle, because they did not feel threatened by the government's integration program, and they were intimidated by the very effective Jewish television propaganda of the day, which tarred any racially conscious White person as "trailer trash."

Blacks also rioted during the 1960s -- not in opposition to the government's programs of forced racial mixing, but because their expectations of equality were not satisfied. The government and the Jewish media and the liberals had been telling them for decades that they were just as good and just as capable and just as deserving as White people, and that they could have everything that Whites had. And when they found that most Blacks couldn't have everything Whites had, when they discovered that a White life-style was not automatically forthcoming for them, they rioted and burned and looted on a huge scale. They burned Detroit and Newark and Los Angles and Washington and 20 other American cities in the 1960s.

The response of the government, the media, and the liberals to Black lawlessness was more of the same. The media and the liberals blamed both the Blacks' frustration and their explosions of rage on "White racism," and the government devised still more programs to force Blacks and Whites together. But the old social constraints on Blacks were gone. They no longer had to address White people as "sir" or "ma'am." They no longer feared or respected White people. And, most important, they no longer compared their own attainments with those of other Blacks but with those of Whites, and the comparison infuriated them. And so Black behavior took a drastic downturn, and Blacks began filling up the prisons.

Another excellent example of the change in Black behavior which results when the constraints imposed on Blacks by Whites are removed and at the same time all the barriers between a Black society and a White society coexisting side by side are taken away, is provided by South Africa. The two principal differences between South Africa and the United States in this regard are, first, that in South Africa the Blacks are the majority race; and second, that the removal of the White constraints and of the barriers between the two societies occurred much more quickly. The results, however, have been almost exactly the same. The Black crime rate in South Africa always was much higher than the White crime rate, of course, but prior to 1994 the victims of Black criminals were nearly all Black. The White government simply didn't tolerate Black crime against Whites, and Blacks who attacked Whites knew that they almost certainly would be caught, and that when caught their punishment would be swift and very severe.

Just as in America the liberals blamed Black criminality in South Africa on White racism. It was the effect of apartheid on Blacks which frustrated them and made them strike out at their fellow Blacks, the liberals explained. It was the White man holding the Black man down; it was the White man forcing the Black man to live in crowded, dirty, and violent slums; it was the White man refusing to share his schools and his neighborhoods and his White women with the Black man which made the Black man behave in a criminal way. Take your foot off the Black man's neck and treat him like a fellow human being, the liberals said to the White South Africans, and his behavior will improve greatly.

Well, White people are nothing if not gullible, and White South Africans are if anything even more gullible than White Americans. They listened to the liberals. They said to themselves, yes, we're being terrible to the Blacks by making them have their own, separate society and by policing them so strictly and by not letting them go to school with us or marry our women. They felt guilty about apartheid. And so in 1994 they turned their country over to the Black majority in South Africa. They let the Blacks elect a Black government for the country. There no longer were any restrictions on where the Blacks could live. They could go to White schools and marry

White women. They had Black judges and Black police officials. Apartheid was history. The White man's foot was off the Black man's neck.

And the Black man's behavior suddenly became much worse than it had been before. Not only did he begin raping, robbing, and murdering Whites on an unprecedented scale, but he also began committing more crimes against his fellow Blacks than ever before. Life in the Black townships has become much more violent and dangerous than it was prior to Black rule. And Blacks in rural areas are being burned and stoned to death by their fellow Blacks on charges of witchcraft and sorcery. When the Whites were in charge they didn't tolerate that sort of thing. But now the Blacks are in charge, and many of them are wishing the Whites were running the country again. Crime is so bad that they long for apartheid again, when they felt much safer. And they're actually saying this in public. They're telling this to White television reporters.

You see, the same two things changed suddenly for Blacks in South Africa in 1994 as changed for Blacks in America over a period of several decades. White control was relaxed, and Black society lost its boundaries as it was told to merge with White society. And the results were very similar: an explosion of Black criminal behavior. The liberals, of course, have an explanation for Black behavior in South Africa just as they do in the United States. It's payback time, they say. The Blacks are still angry about having their human rights violated under apartheid, and that's why they're murdering White farmers and raping White women and stealing cars from White men, the liberals explain. It's a little more difficult for them to explain why the Blacks also are killing and robbing and raping more of their own people now.

But we know the explanation, don't we? First, without the White man's foot on his neck, the Black man will behave in his accustomed way. Without the White man forcibly restraining him and making him fear the consequences, the Black man will do what comes naturally to him. And second, the Black man's society, as squalid as it may seem to us, does at least serve the purpose of providing a frame of reference for Blacks. Take that frame of reference away, and there will be trouble. When Blacks are able to compare their condition, their attainments, their status with those of other Blacks, they can deal with it. When they begin comparing themselves with Whites, the result is frustration, resentment, anger, and criminal behavior.

And I also should mention that the government's attempt to force a multicultural society in America has resulted in an increase in criminal behavior on the part of Whites also. At the same time that the Black incarceration rate has been rising, so has the White rate. I don't have a racial breakdown for 1930, but in the decade between 1985 and 1995 the percentage of White Americans in state and Federal prisons rose from 0.12 to .23: that is, from about an eighth of a per cent to a little under a quarter of a per cent. In the same decade the percentage of Blacks incarcerated increased from .74 to 1.5: from three-quarters of a per cent to one and one-half per cent. Although the percentage of Blacks in prison increased slightly faster, both the White and Black imprisonment rates nearly doubled during that one decade, with Blacks somewhat more than six times as likely as Whites to be in prison.

And I also should point out that most of the five-fold increase since 1930 in the percentage of Americans in prison has taken place since the great social and racial revolution of the 1960s which the liberals remember so fondly: the decade of pot smoking and freedom marches and sit-

ins and draft card burning and trashing the dean's office. The rise in the rate of incarceration was quite moderate between 1930 and 1970. It was in 1972 that the percentage of the American population in prison really began to skyrocket.

Today there are far more Americans in prison per capita than in any other industrialized country except Russia, and we're neck and neck with Russia. We have nearly 11 times the incarceration rate of the Netherlands, for example.

The lesson of all this is that liberal theories about the wonders of multiculturalism and racial diversity and the horrors of segregation are one thing, but the hard, cold reality of the prison statistics is something quite different. You can force the races to mix only if you're prepared to lock them up at more than five times the rate for separate, racially homogeneous societies.

AIDS and the Cult of Equality

The organization which I head, the National Alliance, has for the past five years or so been publishing warnings about the dangers of contracting AIDS through sexual contact with non-Whites. We have warned, for example, that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely as heterosexual White males of being carriers of HIV, the AIDS-causing virus. Our data came from the U.S. government's Centers for Disease Control and were entirely accurate at the time. Of course, we were lambasted by the Jewish media and by a great many Politically Correct White people as well -- "racially sensitive" Gentiles who take their lead from the Jewish media -- for providing these warnings. We were denounced as "haters," and horror was expressed that we would publish such information.

Some of these Politically Correct Whites are so steeped in the lie of equality that they don't believe such a startling difference between the races could exist. After all, they have been told all their lives by the public schools and the government and the controlled media that Blacks and Whites are just alike except for skin color. So how could Black men be 14 times as likely as White men to transmit AIDS to a sexual partner? I mean, I receive hand-wringing letters literally every day from anguished egalitarians who whine to me that "we are all the same inside, Black and White. We all bleed red." Well, of course, snakes and rats bleed red too. But there are differences.

Other White people who like to think of themselves as "racially sensitive" understand that this enormous racial disparity in HIV infection rates is real -- they do not believe that the Centers for Disease Control is faking the data -- but they believe that it is "racist" to mention it. They deplore anything which might offend Blacks by reminding them of racial differences or -- even worse -- which might reduce the incidence of interracial sex. Better for White women to die from AIDS, they believe, than to avoid sex with Black men.

Well, just last week new AIDS data were published based on a study of 1.7 million blood donors in the United States. Each donor was tested for the presence of HIV using a new method which distinguishes between recent infections by the virus and infections which have been in the donor's blood for more than a few months. The study revealed a new infection rate among Blacks which is more than 25 times the new infection rate for Whites. I'll repeat that: the per capita number of new HIV infections among Blacks is between 25 and 26 times the number for Whites, indicating that the disparity between Blacks and Whites in the infection rate is increasing rapidly. While five years ago heterosexual Black males were 14 times more likely to be HIV carriers than Whites, the latest figures for new infections indicate that that ratio now is somewhere between 14 and 25: probably around 20.

AIDS began as a Black disease in Africa; it spread to White homosexuals through sexual contact with Blacks, and for a few years White homosexuals made up the principal reservoir for AIDS outside of Africa; now, among heterosexuals, AIDS is on the way to becoming an almost exclusively Black disease again. In addition to the obvious behavioral reasons for this, there also are more direct genetic reasons: Blacks are genetically predisposed to infection by the AIDS-causing virus. This is an inherited, racial difference.

The main reason why AIDS remains a concern for White Americans is that heterosexual Whites can and do become infected by the virus, even if not as easily as Blacks do, and when we are infected the virus is just as lethal for us. There was a time when the main infection channels for Whites were intravenous drug usage and bisexual White males, who spread the disease from their homosexual male partners to their heterosexual female partners. These days the greatly increased incidence of interracial sex, primarily between Black males and White women, is the principal channel the disease has into the heterosexual White population. Were it not for this interracial sex, we might be able to look forward to seeing the disease confined almost entirely to Blacks and homosexuals.

It might seem no real loss to us if White women who have sex with Blacks are lumped in with Blacks and homosexuals as part of the AIDS reservoir; certainly, we can do without them. Unfortunately, however, these trendy/trashy White women also have sex with White men. And the media bosses are doing everything they can to push the trend toward even more interracial sex by producing more racially mixed television entertainment and advertising. Mainly because of this, it looks like AIDS will continue to be a threat to normal White men and women even as it becomes more and more a Black disease.

The most interesting aspect of this to me is the continuing refusal of a large segment of the White public to recognize the racial aspects of the AIDS epidemic. Even people who're not zealots for Political Correctness are embarrassed by any discussion of the subject. To warn White women that sexual contact with a Black male these days is about 20 times as likely to result in an HIV infection as contact with a White male seems very offensive to these overly sensitive souls. To them it's like yelling "nigger" in public. It's just so embarrassing that they can't deal with it.

You know, I'm as much in favor of politeness and decorum in race relations as anyone. I've never been in favor of being gratuitously offensive. But I've also never been in favor of sticking my head in the sand or refusing to deal with relevant facts: especially facts relevant to the ever-growing and ever-more-threatening racial problem in America. On these broadcasts I've talked about the much greater tendency of Blacks toward criminal behavior. I've talked about the prison statistics and the murder statistics and the armed robbery statistics and the rape statistics. These statistics come from the U.S. Department of Justice and the Census Bureau and the FBI, and they show really radical differences in Black and White behavior. These behavioral differences are based on race, on genes -- not on income. One can see this radical difference in criminal behavior between Blacks and Whites in the same income brackets. And these crime statistics, just like the AIDS statistics, are relevant. White people need to be aware of these racial differences. Actually, it wouldn't hurt Blacks to be aware of them too. Anyway, I don't talk about crime statistics in order to offend anyone or to hurt anyone's feelings. Yet whenever I do talk about them, I receive the same whining letters from White idiots who ask me why I can't understand that "we're all the same inside."

And it's the same when I talk about IQ differences between the races. These racial intelligence differences are large, they are real, and they are relevant. Our schools are in the mess they are in today largely because we ignore these racial differences in intelligence, these differences in problem-solving ability. It embarrasses otherwise intelligent White people to talk about them. They don't want to be reminded of them. And so they ignore them and pretend that they don't

exist. And they hate me when I won't let these relevant truths be ignored; they hate me when I rub their noses in the truth.

My organization, the National Alliance, publishes material on racial demographics. For several years we've distributed stickers which have the words on them in large print, "Earth's most endangered species: the White race -- help preserve it." Millions of those stickers have been stuck on fences or power poles or tacked to bulletin boards all over America.

You may have seen one. If you haven't, send me a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and I'll send you a free sample. And of course, that sticker, just like everything else we publish, is based on hard facts. It's based on the fact that White Americans are fast becoming a minority in their own country, just as people of European race already are a minority in the world and are becoming a smaller minority with each passing year. In 1950 the population of the United States was 90 per cent White. Today it's just over 70 per cent White, and Bill Clinton has been boasting to his supporters that Whites will be a minority in the United States within the next few decades. In the world the White population already is down close to 10 per cent -- and that's because Whites, with their medical science and their agricultural science, have reduced the death rate in the non-White areas of the world and caused the populations there to explode during the 20th century.

Anyway, the message on our sticker is about as innocuous and inoffensive as a message can be. Not a word about Blacks on the sticker, not a word about hurting anyone or about anyone being superior or inferior to anyone else. Yet that simple message -- "help preserve the White race" -- brings us more hate mail than anything else we publish. And I mean hate mail from White people, who really become uptight when they see our stickers.

Of course, I don't mean that all White people become uptight when they see our publications or hear my message. Actually, our favorable mail -- letters from people who tell us how pleased they were to see one of our stickers or to hear one of my broadcasts, people who tell me how much they agree with my message: our love mail -- is running more than three to one over our hate mail. But that may be simply due to the fact that the people who like what I have to say are a more literate bunch than the haters; they are better able to cope with the task of writing a letter.

I say that because I'm aware of Bill Clinton's popularity polls, and I know that anyone who likes Bill Clinton must hate what I say. Of course, I know that much of Bill Clinton's constituency isn't White. The Democrats have put together a coalition of non-Whites and seriously defective Whites -- homosexuals, feminists, welfare recipients, and so on: people who have a grievance against society and think they're entitled to special treatment -- and this coalition makes up a majority of the Clinton constituency. And I'm not talking to these people. I don't care what they think. The only people in the Clinton constituency I care about are the more or less normal, productive White people.

I say more or less normal, because it's difficult for me to regard anyone who supports Bill Clinton as being entirely normal. I think these people need to have their heads worked on -- seriously. I think that if we could understand what's wrong with these White Clinton supporters we could understand what makes people send me hate letters when I publish AIDS statistics or

race-and-crime statistics or other facts which are contrary to what they've been told by their television.

At first I thought that these people were afraid that the material I publish might offend Blacks and might provoke a riot and that was why they objected to it. Of course, I wouldn't be offended if a Black organization published statistics, for example, proving that White people are much more likely to get skin cancer from exposure to the sun than Blacks are. It wouldn't bother me a bit. For one thing, I know that it's true. For another thing, I believe that it's good for White people to be reminded of that: it might make them a little more careful not to get sunburned. And if the Blacks want to believe that their relative immunity to sun-induced skin cancer makes them a superior race, well that's all right with me too. I'm not offended.

But really, I think that the White people who get upset with me when I say that we ought to preserve the White race aren't worried that this will hurt the feelings of Blacks. They aren't worried about being offensive to Blacks. It is they who are offended, because it is an assault on their religion. One of the things that led me to this conclusion was my noticing that the people who send me hate letters have a tendency to say very similar things, as if they're quoting from scripture. I've already mentioned one of the scriptural quotes I often hear from these people: "we're all the same inside," which is just another way of saying that the only difference between the races is skin color. And then there's the reminder that we all bleed red. I guess I've heard that a thousand times. And it's such a stupid thing to say, that they must be quoting scripture. It's like saying that people have white bones, and rattlesnakes have white bones, therefore there's really no difference between people and rattlesnakes. When they say, "We all bleed red," that's supposed to end the argument. It's like they believe they have said something very profound.

And there are other really stupid things they all have in their litany. For example, I've heard them say at least a thousand times, "There's no such thing as a White race. There's only the human race." And if you meet one of these idiots face to face, he'll prove to you that there's no such thing as a White race. He'll put his hand down on a sheet of white paper and triumphantly point out that his skin tone -- and mine -- aren't really white, like the paper. End of argument.

You know, I called these people idiots because they say such stupid things. But really, most of them are not idiots. Most of them can figure out how to operate their VCRs, and some of them can even fill out their own income tax forms, which is more than I can do. They all say the same stupid things because these things come from a catechism. They are statements of religious orthodoxy. They don't really believe that when I say, "I am a White man," they can refute me by showing me that my skin tone is not the same as a sheet of white paper. They only believe that in their make-believe world of egalitarianism. And the reason they become angry when they see my stickers about preserving the White race is that I am challenging their religion, which tells them that there is no White race. I am telling them that what they believe isn't real; it's only make-believe. And that makes them angry. It makes them hateful. That's why they write me hate letters which are full of angst and passion and venom, instead of just ignoring me or laughing at me as a benighted infidel. They feel threatened. At some level of their consciousness they understand that their religion is just make-believe. They can be Religiously Correct -- they can be pious -- when they are with other egalitarians. But in the presence of a heretic they feel threatened, because, as I said, at some level they understand that their Religious Correctness is only make-

believe. It cannot stand up to examination in the real world. It will collapse like a house of cards. That's why they hate any dissident, any heretic.

I'll say it again: when I see a lot of otherwise intelligent people saying the same stupid things as if they were reciting scripture or reading from a catechism, and when they respond with angst and hatred when contradicted, then I suspect that I am dealing with the members of a religious cult -- and in this case it's the cult of egalitarianism. These are people for whom the statement that there is no difference between Whites and Blacks except skin color is not a scientific statement: it's a religious statement. They're horrified when I advise White women that sexual contact with a Black male is about 20 times as likely to give them AIDS as is sex with a White male, not because they believe that I'm saying something which is scientifically incorrect, but because I'm saying something Religiously Incorrect; I am saying something heretical, which threatens their whole belief structure. They are responding to me in the same emotional way that a devout Christian in the 15th century might have responded to someone who announced publicly that he didn't believe in the virgin birth. And in fact, the people that I offend by stating truths which contradict their egalitarian beliefs, just like their 15th-century Christian counterparts, would like to see me burned at the stake.

You know, this business of making a religion out of egalitarianism isn't just a curious psychological phenomenon, suitable only for investigation by students of abnormal psychology: it's an extraordinarily dangerous phenomenon that every patriot -- and in fact, every rational person -- ought to be very concerned about. In the first place, the prophets and the priests and the bishops of the cult of egalitarianism have at their disposal the most powerful machinery of persuasion and mind control which has ever existed: they are the masters of Hollywood and Madison avenue, of television and films, of all of the most influential newspapers and news magazines. Using their machinery of mind control, they have persuaded the most impressionable segments of our people that certain concepts are sacred and undebatable: concepts such as democracy, equality, diversity, multiculturalism. These are holy concepts, which must never be questioned by cult members. And other concepts are undebatably evil: racism, patriotism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Semitism -- ah, yes, above all else, anti-Semitism must be opposed by the cult members.

The cult has appeared under different guises at different times and places. Sometimes it has been called communism, sometimes democracy, but the underlying idea always has been equality, and the prophets and bishops always have been the same people -- that is, people from the same tribe, the tribe of Karl Marx and Michael Eisner and Steven Spielberg. And they have preached their poison, their hatred for heretics, for all who questioned their doctrine of equality. They have murdered more people in the name of equality than have been killed for the sake of any other religion. As the great Russian patriot Alexander Solzhenitsyn noted just a few months ago, two generations of the best of his people were selectively murdered in the name of equality -- everyone who excelled, everyone who stood out from the crowd, everyone whose excellence showed up the lie of human equality, was murdered by the egalitarians who had a deathgrip on Russia. And really, if they could, they'd do the same thing in America.

That is something to remember every time you hear a cult member whine that "we're all the same inside." It's something to remember when the simple warning that contact with Blacks is the way

most White women are becoming infected with the AIDS virus elicits the sneering response from a cult member that "their blood is just as red as yours." These cult members really don't care how many White women catch AIDS from Blacks or how many White people are the victims of Black criminals. Their only concern is that people not be reminded of these things.

Thoughts on Accepting Responsibility

I receive many letters from listeners, and usually they are gratifying to me. Some people tell me that I have opened their eyes or that I have helped them make sense out of what's been happening to their world, that my explanations have really helped them understand what's going on, have helped them see the big picture. And some people tell me that they already had figured out by themselves what's happening, and that they are very happy to have discovered my broadcasts, because now they know that they aren't the only ones to have figured it out: that they aren't alone in the world, that there are others who have come to the same conclusions they have.

I especially sympathize with these people who tell me how glad they are to discover that they're not the only ones who understand what's happening, because there was a time when I also wondered whether I was the only sane person in the universe. I was running around telling anyone who would listen, "My god, don't you understand where this policy of racial integration of the schools will lead? It will lead to the drugs and crime that are endemic among Blacks spreading to White boys and girls. It will lead to a lowering of scholastic standards to accommodate the Blacks. It will lead to a greatly increased rate of racial intermarriage."

And people would look at me as if I were crazy, and they'd tell me I was an alarmist. They'd say to me, "Just having a few Blacks in school won't hurt anything. Surely everything will go on pretty much as it always has."

Then, after I'd looked into the ownership and management of the news and entertainment media which were pushing every destructive racial and social and political policy and I discovered that most of them were Jews, I figured I had the key to what was happening to America, and I tried to tell people about that. I'd say, "Listen, did you know that every major studio in Hollywood is run by Jews? Did you know that all three television networks are run by Jews?" In those days there were just three television networks, ABC, CBS, and NBC. And I'd start naming the Jews who were running the big film companies in Hollywood, the Jews who ran the networks, the Jews who owned the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and the three weekly news magazines. I'd say, "Hey, listen, the Jews make up less than three per cent of the population in the United States, and yet they control nearly every medium of mass communication. That's no coincidence." And people would tell me, "Well, so what? They're just good businessmen, that's all. They're clever at that sort of thing. That's how they got control. Don't worry about it."

And I'd say, "But don't you see, with their monopoly control of the media they're able to have an enormous influence on public opinion. Look at what they're doing with these television serials of theirs, *All in the Family*, and *M*A*S*H*, and the rest. They're all slanted the same way -- all of them. That's no coincidence. And by controlling the ideas and opinions of such a large segment of the public, they can control votes, they can control political candidates. That's why our government is pushing the same policies the media are pushing. It's no coincidence. Don't you understand?"

And people would say to me, "Don't talk like that. That sounds like anti-Semitism. You can't say anything that's anti-Semitic, because if you do the media will destroy you, they'll smear you, they'll cause you to lose your job. Go away; don't talk to me."

And I'd reply to them, "Look, I don't care what you call it -- anti-Semitism or patriotism or alarmism or what -- the point is that it's the truth; it's what's happening to us. And it's our responsibility to stop it." But my listeners already would be running away as fast as they could go. And I would really feel lonely. And so I can sympathize with the listeners who write me today and tell me how glad they are to have found out that they're not alone in their concern for what's being done to our country, to our civilization, to our people.

But let me tell you, it's a lot easier today to find people who agree with us than it was 25 years ago. There are a lot more concerned people out there today than there were then. There are a lot more people who understand what's happening. And if my efforts have had anything to do with that, if I have been able to increase the number of those who understand, then I am very happy for that. That is my reward for everything I do: knowing that I am building the number of people who understand what's happening in the world today.

But you know, there's more to our task than just helping people to understand what's happening. The bigger job is to get people to accept responsibility -- personal responsibility -- for straightening things out. Even back in those days when I felt very lonely, I realized that getting people to accept responsibility was a more difficult job than getting them to understand. When people told me, "You can't talk about the Jews; they'll destroy you," -- when they said that and then ran away from me, it was clear that they already had at least some understanding of the Jewish problem. They understood that the Jews are extremely powerful and are organized and don't want anybody explaining to the public what they're up to. These people already understood that much without my telling them about it. They just didn't want to do anything about it. They were afraid. They didn't want to accept personal responsibility.

It took a while for that fact to sink in. I couldn't understand this unwillingness to accept responsibility. I mean, when our ancestors came over here from England and Scotland and Scandinavia and Germany and took this land away from the Indians and built a country, they weren't a bunch of softies or cowards or people who ran away from a challenge. They were strong people. They were fighters. How did their great-great-great-great-great grandsons become such a bunch of wimps, such a bunch of couch potatoes and lemmings? I couldn't understand that.

Well, since then I have gradually come to understand how that happened, how America lost its spine. America isn't the only country that's happened to. And of course, not every American has lost his spine. There still are many Americans who are not afraid of the truth. There still are Americans who are willing to accept personal responsibility: Americans who when they understand what's going on, either because I explained it to them or they figured it out for themselves, don't run away. Instead they say, "What can I do? How can I help?" There still are Americans like that. The problem is that there aren't enough of them. So I want to share with you my thoughts on this concept of personal responsibility, in the hope that it will help you be willing to accept your responsibility also.

You know, we live in an age of shirkers, of deadbeats, of people who actually think they're being smart by never being responsible for anything. It seems like the first rule a lot of our soldiers in Vietnam learned 25 years ago was "never volunteer for anything." That's what I hear from a lot of Vietnam vets. But this attitude also has permeated our whole society and has affected many Americans who are too young to have been in Vietnam. People who spend a lot of time on the Internet discussing political and social issues with other people tell me that the word there too is "never join anything; if you do the government may cause you trouble or you may be asked to do something; so the smart thing to do -- the safe thing to do -- is never join anything."

Well, of course, the thing about the Internet is that it is anonymous. People can express their opinions about anything they want without anybody knowing who they are. They all use pseudonyms or nicknames. It's the perfect environment for cowards, for shirkers. They can shoot their mouths off and act like real men without being called to account. And like shirkers everywhere, they would like for everyone else to be a shirker too, so they are not shown up for what they are. They would like for their cowardice and irresponsibility to be regarded as prudence. They want to thought of as smart guys instead of as shirkers.

But really, how smart is it never to accept any personal responsibility? What that amounts to is opting to be a spectator in life instead of a participant. Life is interesting. Life can be fun. There are many fascinating things to observe, to talk about. And I guess these smart guys figure that they will watch it all first. They will talk about it all with their friends first. Then when they know everything they can go back and make smart choices about what to become involved in. They won't make any mistakes.

But you know, it doesn't work that way. You don't get to go back and start over after you've watched it all and got it all figured out. You only get one shot at life, and you've got to make the most of it. You've got to figure it out as you go, even if that means accepting some risk and making some mistakes. There's no going back. If you just watch it all the way to the end, telling everyone how smart you are because you're not making any commitments or taking any chances, you've missed your chance to live. And that chance never will come again. The people who live are the people who participate in life, not the spectators who just watch it go by.

I guess that in this television age, when kids grow up spending much more time watching things happen on the TV screen than actually doing things, people who are naturally weak and passive will slip into the spectator mode and stay there all their lives. And at this point there's not much we can do for them. They've just missed it. But I know that there are many men and women out there who still are capable of reaching out and taking hold of life and living. Those are the ones I'm talking to. And I apologize if what I'm saying sounds painfully obvious, painfully self-evident -- but it is so extremely important that I must say it.

This wonderful gift of life that we have, what does it mean? What is its real value? Is it simply a collection of sensations, of feelings, that we get as spectators? I'm sure that for many people that's what life is. The more pleasurable their collection of sensations, the more pleasant their feelings, the more enjoyable the things they see as spectators, the better their life is. And that's understandable. That's what life always has been for animals -- and we are animals. We are creatures of instinct, and our instincts tell us to survive, to find food, to seek shelter, to

reproduce, to avoid danger. In a prosperous, civilized society the drive to satisfy these basic needs expresses itself as a quest for wealth, for enjoyment, for comfort.

A thousand years ago our ancestors also sought wealth, enjoyment, and comfort. But they didn't believe that these things were quite as important as most people today think they are. In that age before television people were perhaps a little closer to the earth, and they were a little more aware of just how temporary an individual's life is, and they reached out for things with a little more permanence, things beyond wealth and comfort and pleasure, things which to them seemed to have more real meaning. I remember a few lines of poetry which expressed this feeling among our ancestors in Scandinavia -- and more generally in the Germanic parts of Europe -- back during the Viking age. Those lines are:

Cattle die, and kinsmen die,
and so must one die oneself.
But there is one thing I know which never dies,
and that is the fame of a dead man's deeds.

For our ancestors a thousand years ago, of course, cattle were wealth, and kinsmen were power, and though they sought these things just as we do today, they understood that they were transitory; the value of these things was not permanent. The only thing that is permanent is the mark that one makes on the world with one's deeds. Everyone wants to live well, of course, but it is better to live effectively: to live so that one is remembered for what one has accomplished.

And to put a little finer edge on the concept, it is not just fame in itself which is important. What counts also is the type of fame, the type of renown. The goal was to be remembered not just for being able to throw a spear farther than others or to swing a battle-ax harder or to use a sword more skillfully; it was to be remembered for having lived a meaningful life, a significant life. For some that meant a life of accomplishment, of changing the world; for others it meant a life lived as closely as possible in accord with the ideals of personal honor and of service to one's people, so that one's life could be held up as a model and remembered as such.

In any case the life that had lasting value was a life of participation; never a life of sitting on one's hands and playing it safe. Perhaps too much television and too much comfort have caused us to lose sight of this very important thing which our ancestors understood. I think that they saw their individual lives more clearly in the larger context of the ongoing life of the race than we do. They were on more familiar terms with birth and with death than we are and were not as likely as we are to slip into the folly of believing that they would live forever. And so being constantly aware of the reality and inevitability of death they were more concerned than we are to use their lives effectively and to give lasting meaning to them.

For those of us today who do want to participate in life, who want to live significant lives, there is no more significant activity in which to participate than working to assure a healthy future for our people, for our European race. And there is almost no limit to the ways in which you can participate in this activity. Whether you're a housewife or a computer scientist or a machinist or a secretary or a bulldozer operator or a law-enforcement officer or a teacher or a writer or an artist, you can participate. The only reason that a rabble of feminists and queers and Jews and Blacks

and mestizos and liberals and Clinton supporters are running America into the ground today is that decent people are sitting on their hands. If the decent people in America would get off their hands and accept personal responsibility for what is being done to their world, and if they would make a commitment and begin working together, we could sweep the whole Clinton coalition into the dustbin of history. It doesn't matter that the Clinton rabble outnumber us. We will whip them in a minute. We will have the media bosses jumping into the ocean all along the East Coast and swimming toward Israel as fast as they can go. But first we must be willing to accept personal responsibility.

And so my message today to every decent person who is listening is this: Don't be a shirker. Don't try to be a smart guy by continuing to cheer from the sidelines but refusing to join the team and get out on the field. Stand up and become a participant in life. Make of your life a model that people will remember and talk about long after you're gone. And sure, the bureaucrats in the Clinton government may try to put your name on some sort of "enemies" list of Politically Incorrect people, but you should regard that as a badge of honor.

And let me tell you something else -- and this is directed not only toward the decent men and women in my audience, but also toward those who now think of themselves as "smart guys" -- let me tell you: don't worry if the Clinton government hates you for standing up and accepting your personal responsibility. Don't worry if Hillary Clinton denounces you as part of some "right wing conspiracy." Don't worry if Janet Reno tells her jackbooted thugs that you should be watched. Don't worry about any of these people. Don't be afraid of them, because they aren't going to last. Their ship is taking on water fast, and they are going down sooner than they expect, believe me.

Listen, I'm not one of these old-fashioned moralists who'll tell you that because every major city in America has become the sort of place that would make the folks in Sodom and Gomorrah blush, we're going to be punished with fire and brimstone. I don't believe that wickedness is automatically punished. I do believe that evil can thrive and prosper for quite a while. My god, look, at how successful the Jews have been.

But I also believe that when a society loses its manliness, when its leaders lose all sense of direction and no longer are guided by any principle or any ideal and are concerned only with looking out for themselves, when a country loses its backbone and its citizens withdraw from the public arena and refuse to be anything but spectators -- then that society, that country, will not remain afloat for long. It's going under.

I mean, how can anyone be afraid of a government headed by Bill Clinton? How can anyone take seriously a Congress whose members are so frightened by the opinion polls that they won't throw the bum out? Janet Reno may still have a lot of jackbooted thugs at her disposal, but by being a part of the Clinton government she has forfeited the respect, the serious consideration, of decent citizens. Really, the time has come for us to understand that this government of clowns and criminals in Washington may still be dangerous, but it won't be around forever. And I'm not talking about just the Clinton administration; I'm talking about the whole structure, the whole system. In planning our strategies, in deciding how we should live, what the government thinks about us just shouldn't be as fundamental a consideration as it would be if we lived in a healthy

society with a government of principled men. Even the smart guys should be thinking ahead to the time when this rotten system and all its supporters, all its collaborators, are with the maggots, and people who don't know how to accept personal responsibility because they have never done it, people who don't know how to participate in events because they always have been only spectators, may find the going a lot rougher. The non-participants may find it much harder to survive.

Anyway, it's always better to be a participant than a spectator, and never more than now. It is time, my fellow White men and women, for us to stop worrying about anything except doing what is right. It is time for us to accept our responsibilities.

Thanks for being with me again today. And by the way, if you missed my radio broadcast last week, you still can listen to it through the Internet. The current program and a few recent programs -- both text and audio -- always are accessible on the Internet.

A Trial in Jasper

Last week they had a trial in Jasper, Texas, of 24-year-old John King, one of three White men accused of killing a Black by dragging him behind their pickup truck. The media made a real circus of the trial. Every night on the television news programs Tom Brokaw and the other network news announcers reminded us with a grim face and a sober tone about the gruesome nature of the killing. Over and over again they showed us the chain which had been used to drag the Black. They showed us the asphalt road along which he was dragged, with painted circles on the road wherever the police had found blood. And they told us what an awful White racist John King was. They showed us his tattoos. They told us that he was a petty criminal who had been in prison. They read us some of the letters he had written expressing his dislike for Blacks. And the media people really rubbed all of this in hard -- "White racist, gruesome killing, Black victim, hate crime, evil Whites, good Blacks" -- it was like a ritual chant, over and over again, until they even had a hardened cynic like me flinching. That's the power of television.

And now they've got the trials of the other two White men accused in the killing to look forward to: more circus, more ritual. And I hardly need to tell you what the purpose of the circus is. The media bosses are pushing hard to have new "hate crime" legislation enacted, and their step'n'fetchit in the White House is eager to oblige. These circus trials are intended to make the White couch potatoes, the White lemmings, feel just a little guiltier for being White and soften them up so they won't object to having their freedom taken away. And really, that's where all of this is headed: the goal is "hate speech" legislation of the sort they've already gotten enacted in Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, and a dozen other countries, where it is now illegal to say or write or publish anything Politically Incorrect.

You know, there are many conservative Americans who sneer at that prognosis. They believe that I am just a doom-sayer. They believe that Americans are too smart and too independent to surrender their freedom. Well, sir, I wish that they were right, but I'm sure they aren't. These days, whenever there's an argument about the good common sense or the rugged independence of the American people, about their devotion to principles and to freedom, all we have to do is look at what they elected President -- twice. That should settle the argument. That raping, lying, draft-dodging, coke-snorting piece of filth in the White House, who is still overwhelmingly popular with the American people, is not a figment of my imagination. He is, unfortunately, all too real. And believe me, anyone who would choose Clinton to be his President will not put up even the slightest objection to having his freedom taken away in return for the promise of more security. That is how far America has fallen.

Let's look at the details. During the television coverage of the trial in Jasper I did not once hear it mentioned that the Black who was killed was himself a convicted criminal. Instead he was held up to the television audience as a devoted family man, a choir boy, a Black man loved by all who knew him, almost a saint -- brutally murdered by three low-life White thugs who were racists. And to be sure, there hardly can be any doubt that the three young Whites who killed him were low-lifes. All three of them were convicted criminals, just like their Black victim. And the killing itself was a pretty good indicator that they were low-class people, certainly not the sort anyone would want for neighbors. The killing was an act of drunken hooliganism, done on the spur of

the moment without a thought for the consequences. It was done stupidly, in a way that was certain to result in the perpetrators getting caught.

The media suggested that they believed they were engaged in a race war, Whites against Blacks, and that their killing of the Black was part of that war. If that was so -- and I really doubt that they had any coherent reason for their actions that night -- but if they thought that they were part of some White army, they should have understood that in any White army worth its salt such drunken foolishness would not be tolerated. Such an act of indiscipline and hooliganism would have resulted in a court martial and a firing squad for the three low-lifes who did it.

The media also made much of John King's racial beliefs. He was a nice boy before he went to prison and was exposed to White racist gangs, they said. After he came out of prison he hated Blacks, they said, and they implied that it was because he had been indoctrinated with racial hatred by these racist gangs while in prison. Another good reason for a "hate crime" law: keep these White racist gangs from poisoning the minds of nice, non-racist boys like John King used to be. Actually, what happened to John King while he was in prison was not indoctrination by White gangs. It was direct contact with the reality of the Black nature. It was direct exposure to the wonders of life with the colored brother.

Let me tell you, I've lived in East Texas. I graduated from a military school in a small East Texas town only about 100 miles from Jasper, and I have a pretty good feeling for what it's like in that part of the country. There are, of course, too many Blacks there, just as in most other parts of the country. But in the small towns like Jasper the Blacks are moderately well behaved. The police don't coddle them like they do in the big cities. The White people in East Texas aren't terrorized by them. And so John King didn't think much about Blacks or about the racial situation in this country -- until he was sent to prison for burglary and was exposed to a majority prison population consisting of Black criminals like James Byrd, the Black ex-convict he was convicted of killing.

I don't want to get into all of the gory details about what young White men are exposed to in prisons these days, where the majority of the inmates very often are Black. It is a hell almost beyond imagining for White Americans brought up in a genteel environment. For Blacks homosexual rape is accepted behavior. It is not a rare occurrence; it is routine. It's the way they establish their barnyard pecking order. They rape each other when they must, but they much prefer to rape Whites. They get away with it because the government's official position is that it doesn't happen, or at worst is only a very minor problem. And of course, the media don't like to talk about such things. It doesn't fit.

And even if a young White man doesn't get raped, it is something he is constantly aware of, something which he must constantly be on guard against. He is surrounded by Blacks who no longer feel that they must ape the White man in their behavior. Instead they behave in prison in the way that is natural for them, the way they behaved in the jungles of Africa. And you know, everyone in the government understands this racial situation in the prisons. They make jokes about it at their cocktail parties in Washington. Most of them know some fellow bureaucrat or politician who has been sent to prison for taking bribes or committing perjury or the like, and the reality of being thrown into a cage with a mob of unrestrained Blacks is something which is

never too far below the surface of their consciousness. But of course, in their public statements they pretend that they believe that Blacks and Whites are the same and that there's nothing in particular to worry about if one is locked up with Blacks.

Well, John King was exposed to the brutal truth when he was sent to prison for burglary, and he learned to hate Blacks in a hurry. He turned to White gangs in prison in order to survive, and when he came out he was indeed a changed man. If there's anything good that can be said about America's prisons today it is that they provide a strong dose of racial reality to those Whites unfortunate enough to be forced to spend some time in them.

John King was sentenced on Thursday of last week, and NBC anchorman Tom Brokaw announced the news of the sentencing on the NBC Evening News with these words: "And in Jasper, Texas, today the ***racist*** got the death penalty." That's the way Brokaw introduced the news: not "John King got the death penalty" or "the man who was convicted in a dragging death got the death penalty," but "the ***racist*** got the death penalty."

Do you believe that was a slip of the tongue? Listen, Tom Brokaw is paid seven million dollars a year to read his news scripts. He is paid seven million dollars a year because he is a very good actor and says -- convincingly -- exactly what the Jews who formulate his news program want him to say. He is paid seven million dollars a year for his half-hour appearance every evening because he uses his words, his facial expressions, his tone of voice to convey exactly the message that his bosses want conveyed. And that message in this case was, "racism is a crime, and racists deserve the death penalty." That was Tom Brokaw's subliminal message to us, and it was a calculated message.

Of course, media people do sometimes make slips of the tongue. On Wednesday of last week, with the Jasper trial on everyone's mind, a well-known White disk jockey, Doug Tracht, at Washington, DC, radio station WARW-FM, played part of a song by Grammy-winning Black hip-hop performer Lauryn Hill. Well, Doug Tracht, who is best known by his nickname, "the Greaseman," didn't like the Black woman's song, and so he commented as he stopped it, "No wonder people drag them behind trucks."

Now, that was a slip. Within hours the CBS-owned station had fired Tracht. Before the day was over he also had lost his job as part-time deputy sheriff in suburban Falls Church, Virginia. And you can bet your bottom dollar that he never will be allowed to work again in the controlled media. He made the mistake of saying what was on his mind.

But Tom Brokaw didn't make a slip when he introduced the news the following day about John King's sentencing with the words, "And in Jasper, Texas, today the racist got the death penalty." Tom Brokaw was delivering a subliminal message calculated by Neal Shapiro, the Jewish executive producer of the NBC Evening News, and Brokaw's other Jewish bosses. The message again was: "Racism is a crime. Not liking Blacks or Jews or mestizos or Asians is a crime. Racism deserves the death penalty. We need a law against racism." Tom Brokaw is paid seven million dollars a year by his Jewish bosses because he delivers subliminal messages like that very skillfully, very convincingly. Tom Brokaw is paid to be a Judas goat, to lead the sheep to the slaughter.

Now, perhaps you think that I am imagining things. Perhaps you think that I am way off target, first, in imagining that the media coverage of the news has the effect of making White people feel guilty and of conditioning them to give up their freedom without protest, and second, in imagining that this is the result of a deliberate plan by the Jews who control the media.

Well, I wish that it were just my imagination. But you know, the panicked reaction to the Greaseman's casual comment, "No wonder they drag them behind trucks," -- his immediate firing by his radio station, where he was by far their highest rated announcer, and his firing by the sheriff's department for his Politically Incorrect slip of the tongue -- that wasn't my imagination. White people do feel intimidated by the media propaganda. In Jasper, Texas, the White people are falling all over themselves in their efforts to apologize for being White. The effect of all of the media publicity has been guilt, guilt, guilt. White men, as well as women, in Jasper have been wringing their hands in anguish and begging not to be judged as racists, just because of John King and his two companions. One of the first things the White people of Jasper did was tear down a fence which had divided the White and Black sections of their cemetery. And the 11 White people on John King's jury chose the one Black man on that jury to be the foreman, so that they could show the world that they aren't racists. Now they've built themselves a new city park and named it James Byrd Junior Park. How many other towns in America have named city parks after local ex-convicts? Indeed, James Byrd was an ex-convict who happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time and got himself killed in an especially messy way -- but he's still only an ex-convict, a petty criminal and ne'er do well. And it's quite clear that if he'd been White instead of Black, no city park would have been built in his honor, no matter how messily and painfully he died. And so the effect of the media coverage of his killing has been to create a sense of White racial guilt in the lemmings.

What about the motivation behind the media coverage? Why did this trial in Jasper get such enormous media coverage all over the country? Was it just because the defendant had committed an especially gruesome crime? The more gruesome the crime, the more coverage the trial will get -- is that it?

No, not really. You know, another murder trial opened the same day that John King's trial did. While John King was being tried in Jasper, Texas, last week for killing James Byrd, Danny Martinez was being tried in Denver, Colorado, for the rape, torture, and murder of 14-year-old Brandy Duvall. But of course, unless you live in Denver, you haven't heard a word about the Martinez trial. Tom Brokaw didn't even mention it. All you've heard about is the King trial. Is it because the murder Martinez committed wasn't as gruesome or newsworthy as the murder King committed? Well, I'll let you be the judge.

Martinez and six other members of the mestizo gang to which he belongs, the Bloods, grabbed 14-year-old Brandy Duvall from a Denver bus stop, where she was waiting for a bus. They took her to a house where one of the gang members lives, and they held the 14-year-old White girl down on a mattress while she was gang-raped for several hours. The gang members then took turns sexually torturing the White junior high school student. They repeatedly rammed a broomstick into her vagina while she screamed and begged for her life. Then, after they had finished amusing themselves, Martinez and the other mestizos handcuffed the bleeding White girl, put a hood over her head, and drove her to a drainage ditch. There they stabbed Brandy

Duvall 28 times with a butcher knife and then dumped her body into the ditch, where she bled to death. After that the gang members went back to the house and disposed of the bloody mattress on which she had been gang-raped and sexually tortured.

And as I just told you, Danny Martinez was being tried for this horrible crime last week at exactly the same time John King was being tried. So why do you think the media focused so heavily on Jasper, Texas, and didn't have a word to say about the trial in Denver? Could it be that the Jasper trial served their propaganda purpose and the Denver trial didn't? Could it be that the Jewish media bosses wanted to make White people feel guilty and intimidated, and the Jasper trial served that purpose, while the Denver trial didn't? Could that be the only reason why they covered up the horrible rape, torture, and murder of 14-year-old Brandy Duvall while they beat us over the head with the dragging death of a Black ex-convict in Texas? Could it be that they kept quiet about Brandy Duvall because she was White and her murderers were mestizos? Did they make a circus out of the Jasper trial just because the victim was Black and the murderers were White? That's what I think. What do you think?

Let me just recap this for you, because it really is extraordinarily important. What happened in Jasper, Texas, to a Black ex-convict shouldn't have happened in a civilized society. It was an especially gruesome murder. And there is no doubt that John King hated Blacks as a consequence of his own experiences with them in prison. All of that is a legitimate subject for news coverage.

But what happened to 14-year-old Brandy Duvall in Denver is even more terrible than what happened to James Byrd. It is more newsworthy, something which the White citizens of this country should be more concerned about, because it was an organized, gang attack by non-White racists, by mestizo racists, on a White person. An innocent White child was killed in Denver, while the victim in Jasper was a Black criminal, an ex-convict.

The news media have gone all-out on the Jasper trial and have been completely silent on the Denver trial, not because the killing of James Byrd was more gruesome than that of Brandy Duvall or more newsworthy or more interesting to television viewers, but solely because in Jasper the victim was Black and the perpetrators were White, while in Denver the victim was White and the perpetrators were mestizos. That is the only reason for the enormous disparity in the news coverage of the two trials: the only reason. The Jasper trial suited their purpose and the Denver trial didn't.

And that purpose -- the purpose of the Jewish media bosses -- is to make White people feel guilty, so that they won't oppose the Jews' campaign for so-called "hate crime" legislation, the same sort of legislation which the Jews have succeeded in having imposed on the people of Canada and Britain and France and Germany and Switzerland and much of the rest of Europe. It is legislation whose real aim is to keep White people from defending themselves against the Jews, to keep White people from criticizing the Jews or speaking out against their activities.

And this White guilt campaign by the media is working; it is having the desired effect. Many White people are feeling guilty as a result. Many White people are feeling ashamed of their natural dislike of Blacks. That's why Doug Tracht, the Greaseman, lost both his jobs so quickly

when he made a Politically Incorrect remark about the Jasper trial. That's why the White citizens of Jasper have named a new city park after a convicted Black criminal. That's why there will never be a park in Denver named after Brandy Duvall.

Yes, the media bosses planned this propaganda campaign, and Tom Brokaw is doing a very effective job as a Judas goat. But you know, if this campaign doesn't work for the Jews -- if it backfires in the long run and White Americans reject the effort of the media bosses to take away their freedom, Tom Brokaw may decide that seven million dollars a year was nowhere near enough payment for his treachery. Let's aim for that.

Odysseus' Way

Sometimes after I finish speaking with you in one or another of my programs, I have a bad feeling. I feel that I have let you down by not really leveling with you and telling you everything. I feel as if I have walked into the courtyard of the temple and politely reprimanded one or two of the moneychangers there for his dishonest practices, when I should have overturned all of the tables and then taken a whip to everyone in sight.

I feel that way after I have focused heavily on a very specific problem in our society -- on our immigration problem, on our embarrassment in the White House, on the decline of our schools, on the correlation between AIDS and race, even on such an urgent matter as the Jewish control of our news and entertainment media -- because I feel that I may have led some of you to believe that if we solve the particular problem I have talked about, or even many of the problems I talk about on these programs, then we will be well on the way to having things straightened out the way they ought to be. And that just isn't so.

The problem with the moneychangers in the courtyard wasn't in the details of the way they conducted their business. The problem was that they shouldn't have been there at all, and the fact that they were there, and nobody really cared that they were there, indicated a far more pervasive and fatal problem in the society than the mere shortchanging of the moneychangers' customers. Punishing the moneychangers -- even making them all conduct their business honestly -- could not solve the underlying problem. It could not do anything at all even to ameliorate that problem.

Let's think of a story a thousand years older than the one about the moneychangers in the courtyard. Let's recall the story of the return of Odysseus, king of Ithaca, to his palace after being away for 20 years during the Trojan War and subsequent adventures. He finds his palace overrun with strangers lusting after his wife and his kingdom, feasting on his food, and corrupting his household with their bad manners. Odysseus doesn't think about dealing with this problem by correcting the manners of his unwanted guests. He simply makes a plan and kills the whole bunch of them, and then he goes about straightening things out.

And we might liken our situation in America today to being at a banquet thrown by a gang of unwelcome guests in our palace: a palace that we and our forefathers built with our own hands. These unwelcome guests have set out a whole array of dishes that they have concocted for us, and they invite us to join them at the table and eat and be merry. And what a splendid array of dishes there is to choose from! Try a nice casserole of very assertive female business executives, female Army officers, and female fighter pilots garnished with homosexual television entertainers. Yum, yum, yum!

How about a tasty salad of subsidized housing for non-White welfare recipients in White neighborhoods, with a dressing of affirmative action and equal opportunity? Surely you will enjoy the delicious sensitivity soup: that will just whet your appetite for a wonderful broiled filet of Political Correctness. And there are appetizing side dishes of permissively raised, smart-aleck 10-year-olds who have been taught to address all adults by their first names; of racially

integrated, coed university dormitories; and of fast-talking, loudmouthed Jewish comedians with all the latest jokes about your various bodily functions.

And you can wash everything down with your choice of beverages. There's hearty multicultural ale; there's fine diversity wine; there are as many delicious anti-discrimination cocktails as you want. And for dessert there's "Holocaust" remembrance cake with a nice icing of Black basketball players, Black football players, and Black talk-show hosts. And while you're eating and drinking and yukking it up with our guests, you'll be entertained by the Bill and Monica dance team performing the hora and accompanied by Hillary's village rappers. Isn't it all just too, too wonderful?

What? None of that appeals to you, you say? All you want is a simple dish of Aryan dignity and Aryan discipline and Aryan honor?

Well! What are you, some kind of racist? Don't you appreciate anything our very, very clever guests have done for you, even if you didn't ask for it? Are you inclined to reprimand some of the pushier and more obnoxious guests? Are you inclined to explain to them exactly what it is about diversity wine which makes you sick to your stomach? Do you want to tell them why you gag at the sight of Black basketball players on cereal boxes, and why you're sure you'll vomit if you're forced to choke down even one more slice of "Holocaust" remembrance cake? Do you believe that you should try to persuade our guests to let us have a small corner of the banquet table for ourselves, set with food and drink the way we like it?

Well, I'm not really inclined to do any of those things. I'm inclined to deal with our unwelcome guests the way Odysseus dealt with his. I'm inclined to turn the whole banquet table over onto the floor and then begin splitting skulls, right and left. I'm inclined to lay waste to the whole multicultural feast, to spill the blood and brains of the cooks and caterers and waiters, along with those of our unwelcome guests, onto the floor and into every filthy, alien dish they have prepared for us, and then to take a firehose and wash the whole mess out the door and into the gutter.

I apologize for such a distasteful analogy with our present situation, but I want to explain to you today why I believe that it is essential for us to take a radical rather than a conservative approach to dealing with our unwelcome guests. I want you to understand why reform cannot cure our society's present sickness and why revolution will be necessary. Of course, on these programs we talk mostly about very specific problems -- we talk about the danger of AIDS from interracial sex, about the corruption of our legal system, about the declining standards in our schools, about the reluctance of the controlled mass media to report Black-on-White crime, about the lies and distortions of history on the part of an educational establishment which is more concerned with Political Correctness than with truth, and about many other things. And all of these things are extremely important. They're important because they are details in the overall picture, and we must understand the details if we're really to understand what has happened to us and if we are to make an intelligent plan for the future.

But what we don't want to do is become so absorbed by any one detail that we forget the big picture. We don't want to slip into the error of believing that we can become healthy again by dealing with just a few specific problems. We don't want to make the mistake of believing that a

proper way to behave at the banquet thrown by our unwanted guests is to avoid the most distasteful dishes they have prepared for us and nibble at the ones which are a little less obnoxious to us.

The problem is that every dish our uninvited guests have prepared for us is poisonous to us in one way or another. They have taken over our pantry and our kitchen, they have substituted their recipe books for ours, and they have very largely remodeled our palace to suit themselves. Whenever they have come across something in the palace which suits our tastes instead of theirs, they have done their best to destroy it. They really have done a thorough wrecking job on our society, a thorough job of making it a society which suits their nature but is deadly to ours. We cannot live in the same world with them: certainly not in the same palace. It's not just this particular banquet of alien dishes which is a problem we must deal with: it is their continuing presence in our palace, waiting for their next opportunity to poison and subvert -- which is why the method of Odysseus is the proper method for us to use in dealing with them.

I want to read something to you which was written 75 years ago by one of our uninvited guests during a rare lapse into frankness. The guest's name was Maurice Samuel, and he was a very prominent and influential man among our guests. He was an active member of the Zionist Organization of America and the recipient of many awards from other Jewish organizations. He wrote 20 books, all of them dealing with Jewish topics. He was a Jew's Jew, a guest at the forefront of those hell-bent on remodeling our palace.

In 1924 Maurice Samuel wrote a book titled *You Gentiles*, and it was addressed to us. It is an amazing book, because in it Samuel explains to us in detail why the Jews are remodeling our palace for us. He explains that the natures of his people and our people are so different that nothing we do can be pleasing to Jews, and so they are changing everything to suit themselves. Of course, he explains all of this to us in a typically deceptive way. He tells us that all of the changes the Jews are making in our society are really good for us. And then he invites us to come to the banquet his fellow Jews are preparing for us in our own palace.

Now I'll read you just two brief passages from a chapter of *You Gentiles* which is titled "We, the Destroyers." And remember, this was written 75 years ago, in 1924, and when Samuel refers to the instruments of destruction which the Jews are using against our society, he's talking primarily about communism, in which so many Jews were playing a leading role at the time. Maurice Samuel writes:

"In everything we are destroyers - even in the instruments of destruction to which we turn for relief. The very socialism and internationalism through which our choked spirit seeks utterance, which seem to threaten your way of life, are alien to our spirit's demands and needs. Your socialists and internationalists are not serious."

That was written before the Jews had proved that ***their*** socialists were indeed serious by butchering 50 million of our people. Samuel concludes the chapter:

"We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain the destroyers forever. ***Nothing*** that you will do will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world, which it is not in your nature to build."

Fascinating, isn't it? I'll bet you'd never heard that before. But Maurice Samuel was, in fact, one of the most widely read Jewish authors from the 1920s through the 1950s. By the 1950s, of course, the remodeling job on our world that Samuel and other Jews were demanding in the 1920s already was well underway.

An interesting historical fluke in the 1950s that I believe wasn't foreseen by anyone, including our unwelcome guests, was the Cold War. The Jews had been riding high in the Soviet Union prior to the Second World War, and Jewish publicists in the United States had been solidly pro-Soviet. Stalin, of course, had started an ethnic cleansing program in the Soviet bureaucracy just before the war began, cleaning out many of the entrenched Jews and replacing them with Russians. But the Jewish propaganda in the United States had so much momentum that it couldn't switch directions very fast. And then the war halted Stalin's cleansing program before many Jews in the West understood that their fortunes were changing in the Soviet Union. The Soviet espionage network in the United States, which was almost entirely Jewish in its personnel, remained intact throughout the war and provided the Soviet Union with plans for America's nuclear weapons, among many other things. I was in elementary school at the end of the war, and I still remember my teachers parroting the official party line about our gallant Soviet ally, good old "Uncle Joe."

After the U.S. participation in the war had made it possible for Stalin to beat back the Germans and achieve a Soviet victory, however, Stalin returned to his program of de-Judaizing the Soviet bureaucracy, and the Jews' pro-Soviet and anti-fascist propaganda machine in the United States finally did an about-face and began warning us of the Soviet menace. By the middle of the 1950s "fascism" in its various forms no longer was the principal threat to the American way of life, and communism took its place as the number-one enemy in the propaganda coming from Hollywood and New York. The Jews' remodeling program had to develop new techniques and new slogans, and their whole propaganda machine didn't shift gears at the same time, resulting in a bit of confusion for a while. The Cold War probably put the remodeling program a decade or more behind its original schedule.

I have an old, yellowed editorial from the July 1955 issue of the magazine *The Point.* It is titled "Should Hate Be Outlawed?" In it an unusually bold Gentile editor, Leonard Feeney, is still taking issue with the Jews' campaign at that time to stamp out fascism by outlawing "hate" -- a campaign, he notes, which has been pushed hard by them since 1940. At least, 1940 is when the "anti-fascist" campaign became noticeable to Feeney. He writes:

On billboards, on bus and subway posters, in newspapers and magazines, through radio and television broadcasts, Americans are being assured and reassured, both subtly and boldly, that "Bigotry is fascism . . . Only Brotherhood can save our nation . . . We must be tolerant of all!"

The editor continues -- and remember, this was written 44 years ago:

The long-range effects of this [anti-fascist propaganda] campaign are even now evident. It is producing the "spineless citizen": the man who has no cultural sensibilities; who is incapable of indignation; whose sole mental activity is merely an extension of what he reads in the newspaper or sees on the television screen; who faces moral disaster in his neighborhood, political disaster in his country, and an impending world catastrophe with a blank and smiling countenance. He has only understanding for the enemies of his country. He has nothing but kind sentiments for those who would destroy his home and family. He has an earnest sympathy for anyone who would obliterate his faith. He is universally tolerant. He is totally unprejudiced. If he has any principles, he keeps them well concealed, lest in advertising them he should seem to indicate that contrary principles might be inferior. He is, to the extent of his abilities, exactly like the next citizen, who, he trusts, is trying to be exactly like him: a faceless, characterless putty-man.

Between 1955 and the Clinton era the Jews' "anti-fascist" campaign didn't stop. It just changed its slogans a bit. With Clinton in office the campaign is once again expressing itself openly as a campaign to outlaw what it calls "hate." And unfortunately, the tendency of the American people to be without spine or principles, lest they offend someone and be considered "haters," has proceeded to a terminal state.

And this business of making the Gentiles more "tolerant" -- more puttylike -- has been only one part of the Jews' remodeling program on our palace. Virtually all of the dishes set before us now are dishes of their preparation: prepared in our kitchen with our resources, but according to their recipes, so as to suit themselves. They have gotten their filthy hands on everything that used to be ours and changed it until it is unfit for us. Our art, our music, our literature, our history, our morals, our cinema, our sports, our life-styles, our ideals, our schools, our family life, our child-raising practices, the relations between our sexes, our government: you name it; they've changed it.

Such a tolerant government they have given us; such a wonderful and sensitive President, who feels our pain; such marvelous sports heroes -- Michael Jordan and Magic Johnson and Mike Tyson -- to be idols for our kids; such brilliant men running our news and entertainment media -- Disney's Michael Eisner and Time Warner's Gerald Levin and Universal's Edgar Bronfman and MTV's Sumner Redstone -- all busy keeping us entertained and informed.

Of course, our history and our literature and our art and our music all still exist -- in some locked basement storeroom of our palace. What has really been destroyed is our people's sense of identity -- and with it their morale and their values. Putty-men: more than half of them think Bill Clinton is an OK guy. I'll bet more than half of them also haven't the faintest idea who Odysseus was: "Hey, what band is he in, man? Which team does he play for?"

Probably three-quarters of them think that our guests have done a good job of remodeling, that we're better off for it. They've learned to like the new dishes our guests have prepared for us. They've been taught new tastes: Tupac Shakur and Ice Cube instead of Beethoven. They have new heroes: Malcolm X instead of Leif Ericsson, Michael Jordan instead of Neil Armstrong. They would thoroughly disapprove of taking a whip to the moneychangers. They wouldn't understand the reason for that. They would consider that very intolerant, very bigoted. And besides that, too masculine, too violent. Ugh! Much better to talk things out with the

moneychangers. And as for Odysseus' way of dealing with the uninvited guests in his palace: why, they would consider that a "hate crime," something for Janet Reno to have the FBI deal with.

It is this change in the sensibilities of our people wrought by 75 years of remodeling which makes any program of reform impractical. Most of our people simply have no understanding of the need for reform. They believe that things are pretty much OK the way they are. And if there still are a few flaws in our society, they are nothing that a few more slices of "Holocaust" remembrance cake washed down with another bottle of diversity wine can't fix. We can wage a temperance campaign against the diversity wine, but we'll be outcampaigned by the wine merchants, I'm afraid. No, I really believe that what we need to do is string the old bow and bring an end to the whole banquet the way Odysseus did.

Special Treatment

St. Martins Press has just published a fascinating new book. It's by journalist Gordon Thomas and is titled *Gideon's Spies: the Secret History of the Mossad.* Mossad is the name of Israel's official espionage and assassination agency. The history of the Mossad is an interesting enough subject in itself: all of the gory details about how our gallant, little, democratic ally in the Middle East carries out state-sponsored assassinations, terrorist bombings, and other hanky-panky, with nary a word of protest from that great enemy of terrorism we have in the White House. Bill Clinton likes to wax indignant about the terrorism of Osama bin Laden and Colombian rebels and Hutus in Uganda and others -- that is, about the terrorism of everyone except our gallant, little, democratic ally in the Middle East.

What makes Thomas's book especially interesting and relevant at the moment, however, is that he details some Mossad espionage inside the Clinton White House. Specifically, he reveals that Clinton knew that his steamy telephone-sex sessions with his Jewish bimbo/intern Monica Lewinsky were being tapped by the Mossad. We know that Clinton knew, because he told Monica about it after an oral-sex session in the Oval Office, and she told Special Prosecutor Ken Starr, in sworn testimony, what Clinton had told her. Clinton knew, because the FBI's counter-espionage people knew and had warned him.

Now, this is not really new, because it was in the published Starr report. The Congress knew all about it during the impeachment process and the Senate trial. What is new is that it's finally beginning to get a little press coverage, the result of the publication of Thomas's book. It was all over the front page of the *New York Post* ten days ago. Why didn't it get a lot of press coverage earlier? Well, the obvious answer is because the telephone tapping was being done by our gallant, little, democratic ally in the Middle East, and neither the media people nor the politicians in the Congress want to say anything bad about Israel; it's not good for one's career.

Why is it important? Well, just think what it tells us about Mr. Clinton's character. He knew that his telephone-sex sessions with Monica were being recorded by the Israelis, because the FBI told him, but he didn't care. And he also didn't care that the FBI was tapping Monica's telephone too. He warned Monica about it so that they could prepare a cover story in case the press learned about it, but he kept right on having telephone-sex with Monica. Such irresponsibility is hard to fathom. To Clinton being President is a game. The idea of the game is to have as much fun as possible while pretending to be a serious world leader. If you're a skillful enough liar and a good enough actor you can get away with it, especially if your friends in the media cover for you -- and if the people who like you because you feel their pain keep giving you a "thumbs up" on the popularity polls. Well, as I told you a long time ago, Clinton is a constitutional psychopath, and this is just one more indication of that fact.

More important than what this telephone-tapping tells us about Clinton's character and attitude is what it tells us about our relationship with our gallant, little, democratic ally in the Middle East. The Israelis, of course, always have waged an espionage war against America. Every time they get caught -- as, for example, in the Jonathan Pollard case -- they promise they will never do it again, and their apologists in the media and in the Congress explain that they really shouldn't be

blamed, because they're only spying on us so that Israel will be secure. They're surrounded by enemies in the Middle East, and they need every bit of national security information they can get. They can't trust anyone but themselves with their security, because during the "Holocaust" everyone else let them down, we're told.

Well, actually, we know from past experience that the Israelis not only steal our secrets, they sell these secrets to our enemies. Selling U.S. military and diplomatic secrets to the Soviet Union back during the Cold War was standard operating procedure for the Israelis. These days they have a willing buyer for stolen secrets in the form of China. Beyond selling secrets, Israeli spying has a much more sinister purpose, as former Central Intelligence Agency Director William Casey indicated to Thomas in an interview. Most countries spy for security purposes. Israel spies in order to control the country on which she is spying, primarily through the blackmail of politicians. In the case of the Lewinsky telephone taps there are strong indications that the Israelis used the information they collected to blackmail Clinton. They wanted him to halt an FBI search for an Israeli agent on the White House staff, otherwise they would leak their recordings of his telephone-sex with Monica to the press.

The White House denies there was any blackmail, and of course the Israelis deny it. Gordon Thomas says that he has no evidence of direct Israeli blackmail and suggests that it probably was more subtle and indirect than that. All he can be sure of is that the Mossad was recording Bill and Monica's telephone-sex sessions, and that the FBI was looking for an Israeli spy in the White House. Beyond that it's just speculation. But the search for the Israeli spy in the White House was halted, and then Mr. Clinton went right on having telephone-sex with Monica, knowing that it was being recorded and in addition suspecting that some Jew on his staff was working secretly for the Mossad -- but he didn't care. Can you imagine how frustrating that sort of thing must be for the FBI and other counter-espionage agencies?

Well, that's life in the Clinton era. And of course, when the Senate voted on Clinton's articles of impeachment last month, every Jew in the Senate, Republican as well as Democrat, voted for acquittal. There are 11 Jews in the U.S. Senate -- which, incidentally, is more than four times their quota of the U.S. population. During the impeachment hearings and the trial some of these Jews said they were for Clinton, and some said they were against him. New York's Jewish Democrat Senator Charles Schumer loudly supported Clinton throughout the process. Connecticut's Jewish Democrat Senator Joseph Lieberman and Pennsylvania's Jewish Republican Senator Arlen Specter publicly denounced Clinton. But when the final showdown came all 11 Jews quietly voted to keep Clinton in office. It makes one wonder about the genuineness of their denunciations of Clinton during the trial. What counted in the end was that Bill Clinton cannot say "no" to Israel, and he has appointed more Jews to his administration than any three other Presidents, and all the Jews in the Senate and in the media appreciate that. That is what counts with them.

The FBI is not the only American law-enforcement agency which is frustrated by the unwillingness of Bill Clinton to say "no" to the Israelis. Israel continues to be the hideout of choice for Jewish criminals of all sorts fleeing from justice. A Jew commits a murder or a rape or some other serious crime in the United States, and if he's worried about being caught and punished he simply catches the next flight to Israel. That country has a custom of refusing to

extradite any Jewish criminal wanted for an offense against non-Jews in another country. Once a Jewish criminal reaches Israel, he is safe from prosecution and can thumb his nose at the world, no matter how heinous his crime.

A recent example of this is the case of Maryland Jew Samuel Sheinbein. In September 1997 Sheinbein and another Jew, Aaron Needle, killed a non-Jewish teenaged neighbor, Alfredo Tello, in an argument over drugs. After the two Jews had bludgeoned, stabbed, and strangled Tello, they slashed his throat. Then they cut Tello's body up with a power saw, and burned some of the parts. When the Maryland police came looking for him, Sheinbein got some money from his wealthy parents and hopped the next flight to Israel. He's been there ever since. The Israelis consider it immoral to turn a Jew over to Gentiles to be punished, and they have refused all requests by Maryland authorities for his extradition. Just over two weeks ago, on February 25, the Supreme Court of Israel handed down a final ruling against efforts to extradite Sheinbein. The Israelis say they will put Sheinbein on trial in Israel for the murder of Alfredo Tello. So far they haven't gotten around to it. And if they ever do, don't bet on a conviction.

Another recent case of this sort of thing is that of Dror Goldberg, a Jew who committed an especially vicious murder in Houston, Texas. On November 27 of last year the 20-year-old Goldberg walked into a wig shop near his Houston apartment, pulled out a knife, and began stabbing and slashing the two owners and a clerk. The owners survived the attack, but the 54-year-old clerk died of her wounds. Police familiar with Goldberg's past activities suspect that it was a thrill killing: he simply wanted to kill someone with a knife to see what it felt like. Goldberg was arrested, but, like Sheinbein, he has wealthy parents. His parents put up bail to get him out of jail, and now Houston police say they have reason to believe that Goldberg has fled to Israel to escape prosecution.

Now, let me tell you, if it were any country but Israel the U.S. government wouldn't tolerate this sheltering of criminals who have murdered U.S. citizens. At the very least diplomatic relations would be cut off and economic sanctions would be imposed. But of course, Israel gets special treatment. Israel can do no wrong, not only in the eyes of the Clinton government, but in the eyes of virtually every government the United States has had in the last 50 years. When Jews in the United States collaborated in the theft of nuclear materials from a U.S. nuclear fuel processing plant and the smuggling of the material to Israel in 1962, President John Kennedy and the media here were interested only in covering it up, not in holding Israel and its collaborators to account.

When the Israelis deliberately attacked and tried to sink a U.S. Navy vessel, the U.S.S. *Liberty,* in the Mediterranean in 1967, killing 35 U.S. citizens in the process, President Lyndon Johnson and the controlled news media in the United States didn't give a thought to punishing or even criticizing Israel for the murderous attack. Their entire concern was to keep the affair covered up, to keep the American public in the dark about it, and to protect Israel from any blame. The *Liberty* sent out an emergency call for assistance while it was under attack by the Israelis, and the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean sent jet aircraft speeding to the rescue. As soon as Lyndon Johnson learned that it was the Israelis who were trying to sink the *Liberty,* however, he ordered the U.S. jets recalled and left the *Liberty* on its own. He was terrified of the potential political reprisals against him if Israelis were killed by U.S. jets. Better to let the Israelis sink the *Liberty*

and kill her entire crew. Even today the government's official story is that the attack on the *Liberty* was a "mistake," and beyond that, "no comment."

And as it was with Lyndon Johnson in 1967 and with other U.S. Presidents both before and since then, so it is with Bill Clinton today. U.S. government policy is that Jews can do no wrong; Israel can do no wrong. This policy is excused on the basis that Israel is our gallant, little, democratic ally in the Middle East, and that's why we give her special consideration in all things. But really, that's no excuse. Israel is no ally; Israel is and always has been nothing but an enormous liability for America.

And it's not just Israel which gets special treatment. It's Jews generally, whether they run to Israel for protection or not. I'll give you an example of the special treatment reserved for Jews which has gotten a very slight coverage in the news recently, and has been noticed by those of us who notice such things: that's the case of Ira Einhorn. Einhorn was a Philadelphia-area leader of the so-called "counter-culture revolution" of the 1960s and 1970s, a revolution which Jews like to brag turned America upside down and changed young people's values. Bill Clinton was part of that revolution as a cheerleader for the Viet Cong and Ho Chi Minh and as an enthusiastic user of illegal drugs.

Ira Einhorn was a smart, fast-talking Jewish con man, who moved in the same circles as other Jews of his ilk in that era: Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, Allen Ginsberg. Einhorn was much more than just a cheerleader for the Viet Cong. He was a full-fledged New Age guru. He managed to promote himself successfully as a spokesman for everything that was trendy: the marvelous effects of LSD and other psychedelic drugs, pyramid power, various oriental religious cults, transcendental meditation, UFOs and extraterrestrials, CIA conspiracies: you name it; Einhorn was able to pass himself off as an authority on it. He also was a drug dealer.

But mostly he was a very wordy and very self-confident Jew-boy, who was able to mesmerize Gentiles young and old and bring them under his sway -- especially Gentile women. He managed to convince them that whatever nonsense he spewed on any subject was profound wisdom. This was the case despite the fact that he was fat, hairy, greasy looking, and otherwise singularly unattractive: almost a stereotype of the Jew for whom the name "kike" was coined. Of course, the Jewish media and Jews in the Philadelphia establishment helped Einhorn maintain his "guru" image by taking him seriously and giving him good press.

One of the young Gentile women Einhorn mesmerized was a beautiful, blonde girl from the little East Texas town of Tyler, Holly Maddux. Holly was not only beautiful, she was very bright and personable. She was a cheerleader in her high school and graduated as salutatorian. Then in 1965 she went off to Bryn Mawr University in Philadelphia. Bryn Mawr had been founded by Quakers, and in the 1960s it was a hotbed of everything liberal, trendy, and destructive of the old-fashioned values Holly had learned in Texas. Holly began sleeping with Jews while she was at Bryn Mawr. She was fascinated by their wordiness and their self-assurance, which she mistook for genuine intellectual qualities, as many another naive Gentile girl has done.

Eventually she met Ira Einhorn, who had risen to become the head Jewish hippie of Philadelphia, and she fell under his spell. Einhorn persuaded Holly to move into his apartment, and she lived

with him for five years, cooking and cleaning for him and sexually "servicing" him and letting herself be humiliated as he showed off his blonde *shiksa* slave to his Jewish friends. Then Einhorn murdered Holly and stuffed her corpse into a trunk on an enclosed back porch attached to his apartment. The odor finally attracted the police, who obtained a search warrant and discovered the girl's decomposing body. Einhorn was arrested and charged with Holly's murder in March 1979. Einhorn hired Philadelphia Jewish lawyer Arlen Specter, now a Republican U.S. senator, to get his bail reduced from $500,000 to $40,000. Einhorn put up the required $4000 cash and split. He went to Canada and then to Europe in order to avoid prosecution for the murder of Holly Maddux. In Europe he continued his role of New Age guru, and he continued attracting and using Gentile women. Well . . . Jewish women too: his biggest financial supporter has been Barbara Bronfman, of the infamous Bronfman liquor-merchant and media family, which has been much in the news recently with demands for billions of dollars in reparations from the rest of the world because we haven't been treating Jews right. And for 20 years, this Jewish hippie guru has been living high in Europe, being supported by various women, and no one seems willing to hold him accountable for the murder of Holly Maddux. The French government finally decided a few weeks ago that he should be deported, but they have given him two years to appeal their decision. I have a suspicion that two years from now Ira Einhorn will be in Israel.

Well, these are just a few miscellaneous examples of the sort of special treatment Jews routinely get. Part of the reason they get it is the consequence of Jewish media control, which leads politicians and bureaucrats to handle Jewish criminals with kid gloves, lest anyone think they are being "anti-Semitic." Part of it undoubtedly is the consequence of Israeli espionage and blackmail of the sort we have seen in the Clinton administration. But part of it also is that too many ordinary Americans let themselves be buffaloed by Jews. We let ourselves be flummoxed by the Jews' fast talk and air of self-confidence. When an Aryan meets a Jew it is like a slow-talking country bumpkin meeting a slick, fast-talking carnival huckster.

Our ancestors evolved in forest and field and on farms, fighting and working; their ancestors have spent the past 10,000 years in the market-places and bazaars of the Middle East, buying and selling, wheeling and dealing, haggling and swindling. To us words are for communication, for exchanging information; to the Jews words are to disarm, to hypnotize, to mislead, to deceive.

Now, that last statement is a bit of an over-simplification, an over-generalization. But it is nevertheless substantially true. Despite all of the individual exceptions each of us can think of, despite all of the individual Jews we have met who are not especially tricky and all of the Gentiles we have met who are, the general truth remains that as a race we have let ourselves be taken advantage of by a tribe of very tricky con men. We are letting the Jews as a whole do to us, to our society, and to our civilization what Holly Maddux let Ira Einhorn do to her. And we must put an end to this situation very soon. We must put an end to the special treatment we have been giving Jews, or we certainly will end up the way Holly Maddux did.

And for those Americans who really want to get Israel off our backs and get Jewish influence out of our lives, we're going to have to change our ways. We're going to have to forget about the exceptions. We're going to have to look at everything in black and white, with no shades of gray. Our situation is like that of Perseus in attempting to cut off the head of Medusa: one look for

Perseus and the game would have been lost. If our people listen to the reasonable Jews, to the supposedly patriotic Jews, the honest Jews, we fall under their spell again. If we let them give us advice on how to deal with their tricky tribesmen, it's like the country bumpkin meeting the carnival huckster all over again. So it's going to be a rough and unpleasant future for us for a while yet.

Lawyers

I should begin today by telling you that I know from personal experience that there are some decent men who are lawyers. In fact, some of my best friends are lawyers. I also know that the legal profession as a whole has become so corrupt that it is a threat to our race and our civilization. The judicial system in America has become one of the most destructive weapons in the hands of our enemies. And it didn't begin with the O.J. Simpson trial. Two hundred seventy-three years ago the English writer Jonathan Swift described lawyers as:
"...men bred up from their youth in the art of proving, by words multiplied for the purpose, that white is black and black is white, according as they are paid."

And it was not for nothing that 400 years ago William Shakespeare had one of his characters -- Dick the butcher in *King Henry VI* -- say: "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers." Dick was expressing a very popular sentiment in those days.

In fact, that has been a popular sentiment as long as there have been lawyers. Some 2200 years ago serious and tradition-minded Romans were sufficiently troubled by the behavior of lawyers and by their negative effect on public morale that they made a serious effort to rein them in. In 204 BC the Roman Senate passed a law prohibiting lawyers from plying their trade for money. A man skilled in the law might volunteer to defend a friend or a cause in the law courts, but he was forbidden to accept a fee for his services. That would have been one of the best ideas the Romans ever had, if there had been some way to enforce that law effectively. Of course, as the Roman Republic declined and became more and more democratic, it became increasingly difficult to keep lawyers in check and prevent them from accepting fees under the table, and young men with more ambition than scruples flocked to the practice of law.

For a successful Roman lawyer the essential skill was rhetoric. The Greeks had reduced rhetoric to a science -- the science of persuasion -- and a number of Greek rhetoricians set up schools of rhetoric in Rome. Tradition-minded Romans saw these rhetoric schools as a subversive influence: as an assault on Roman morals and customs. Cato the Censor commented early in the 2nd century BC that after listening to some of these clever Greeks it was impossible to know what was true and what was not. Some Greeks themselves shared Cato's view of the rhetoricians, and already two centuries before Cato, Plato had referred to them as notorious for "making the worse appear the better cause." In 161 BC the Roman Senate ordered all of these Greek schools of rhetoric closed and their teachers expelled from Rome.

Alas, that provided only a momentary halt to the problem, and the rhetoricians and the lawyers were soon back in greater force than ever. The rhetoric schools were shut down again in 92 BC by the censors, who were Rome's official guardians of public morality, but again the cure was insufficient for the sickness. Trying to keep lawyers out of the Republic in its last days was like trying to keep maggots away from a dead horse.

And of course, the fact that there always has been an overabundance of men with more ambition than scruples wasn't the only reason for this; there also was the fact that there was a real need for lawyers. As long as we live in a society based on law, we need men to formulate laws, to

administer laws, to interpret laws, and to help ordinary citizens cope with the laws. We also need safeguards to prevent laws and lawyers from swamping our society. We need safeguards to keep laws as simple as they can be while still serving their purpose, and to keep them from proliferating unnecessarily. We need safeguards to prevent lawyers from abusing the system. And unfortunately, these safeguards do not exist in our society. Lawyers are out of control. The legal system is out of control. The Romans at least tried to provide safeguards against the lawyers. We haven't even tried.

The reason we haven't tried is that we have in effect put the foxes in charge of the henhouse. The people we have put in charge of our legislative system and our judicial system are all lawyers themselves, and they are as a class not inclined to do anything to curtail their bread and butter or to limit their power and influence. The result is the sorry spectacle we witnessed in the U.S. Senate last week, when a bunch of crooked lawyers was called on to deal with another crooked lawyer who had been caught *in flagrante delicto.* The senators didn't really care that Clinton had broken the law. What they cared about was his popularity polls. They weren't concerned about having a felon and a reprobate in the White House; they were concerned about votes, about their own popularity polls. That's why we saw the Republican lawyers dancing all around the real issues and failing to come to grips with them. That's why we saw Charles Schumer and other Democrat lawyers dancing the hora in the halls outside the Senate chamber after the head lawyer of their party was acquitted. What a disgusting scene!

Well, it's easy enough to hate lawyers any day of the week on general principles, but I'll tell you about some very specific things the lawyers are up to now which ought to make a real lawyer-hater out of every patriot. What sparked today's comments was the jury verdict earlier this month against an anti-abortion group which has a site on the Internet. Probably you've already heard something about the case. A group of abortionists and their lawyers went to Federal court with a lawsuit against anti-abortion activists who used the Internet to publish "wanted" posters with photographs, names, and descriptions of abortionists. Rewards were offered for personal information on some of the abortionists. The anti-abortionists did not actually threaten the abortionists or urge anyone to harm them, but they did describe them as "baby butchers." During the past five years four abortion doctors have been shot to death, and three other abortion-clinic workers have been killed by anti-abortionists, and whenever one of the abortionists was assassinated his name would have a line drawn through it on the Internet "wanted" list.

A Federal jury in Portland, Oregon, agreed with the lawyers for the abortionists that the public stand of the anti-abortionists might have encouraged the assassins to take action against the abortionists, and the jury ordered the anti-abortionists to pay more than $107 million to the abortionists and their lawyers.

Now, I should tell you that I am not opposed to all abortions on religious grounds, as most anti-abortionists are. I am opposed on racial grounds to the large-scale abortion for mere convenience that we have in the United States and much of Europe today. I am opposed to the large-scale killing of healthy, White babies, just because the mothers decide that it would be inconvenient for their careers or their life-styles to give birth. I believe that the fact that the U.S. government and much of American society, with the vigorous encouragement of the mass media, approve of the large-scale abortion of healthy, White babies for the sake of convenience is a sign of the

moral collapse of our society. I see a sign of moral collapse whenever the convenience of the individual is given precedence over the health and welfare of the race. And in line with this racial view, I approve of abortion whenever it serves a eugenic purpose.

My views on abortion, of course, are not the issue here. The issue is the use of the courts, the use of the judicial system, to punish Political Incorrectness at the expense of everyone's freedom. And if you think that your freedom of speech is not jeopardized when a bunch of Jews and feminists can use the courts to silence their critics, as they did in Portland this month, then you aren't thinking very clearly.

I should point out that this $107 million verdict in Portland against anti-abortionists is only one case in a growing trend of using the courts to take away our freedom. In New York just last week another Federal jury ordered gun manufacturers to pay nearly $4 million in a lawsuit brought by gun-control advocates, even though none of the defendants had done anything unlawful, and no firearm they had manufactured could be tied to any specific wrongful action. They were found guilty on general grounds of being negligent by manufacturing guns which might be used by criminals to harm other people. This verdict is a direct threat to every American's right to self-defense. It is a threat to all of us because the people who would like to keep anyone except the Clinton government's jackbooted thugs from having a firearm have decided to use civil litigation against gun manufacturers and gun dealers to achieve their aim.

Even before last week's New York verdict lawyers representing the cities of Chicago, New Orleans, Miami, and Bridgeport, Connecticut, had filed separate but similar lawsuits against gun manufacturers, claiming that the manufacturers have been negligent by failing to take effective steps to ensure that their guns do not end up in the hands of criminals. Lawyers for Atlanta, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Baltimore are eager to follow with their own lawsuits. Some of these plaintiffs have been frank enough to admit that their aim is not so much to recover money from the gun-makers as it is to bankrupt them and force them out of business.

Many of the people associated with these lawsuits are prominent in the movement to repeal the Second Amendment. Philadelphia Mayor Edward Rendell heads a committee on gun control in the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which has been behind all of the lawsuits filed -- or soon to be filed -- against gun manufacturers by various cities. Rendell's committee works closely with a group of Democratic senators on the formulation of strategy for gun control -- specifically with California Senator Diane Feinstein, New York Senator Charles Schumer, and New Jersey Senator Frank Lautenberg. All three senators are leaders of the gun-banning faction in the U.S. Senate -- and all three are Jews, as is Mayor Edward Rendell himself.

The lawyers behind these class-action lawsuits against firearms manufacturers are following the example set by a series of successful class-action lawsuits against tobacco companies during the past couple of years. Let me tell you, I believe that smoking is an extremely harmful vice our society needs to rid itself of. The companies which sell tobacco products are in my view more morally reprehensible than the drug cartels which bring cocaine and heroin into America. Certainly tobacco kills far more addicts every year than die from their addiction to cocaine, heroin, and all other addictive drugs combined. If it is illegal to import, sell, or possess heroin, then tobacco products also should be illegal.

The politicians, of course, are afraid to tackle the problem of nicotine addiction head-on. There are too many tobacco farmers and too many smokers in the United States. The politicians would lose too many votes. So instead of dealing with the tobacco problem in an honest and direct way they have misused the courts by filing class-action lawsuits against the tobacco companies.

The fact is that the tobacco companies are acting in a legal manner. Every package of cigarettes has a warning on it. No one who gets lung cancer or throat cancer from smoking can claim that he wasn't warned of the danger. That simple fact had been sufficient to protect the tobacco companies from lawsuits in the past -- but not in the Clinton era. Things have become more democratic just in the last decade. Now just obeying the law isn't good enough. Now juries are buying the argument by plaintiffs' lawyers that tobacco companies should pay damages to people who didn't have the self-discipline to avoid becoming nicotine addicts; that anti-abortion groups are responsible if someone is motivated by their anti-abortion message to shoot an abortionist or blow up an abortion clinic; that firearms manufacturers must pay if their guns fall into the hands of criminals or of people who are not intelligent enough to use them properly, even though they are manufactured and sold legally and are safe and effective when used properly. This is really a feminine argument -- the argument that people should be protected from their own weakness or foolishness, that it's unfair -- perhaps even racist -- to put all the blame on criminals for criminal actions, and that no one should be permitted to say really harsh or unkind things against others, abortionists or otherwise. Juries have become more feminine in their attitudes, and lawyers are taking advantage of it.

The tobacco companies may be wealthy enough to withstand class-action lawsuits, but most firearms makers aren't, and certainly no anti-abortion group is. The result is that the courts in America are being used in a way that they never were intended to be used. They are being used by special-interest groups to silence their critics and to impose their social or political agendas on the rest of us against our wills. And the lawyers, instead of opposing this misuse of the judicial system, are in a feeding frenzy. Hundreds of lawyers have become wealthy from these class-action lawsuits, and thousands of others are hoping to do the same.

Of course, it's not just the greed and irresponsibility of lawyers as a class which should be blamed for this misuse of the courts. As is the case with most of the ills afflicting our society today, the Jews -- and not just Jewish lawyers -- have a role in it. Jewish groups have been screaming for months that the wave of killings of abortionists is motivated by anti-Semitism, since a majority of the abortionists who have been shot have been Jews. Jewish groups have been especially shrill about this since the shooting of the Jewish abortionist Dr. Barnett Slepian near Buffalo, New York, last October 23. The fact is that Jews are greatly overrepresented among abortionists, just as they are among those pushing for gun control; if you shoot into a crowd of abortion doctors you're likely to kill a Jew. Jewish groups, however, are convinced that most anti-abortionists are also at least latently anti-Semitic. And so Jews generally have encouraged these lawsuits and cheered the recent verdicts.

And of course, the most notorious use of class-action lawsuits has been their use by Jewish organizations who currently are extorting billions of dollars from banks, insurance companies, governments, and manufacturers around the world in the form of Second World War reparations.

Considering everything, to speak out against class-action lawsuits almost could be interpreted as anti-Semitic.

A similar misuse of the courts -- which need not involve a whole class of plaintiffs -- is that engaged in most notoriously by a lawyer named Morris Dees and the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center. Morris Dees uses the courts as a prop to assist him in raising money from a large mailing list of feminists, Jews, leftists, and other supporters of the Clinton agenda. He looks for a group which is unpopular with his supporters -- a group of anti-abortionists, for example, or a religious group with a doctrine his Jewish supporters consider anti-Semitic -- then he looks for a plaintiff he can use as a straw man for filing a lawsuit against the target group. Then he sends out fund appeals to his list of feminists, Jews, and leftists, in which he says:

"I am suing such-and-such a group, and I intend to bankrupt them and put them out of business, but I need your help. This lawsuit is very expensive. Send me your largest possible donation today, and I will shut this group down for you."

And he has built up a bank account of more than $70 million in this fashion during the past few years, because he always brings in far more money with his fund appeals than he actually spends on litigation against the target groups.

Using the courts in this fashion is called barratry, and lawyers who engaged in barratry used to be disbarred -- but not in the Clinton era. In the Clinton era Morris Dees is a darling of the legal establishment. He is invited to speak to groups of lawyers. He is given awards by bar associations. Other lawyers admire him for his success at barratry. They envy him for the amount of money he has made at it. And Dees, unlike the group of abortionists who won the lawsuit in Portland recently and unlike most of the gun-control advocates filing lawsuits against gun manufacturers, doesn't even pretend to be anything but a barrator. He brags publicly about it. When he sued me, on a legal theory so far-fetched you wouldn't believe it, because I had purchased some real estate from a church that was one of his targets, he bragged to the newspapers and to his list of supporters: "I'm going to shut Pierce down."

Well, he didn't shut me down, but he got his lawsuit against me tried in a court where the judge was a Clinton appointee, and it ended up costing me nearly $150,000, while Dees raked in nearly $10 million in donations from his supporters. At the moment he is suing another unpopular church in Idaho and soliciting donations from his list of leftists, feminists, and Jews to support the suit. And other lawyers will not condemn him. They just envy him.

Morris Dees, more than any other lawyer, epitomizes what is wrong with our legal system in America today. He helps us to understand why there has been a general feeling among our people, from the time of Plato to the present -- a feeling expressed over and over by our writers down through the millennia -- that there is something fundamentally unclean about men whose profession it is to make the worse cause seem the better, to use Plato's words, or to prove that white is black and black is white, according as they are paid, to use Swift's words. The noble Romans considered such a profession to be un-Roman, and today we consider it to be un-Aryan.

Our legal system has become a system of lawyers, run entirely by lawyers, solely for the enrichment of lawyers. It is a malignant system which threatens the freedom of us all and which does not have the will to cure itself. It is because of this that the cure will have to come from outside the legal system and will have to be a very painful cure indeed. Someday, in a new society, we will have to build a new legal system. Let us not make the same mistakes we made -- and that the Romans made before us. Let us build a system with adequate safeguards: a system to serve the race, not the lawyers.

Hands Off Yugoslavia!

I suppose I have a weird sense of humor, but I often laugh at things which really are more grotesque than funny. That certainly is the case when Mr. Clinton holds a press conference, puts on a stern face, and begins wagging his finger and talking about morality. For the past couple of weeks the target of Clinton's finger-wagging has been Yugoslavia and its President Slobodan Milosevic. President Milosevic is an immoral man, Clinton says, because he won't agree to the White House's resident warmonger, Madeleine Albright, sending 28,000 NATO soldiers into Yugoslavia to run things there. President Milosevic believes that he is capable of running his own country without the help of a foreign occupying army. President Milosevic says that he and his fellow Serbs will fight to the death to defend their country from foreign aggression. Mr. Clinton says that is an "immoral" attitude, and he will bomb Yugoslavia back into the Stone Age if Milosevic doesn't let Ms. Albright and Mr. Cohen and Mr. Berger and Mr. Holbrooke and the rest of the glatt-kosher crew in Washington send their troops in to run his country for him.

What makes this situation even more grotesque is the attitude of the media people. They're all taking Mr. Clinton very seriously, not even cracking a smile when he begins lecturing Mr. Milosevic about "morality." It is pretty clear that the media bosses are solidly in cahoots with the Jewish gang around Clinton in this latest war effort. So I laughed the first couple of times I saw Clinton wagging his finger and talking about morality, with all of the media commentators looking appropriately serious. But really, deliberately starting a war with another country is a serious business -- even if, in this case, it also is grotesque.

I mean, American armed forces kill Serbian women and children with missiles and so-called "smart" bombs, and Clinton and his media boosters tell us that we're doing it to save lives. Really, that's what those thugs are telling us: We must bomb Belgrade in order to save lives. If we don't kill these Serbs now, the Clintonistas are telling us, it'll cost a lot more lives later. We have to do it to keep Europe stable, so that we'll have a market for American products there later. The bombing is necessary to safeguard America's economy, and preserve American jobs, Mr. Clinton announced on TV. Really! That inexcusable piece of filth in the White House, who is as ready to start a war as he is to drop his trousers for a female intern -- and with as little thought for the consequences -- has tried to justify bombing Belgrade by saying it is necessary to save American jobs. And those yahoos at the American Legion and the VFW clubs are watching that piece of filth on their television screens and nodding in agreement with him: "Yep, yep. He's our commander in chief. He's right, by golly. We have to support our boys over there and save our economy." And that gang of Jews around Clinton are grinning up their sleeves at how easily they're getting away with it, at how easy it is to use White Americans to kill White Europeans in order to advance the Jews' schemes.

My god! If ever there was a country asking to be struck dead by lightning, it's America today.

Let's look at the background of this thing. Serbia has been around for a long time. Serbs were settled in the area where they are now as early as the 7th century, and they adopted Christianity toward the end of the ninth century. And for five centuries after that they built their nation, a great and proud nation, bounded on the east by Bulgaria, on the south by Greece, on the west by

the Adriatic Sea, and on the north by Hungary. Serbia's greatest city, Belgrade -- the White City, the White Fortress, is the meaning of the name in Slavic -- was founded more than 2,300 years ago by the Celts.

Serbia, like the rest of the Balkan area, has had a turbulent history, with many invasions and wars. But the Serbs are a tough and independent people, and they held their own most of the time. Then in 1389 a great catastrophe befell Serbia. The Ottoman Turks, pushing into Europe from Asia, were met at Kosovo Polje by the Serbian army. The Serbs fought with great bravery against the Turks. One Serb nobleman, Milosh Obelic, rode alone into the Turkish camp, fought his way into the sultan's tent, and single-handedly killed the leader of the Turks with a dagger. Despite their courage, however, the Serbs suffered a crushing defeat at Kosovo. This left the Balkans at the mercy of the Turks, and 64 years later, in 1453, Constantinople also fell to them.

After more than 400 years of Turkish rule, the Serbs finally regained their freedom -- at least, from the Turks -- in the 1860s. In the Treaty of Berlin, in 1878, the Serbian situation was essentially legitimized, though not entirely to the liking of Serb patriots: although the Turks were off their backs, the Austro-Hungarian Empire claimed rights in the area, and this claim eventually sparked the First World War. On June 28, 1914, the 525th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo Polje -- an anniversary which the Serbs still celebrate with great fervor in memory of their national hero Milosh Obelic, who had assassinated the Turkish sultan on the day of the battle -- on this anniversary day in 1914 the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand made the mistake of visiting Sarajevo, where he and his wife were assassinated by a Serb patriot.

After the First World War the New World Order gang in Washington and London were on the winning side and had an opportunity to try some of their social experiments, one of which was to ignore centuries-old ethnic boundaries and cobble together an artificial "multicultural" entity which they called Yugoslavia. In Yugoslavia everyone was supposed to ignore history and tradition and religion and other ethnic realities and pledge allegiance to the new, artificial entity. Well, of course, it didn't work, although after the Second World War the gang in Washington and London turned Yugoslavia over to the rule of bloodthirsty communist dictators in a vain effort to force it to work. As soon as communism collapsed the people in the area set about trying to sort things out in their familiar way and reestablish ethnic boundaries.

I suppose this is difficult for the New World Order gang to understand -- at least, for the Gentiles in the gang. The Jews understand racial nationalism, of course; they take it in with their mothers' milk, and they understand that it is the source of their strength. But the Gentiles have been essentially deracinated. They have grown up in the multicultural morasses which our cities have become. They've been weaned on Jewish television and the destructive ideals it propagates. They think of themselves as individual citizens of the multicultural New World Order, and they can't imagine people motivated by a race-based patriotism of the sort the Serbs feel.

This is one of the reasons the Clintonistas hate the Serbs. If you read the columns and editorials in the *New York Times* and their other publications, you'll find them literally dripping with hatred for the Serbs even years before Mr. Clinton's current war began. They regularly call the Serbs "fascists": one of their favorite pejoratives.

And the hatred continues today: I have the March 29 issue of their *Newsweek* magazine in front of me now, with two major articles attempting to justify a war against the Serbs -- which at the time the magazine went to press hadn't started yet. In both articles there are a number of references to Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, but not once is he referred to as "President" Milosevic. He is called "dictator" Milosevic and "strongman" Milosevic, but never "President" Milosevic. Do you think this is just a coincidence? I don't. I think that the editors of *Newsweek* are trying to de-legitimize Milosevic in the eyes of the American public.

The New World Order gang, Jews and Gentiles alike, hate the Serbs for two reasons, and neither reason is that the Serbs treat the Albanians in Kosovo province roughly. The Clintonistas hate the Serbs because, first, the Serbs want a Serbian nation of their own again. The Serbs don't believe in multiculturalism and power-sharing and all of the other liberal-feminist-Jewish claptrap so beloved by the New World Order enthusiasts. And the Clintonistas are afraid that if the Serbs can have a Serb country, then other ethnic groups elsewhere also may want to opt out of the grand multicultural design.

The second reason the New World Order types hate the Serbs is that the Serbs are refusing to obey orders, refusing to recognize the supremacy of the New World Order. The Serbs believe that they can manage their own affairs, without any help from the New World Order or NATO or the United Nations or Madeleine Albright. They don't want to become a batch of happy serfs on the global plantation, holding hands and singing "We Are the World" along with everyone else. They just want to be left alone. And to the Clintonistas that is intolerable.

And I should point out here that these two reasons for hating the Serbs ultimately boil down to one reason. The aim of the New World Order gang is domination. It is total control. To some of the Gentiles in the gang this aim may be all tied up with the ideology of egalitarianism and multiculturalism and making fighter pilots out of women, but for the Jews it is simply domination. They want to run the world, and they will attempt to destroy anyone who gets in their way.

One of the essential elements in the Jewish plan for domination is multiculturalism; it is to kill everyone's sense of rootedness, everyone's sense of nationhood -- except their own, of course. They control a country by insuring that there is no single, dominant ethnic group which has the potential for resisting them. That's why they're so hot for keeping the flow of Third World immigrants coming into the United States, for example, so that the White majority here will become a minority within the next few years.

And that's why they are hostile to the Serbs' desire to exclude non-Serbs from their living area. The Jews and the other elements of the New World Order gang hate the Serbs because the Serbs won't obey orders and won't let themselves be multiculturalized and deracinated. So the Serbs must be punished. An example must be made of them. Every country in the world must understand that it must obey orders from the United Nations -- or else the smart bombs will start falling and the cruise missiles will start exploding.

Of course, the Clinton gang can't explain to the American people -- not even to the yahoos and lemmings drinking their beer around the television sets in the VFW clubs -- that we have to kill

Serbian women and children to enforce the will of the New World Order. Even the yahoos might not find that a satisfactory reason to cheer their degenerate commander in chief. So we're told that we're doing it for humanitarian reasons, that we're doing it to save lives -- and American jobs. And as I said before, god help us if that's the level we've descended to as a nation. We're overdue for divine retribution, *a la* Sodom and Gomorrah.

One thing to keep in mind when you see our brave commander in chief on television explaining why this new war is necessary, is that he is lying just as much as when he went on television last year and told us that he had never had sex with a certain female intern in the White House. Not only does Clinton have no morality, but he also has no ideology and no national policy. He is simply telling the lies that he's ordered to tell by the kosher gang around him: by his greasy national security adviser Sandy Berger and by that horrid, little Jewish troll Madeleine Albright.

If he really believed that America is justified in dropping smart bombs on any country which mistreats its minorities, then why are we not bombing Tel Aviv instead of Belgrade? Israel, perhaps you are aware, is a country which has an official policy of using torture to extract information from Palestinian prisoners. Israel also is the foremost practitioner of ethnic cleansing in the Middle East. Israel is in an ongoing process of expropriation of Palestinian land as it continues to create new settlement after new settlement for Jews. When a Palestinian home is in the way, it is dynamited. When a Palestinian village is in the way, the Jews simply call in the bulldozers.

I want to make something clear: I do not approve of rape, torture, and throat-cutting as a means of settling ethnic conflicts in the Balkans, whether it is the Serbs or the Albanians or some other group committing the atrocities. I believe that ethnic cleansing can be done without atrocities. I am sure that some atrocities have occurred in Kosovo province, because that's the way things always have been done in the Balkans. I'm also sure that the media bosses in America have exaggerated atrocities committed by Serbs and ignored atrocities committed against Serbs. The Jewish media bosses deal with conflict in the Balkans the same way they deal with interracial crime in America: they report what it serves their interests to report. A group of Whites kill a Black, and it's national headline news for weeks; a group of Blacks kill a White, and no one outside the community where the killing occurred ever hears about it. But I'll say it again: I don't approve of the sort of brutality that the Serbs have been accused of inflicting on Albanians or Croats or Bosnian Moslems. If there are atrocities going on in Kosovo now, however, a substantial portion of the blame must go to the Clintonistas in Washington. When American armed forces are killing Serbs, ostensibly on behalf of Albanians, one shouldn't be surprised if the Serbs take out their anger on the Albanians.

But really, it's not the conflict between Serbs and Albanians that should be our principal concern here. What we should be concerned with is America's policy of killing people who refuse to obey the New World Order gang. We should not let our armed forces be used as a private death squad by Madeleine Albright.

We should be concerned about the Clinton government's policy of ignoring the sovereignty of other countries and calling in missile strikes whenever we don't like the way they're conducting their internal affairs. And the disagreement between Albanians and Serbs in Yugoslavia's

Kosovo province is strictly an internal affair in the sovereign country of Yugoslavia. When we attacked Yugoslavia last week we were committing raw, naked aggression against a sovereign country. Running around the world doing that sort of thing is not conducive to stability or to world peace, regardless of Mr. Clinton's attempts to justify it. America is clearly in the wrong in the present war against Yugoslavia.

And we also should be concerned about our government's policy of hypocrisy and lying. We should not pretend to have principles when we don't. As much as some mush-brained liberals would like to believe that we're operating in accord with some sort of higher morality, where we go charging in to punish any government which mistreats some minority inside its country, it's clear that that's not the case. I've already mentioned the Jews' mistreatment of the Palestinians in Israel, but I also could mention a number of other countries. Turkey, for example, is a lot rougher on the Kurdish minority in Turkey than the Serbs are on the Albanians in Kosovo. Turkish persecution of the Kurds is going on now, and it has been going on for decades, but we've never seen the need to drop smart bombs on Istanbul and demand that the Turks let us send in troops to run their country for them.

And speaking of hypocrisy and lying, let's not be taken in by the lie that when we send in so-called "peacekeeping" troops their purpose is to keep the peace, safeguard democracy, and the like. It is simply to enforce the will of the New World Order. A good example of this was provided in Bosnia just last month, when the New World Order gang supposedly in charge of "peacekeeping" there simply fired the democratically elected president of the Serbian part of Bosnia, Nikola Poplasen. Albright's thugs in Bosnia expressed their unhappiness with Poplasen as soon as he was elected, six months ago, beating Albright's candidate. The news media have been referring ever since the election to Poplasen as a "fascist," and finally they decided to simply fire him. What the New World Order folks mean by "democracy" is a system where their candidate gets the most votes. They usually are able to arrange this through their control of the mass media and doling out bread and circuses. But when something goes wrong and their candidate doesn't win, then they shoot out the lights and grab for the money.

Now, this sort of thing apparently doesn't bother the yahoos in the VFW clubs -- primarily because they aren't capable of thinking beyond the clichés about "supporting our boys" and "safeguarding freedom" and "standing behind our commander in chief" that they have been taught by the media. But it does bother me, and it does bother a lot of other Americans. What we're doing to Yugoslavia is simply not an acceptable way to conduct America's relations with the rest of the world, even if we do have more cruise missiles than anyone else.

And I don't say that because I'm some sort of leftist-feminist opponent of the use of military force when it's needed. I'm not even opposed to military aggression, when it serves America's national interest. But I am opposed to the unprincipled, lawless policy of the Clinton administration of using America's armed forces to enforce the will of the New World Order on other countries. Let's cut out the cant about "supporting our boys," when "our boys" are not being used to advance America's interests but simply to murder people that the New World Order wants murdered.

America is still militarily and economically stronger than any other country. We're still big enough to kick sand in a lot of people's faces and get away with it -- at least for the time being. But we're not so big and so strong that we don't have to have a sensible national policy and that we don't have to think about where our national interests will lie in the future. We're not so powerful that we never have to be think about being morally right in our relations with other countries. In the long run, permitting ourselves to be used as the world's bully will do us at least as much damage as we're doing to Yugoslavia now.

Why the Jews Want War

Last week we talked about the motivation for the Clinton government's murderous attack on Yugoslavia. Mr. Clinton had two excuses for his war: it is to save lives, and it is to save American jobs, Clinton said. It is to save lives, because if we don't whip the Serbs into line now, they'll continue doing things that we don't approve of, and so later we'll have to kill a lot more of them to make them run their country the way we want them to. It is to save American jobs, because we must keep Europe stable and prosperous so that Europeans will buy our products.

I said that the real reason for the war against Yugoslavia is that the Serbs refuse to let the New World Order and the United States tell them how to run their country. The New World Order wants the countries of the world, wherever possible, to be multi-ethnic -- except for Israel, of course. Multi-ethnic countries are easier to control, less likely to put up a solid front against the New World Order. But the Serbs don't want to be part of a multi-ethnic social experiment. They want to live among other Serbs. So, in the view of the New World Order, the Serbs must be punished. An example must be made of the Serbs so that other countries won't be tempted to disobey the New World Order. We discussed all of that last week.

Now we'll discuss it some more. We'll look at some of the details. But first let's orient ourselves, so that we can understand how the details fit together. Here's Orientation Rule Number One: If the Jews are all on one side of any issue, then the chances are very good that it behooves us to be on the other side. A corollary to Orientation Rule Number One is that if the media are in general agreement that a certain policy or program is a good thing, then we ought to be suspicious that it is in fact bad for us.

And it is a fact that the Jews are solidly on the side of Madeleine Albright and her murderous policy in Yugoslavia. I have in front of me an April 3 report from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. It says: "The organized Jewish community has . . . declared unwavering support for U.S. intervention in Kosovo." And if you read the whole Jewish Telegraphic Agency report you understand that by "intervention" the Jews mean all means necessary for a Jewish victory over the Serbs, all means necessary to insure that the New World Order beats the Serbs into submission, even if that means bombing the 2300-year-old Belgrade, one of the most beautiful and historic cities in Europe, into rubble and then sending in U.S. ground forces to kill the last Serb. Another Jewish Telegraphic Agency report from April 3 tells of Jews with Yugoslav citizenship running from Belgrade, where nearly all of them were concentrated, like rats leaving a sinking ship. Draft-age Jewish males, in particular, are clearing out and heading for Israel, so that they won't be drafted into the Serbian army. That sounds familiar, doesn't it?

So let's keep that detail in mind as we look at all the other details: the Jews are solidly in favor of this war, and they've let everyone in Washington know it -- which is why the Republicans are just sitting on their hands and not raising a whisper of protest against Clinton's war. They're not afraid to oppose Clinton, but they're all scared to death of displeasing the Jews.

One doesn't even have to go to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency to learn of the solid backing of the Jews for this war; they're saying the same thing in various ways in the newspapers that they

publish for us to read, and the Jews in the Congress are saying it too. And of course, they've got their man in the White House justifying the war in Jewish terms. Clinton has been saying that we're doing now what we should have done back before the Second World War. We should have attacked Germany sooner, Clinton has been saying, and we would have saved many lives.

Now, that's an interesting way of looking at it: You see someone in another country whose policies or ideas you don't approve of, and so you kill him before he has a chance to become stronger and actually do something with his ideas. The notion is that if we had declared war on Germany in 1933, as soon as Hitler told the Jews that they no longer were welcome in Germany -- that they no longer could own German newspapers, German radio stations, or German film studios -- we could have saved many Jewish lives. So why didn't we attack the Soviet Union in 1920, when the communists started butchering Russian and Ukrainian farmers? Why didn't we kill the communists before they had a chance to kill 60 million of the best Europeans?

You will never hear Mr. Clinton making that argument, of course, and you will never read that argument in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.* And the reason you won't is that in the Soviet Union Jews weren't being killed, just our people -- and our people don't count. So let's not just listen quietly and let them get away with their phony argument that we learned our lesson when we didn't attack Germany in 1933 and many people died as a result, so that's why we're attacking Yugoslavia now. Just tell them, "Hey, we should have attacked the Soviet Union in 1920, before Kaganovich and all of the other Jewish commissars had a chance to kill millions of Ukrainian and Russian farmers. That's why we should attack Israel now, before Netanyahu has a chance to acquire more weapons of mass destruction, kill more Palestinians, and do anything else to destabilize the Middle East."

You see, life becomes a lot trickier when you decide to worry about everyone else's business in the world instead of just your own. And if you are going into the business of other people's business, then you ought to be sure that you really know what you're getting into: you need to be well informed. And if you're getting your news only from the Jewish media, then you'd better be very careful how you interpret it. News about Yugoslavia's Kosovo province, for example, which comes to us from the controlled media over here would have us believe that Albanians are innocent victims and Serbs are murderous aggressors, and that's all there is to it, and so we're morally justified in going over there to kill Serbs.

That's the news today, when the Jews are solidly in favor of a war against the Serbs. Now I'll read you an article from the *New York Times* of November 1, 1987. That was nearly 12 years ago, before the Jews had decided that the destruction of Serbia suited their interests. Here's what the *New York Times* said in 1987:

"Portions of southern Yugoslavia have reached such a state of ethnic friction that Yugoslavs have begun to talk of the horrifying possibility of civil war . . . . The current hostilities pit ethnic-minded Albanians against the various Slavic populations of Yugoslavia and occur at all levels of society, from the highest officials to the humblest peasants. A young Army conscript of ethnic Albanian origin shot up his barracks, killing four sleeping Slavic bunkmates and wounding six others. The Army has uncovered hundreds of subversive ethnic Albanian cells in its ranks. Some arsenals have been raided. Ethnic Albanians in the government have manipulated public funds

and regulations to take over land belonging to Serbs. . . . Slavic Orthodox churches have been attacked, and flags have been torn down. Wells have been poisoned and crops burned. Slavic boys have been knifed, and some young ethnic Albanians have been told by their elders to rape Serbian girls.

"Ethnic Albanians comprise the fastest growing nationality in Yugoslavia and are expected soon to become its third largest, after the Serbs and Croats. The goal of the radical nationalists among them, one said in an interview, is an ethnic Albania that includes western Macedonia, southern Montenegro, part of southern Serbia, Kosovo, and Albania itself. That includes large chunks of the republics that make up the southern half of Yugoslavia.

"The principal battleground is the region called Kosovo, a high plateau ringed by mountains that is somewhat smaller than New Jersey. Ethnic Albanians make up 85 per cent of the population of 1.7 million. The rest are Serbs and Montenegrins. As Slavs flee the protracted violence Kosovo is becoming what ethnic Albanian nationalists have been demanding for years, and especially strongly since the bloody rioting by ethnic Albanians in Pristina in 1981: an ethnically pure Albanian region . . . . The violence, a journalist in Kosovo said, is escalating to the worst in the last seven years."

Remember, I have been reading from the November 1, 1987, issue of the *New York Times,* and the violence I'm reading about has been Albanian violence directed against Serbs. Now I'll continue reading from the *New York Times* news story:

"Last summer the authorities in Kosovo said they documented 40 ethnic Albanian attacks on Slavs in two months. . . . In one incident, Fadil Hoxha, once the leading politician of ethnic Albanian origin in Yugoslavia, joked at an official dinner in Prizren last year that Serbian women should be used to satisfy potential ethnic Albanian rapists. . . . While 200,000 Serbs and Montenegrins still live in the province, they are scattered and lack cohesion. In the last seven years 20,000 of them have fled the province, often leaving behind farmsteads and houses for the safety of the Slavic north."

Well, that's the end of the 1987 *New York Times* article, and you can see that it puts quite a different light on things than the current news coverage. Twelve years ago the Albanians in Kosovo were terrorizing the Serbs and threatening a civil war not only to ethnically cleanse Kosovo by driving out all the Serbs, but also to take large chunks of land away from the Serbs in other provinces. That's when Slobodan Milosevic entered the picture. In the last 12 years he's turned the situation in Kosovo around. He's made Kosovo safe for Serbs again and broken the back of an Albanian rebel army of 25,000 armed terrorists and guerrillas. What Milosevic did was hardly the one-sided Serb aggression against defenceless, peace-loving Albanians that the Jewish gang around Clinton and the *New York Times* today would have you believe.

The April 5 issue of *Newsweek* magazine calls Milosevic "the Balkans bully," but a more accurate name would be "the savior of Yugoslavia." His aim is to protect his people, not to persecute Albanians -- although he's willing to persecute Albanians if that's necessary to keep Kosovo safe for Serbs. The huge masses of cold and hungry Albanian refugees we have been seeing on television are real enough, but the primary blame for their misery is Mr. Clinton's war,

not Mr. Milosevic's policy. The mopping up of the last of the Albanian terrorists by the Serbian army was causing relatively few Albanian refugees until Mr. Clinton began bombing nearly three weeks ago.

And when the New World Order gang around Clinton discovered that the Serbs are a tougher bunch than the other people they're accustomed to pushing around and aren't going to be intimidated by a few cruise missiles and smart bombs, the Clintonistas began blowing up historic buildings in Belgrade. They've deliberately switched from military to civilian targets; they've been bombing the bridges across the Danube. And now they're hinting that the United States will send ground troops into Serbia after all. The head Jew in the Senate, Joseph Lieberman, has been calling for U.S. ground troops to go into Kosovo, and the Gentile politicians who always follow the Jewish party line have been echoing Lieberman. They really do not care how many Americans they cause to be killed, and certainly not how many Serbs. All they care about is enforcing Jewish policy on the Serbs.

In all of their party publications, all of their New World Order house organs, we see the same hatred of the Serbs for defying them, the same determination to either make the Serbs submit or to kill them. In the April 5 issue of the *New York Observer,* for example, we can read:

"Even if the United States had no humanitarian interest in stopping the destruction of the Kosovar Albanians; even if the NATO alliance were not in jeopardy; and even if the flow of refugees did not create the peril of a wider war, we would still have a compelling reason to defeat the Serbian dictatorship. That reason is to discourage potential Milosevic imitators who could pose a far greater threat in the future. . . . The nature of that peril is most obvious in Russia, where foreign policy is influenced by ultranationalists and ex-Communists with an increasingly fascistic tinge. Should those forces ever come to power, they must not think that NATO would countenance atrocities like those committed repeatedly in the Balkans."

Well, really, that's what it's all about: making an example of the Serbs, so as to intimidate everyone else into line -- and to prepare NATO for a really big project: attacking Russia if the Russians ever get around to trying to get even with the Jewish minority there which has caused the Russians so much grief throughout this century.

Those of you who have been listening to my broadcasts for the last couple of years may remember my prediction in my broadcast of December 21, 1996, that the batch of Jews who had just taken over all of the key military and foreign policy posts in the Clinton government, right after Clinton's re-election, were planning to take us into a war before the end of Clinton's second term. I was wrong on just one thing: I figured they would start their war in the Middle East. I thought that it would be Iraq. But it was the Balkans instead. I knew it would be somewhere. There had to be some reason for all of those Jews coming out of the closet and taking over the reigns of power from a soon-to-be-crippled President. And of course, the Balkans will serve their purpose just as well as the Middle East -- if we let them get away with it.

And we really must focus on this one fact -- that this is a Jewish war to strengthen the grip of the New World Order -- because the Jews are throwing up a lot of smoke to confuse people who might not be ready to get on their New World Order bandwagon yet. And I am indeed gratified

by the evidence that there are a great many such people who are refusing to let the Jews take them for a ride, even here in America, the land of the lemming. I never have had a stronger or more positive response to any of my radio broadcasts than I did to last week's broadcast on Yugoslavia. Hundreds of people I had never before heard from wrote to express their agreement. I'll read you just one letter from a listener, who is a military man:

"Your 'Hands Off Yugoslavia' broadcast was well done and, as usual, right on the mark. However, although there is some truth in stereotypes, I think your constant reference to VFW and American Legion types as 'yahoos' is just a bit off the mark. Take it from this American Legionnaire and current member of our glorious imperial military forces, in my American Legion post there is not a great wave of support for Mr. Clinton's current example of international thuggery. Far from it.

"In fact, when I awoke on the day after the bombing started I felt ashamed to put my uniform on and report for duty. What has this nation become? All those who gave their lives and blood for our ideals must be turning in their graves over this. History teaches us the following: America shall not remain the dominant economic and military power forever. And when we fall they will come and slaughter us, and we will have deserved it. I don't want this for my country. I don't want it in any other country. I want peace in my nation and in theirs."

Well, perhaps I have been unfair to the VFW and the American Legion. I certainly hope I have. I certainly hope there are many, many more active-duty military people who agree with the soldier whose letter I just read. The April 5 issue of *Newsweek* magazine says that its latest poll shows 53 per cent of the American people support Clinton's undeclared war against Yugoslavia and 47 per cent support using U.S. ground troops to invade Yugoslavia. I suppose that's not really out of line with Mr. Clinton's popularity polls during the recent Bill and Monica show. About half of the American public will support mindlessly anything their government does -- so long as the ball games and the "entitlement" checks keep coming and Mr. Clinton keeps telling them he feels their pain.

The encouraging part of the *Newsweek* poll is that 36 per cent of the people said they don't approve of bombing Yugoslavia. *Newsweek* and the other Jewish media will be showing us lots of suffering Albanian refugees in the next few days in an effort to bring that last figure down. Meanwhile, what should those of us who are part of that 36 per cent do? What can we do?

You know, we are in a rather extreme situation. We have a totally irresponsible, criminal head of state, a Jewish cabinet hell-bent on pursuing a Jewish rather than an American agenda, Jewish media to back them up, and an electorate consisting largely of yahoos who never should have been permitted to vote on anything, including the local dogcatcher, and who can be counted on to approve anything the Clinton government does. And this criminal coalition has the world's most powerful armed force at its disposal. It's a situation which calls for an armed revolution and a thorough cleansing of the population. I mean, the situation is not theoretical: the criminals in Washington are murdering our people in Europe. Every day that the Clinton government remains intact the criminals will murder hundreds more of our people.

Well, of course, we are not able to mount an armed revolution. About all we can do at this time is express our moral outrage at what the criminals are doing. Expressing moral outrage may sound like a pretty anemic response to cruise missiles and B2 bombers, but it can have an effect. Thirty-six per cent of the U.S. population is a lot of people. So let's express ourselves. Call in to every radio talk show you can hear. Call in repeatedly. Write letters to every publication that has a letters section. Write five or six letters every day, and keep writing them. Let's make ourselves heard. Now!

What Makes Madeleine Run

Sometimes I feel at a loss for words: for example, when I see something which is manifestly very evil or very dangerous or very foolish being done by the American government -- something which is done in plain sight where everyone else can see it just as well as I can -- and nearly everyone else acts as if everything is normal, that there's nothing to worry about. It's like a house is on fire on a busy street, burning brightly in the middle of the day, and hundreds of people are walking by, paying no attention at all to the fire, and I begin yelling, "Fire! Fire! Look, there's a fire!" People would look at me as if I were a fool.

This is the way I feel about the war against Serbia. Bill Clinton and the manifestly evil group of Jewish advisors and assistants around him are murdering Serbian men, women, and children in Yugoslavia every day. They are murdering our fellow Europeans. They are murdering our fellow Whites, and they are doing it in our name. Madeleine Albright and James Rubin, William Cohen, Sandy Berger, Richard Holbrooke -- Jews all -- are appearing on television every night and telling us that we must continue killing Serbs until they surrender. We must stop Slobodan Milosevic's aggression against Kosovo, they tell us. We must bomb the Serbs until Milosevic surrenders. And hardly anyone questions this nonsense. That is, hardly anyone in Washington questions it. Certainly no one in the media questions it. Demonstrators around the world throw bricks and firebombs at American embassies, but the politicians in Washington and the media treat these protestors as a sort of irrelevant sideshow, and the murder of Serbs continues.

And most of the American public goes on about its business as if nothing is happening. They continue watching their ball games on TV and shopping in the malls, while the government they elected murders their kinsmen in Europe. It doesn't really bother them. Now, perhaps they don't understand that the people around Clinton who are waging this undeclared war are evil. Perhaps that's too deep a moral issue for them to get into. Perhaps they don't even know that the Clinton gang are all Jews. Perhaps they've been too busy watching their ball games to notice that. But we have to assume that a substantial portion of them are bright enough to understand that the government's whole rationale for this war is a pack of lies; it's nonsense. Slobodan Milosevic is called a "fascist dictator." Actually, Milosevic is a socialist. He used to be a communist. And he is the democratically elected president of Yugoslavia. He is accused of "aggression" for putting down an Albanian rebel army of terrorists and guerrillas in Serbia's Kosovo province. If a Mexican rebel army tried to take Texas or Arizona or California away from the United States, and the U.S. government sent in the Army to put down the rebellion, should that be called "aggression"?

I've said this before, but I'll say it again: the only aggression taking place in Yugoslavia now is the unprovoked bombing of that sovereign nation by an outside force, namely, the United States and its collaborators. What the United States is doing to Yugoslavia fits exactly what the word "aggression" means and always has meant, both in common usage and in international law. And the effort of the Yugoslav government to put down a revolt by Albanian rebels is not aggression. Now, maybe the couch potatoes can't figure that out, but there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who can, and that includes every politician in Washington and every media boss, and it also includes thousands of business leaders, academic leaders, and cultural leaders. Why are

they not speaking out against the aggression against Yugoslavia? Why aren't they displaying their outrage, their horror, their disagreement with what the Clinton government is doing? Why aren't the politicians in the Congress speaking out? They impeached Clinton for his perjury, but what he is doing now against Yugoslavia is a thousand times more criminal, and they do nothing.

You know, this is not a question of whether you sympathize more with Albanians or with Serbs. This is not a question of whether you believe that Kosovo should remain a part of Serbia or should become a part of Albania instead. This is a matter of your government in Washington being out of control and doing atrocious and illegal things that neither the Constitution of the United States nor the historically expressed will of the American people gives it the right to do. The Clinton gang is murdering people wholesale, destroying European cultural treasures, giving patently spurious excuses for what it is doing, and the politicians and the media bosses have expressed their virtually unanimous approval, while most of the American people -- including those bright enough and knowledgeable enough to understand clearly what's happening -- remain silent or even express their approval. So why should I make myself look foolish by shouting, "Fire!"?

Well, the reason that I'm willing to risk looking foolish is that there are some people besides myself who do care: the people who are demonstrating with the Serbs in American cities, the people who are throwing bricks at American embassies around the world. And there are a lot of other people who are not blind supporters of whatever Clinton and his Jews do, people who at least are troubled by the murder being committed in their name by their government, people who would like to understand. I hope that by speaking out I can help some of them understand and take a position. And besides, even if no one else cared, even if no one wanted to understand, speaking out against evil is the right thing to do. It is what every moral man is obliged to do, regardless of whether or not it accomplishes anything.

Let's go back and look again at some of the issues involved here. This business of labeling as "aggression" the internal policies of another country that our government doesn't like and then using that as an excuse to wage undeclared war against the other country really ought to be troubling to every patriotic American, regardless of his religion or his politics. The example I gave a minute ago of the Mexicans in Texas or California outnumbering the White people a few years hence and declaring that henceforth the state in question will be a part of Mexico -- or "Aztlan," as they call it -- is not really very farfetched. Mexican organizations in the United States already are making plans to do exactly that. Will we approve of the U.S. government putting down such an attempt to secede, or will we condemn any effort to preserve the Union as "aggression"?

You know, it really is important to be consistent. It really is important for the people of a nation to feel that they are right and just in their actions. And how can we call the effort of the Yugoslav government to put down a rebellion by Albanians in Kosovo "aggression" without condemning our own government when it acts similarly in the future? The couch potatoes -- the people who voted for Clinton -- may not care about such things, but the rest of us should.

One of the most hypocritical aspects of Clinton's war against Yugoslavia is the pretense that Belgrade is being bombed for "humanitarian" reasons, that Americans are killing Serbs to save

the lives of Albanians. You know, what started the conflict in Kosovo a year ago between Albanian rebels and the Yugoslav government was the covert arming of the Albanians by the U.S. government. The KLA, or Kosovo Liberation Army, is really a "contra" army which was financed and supplied by the Clinton government. Perhaps the Serbs would eventually have ethnically cleansed Kosovo, or large parts of it, anyway, but what actually brought the conflict in Kosovo to a head last year was the buildup of the KLA. This KLA buildup to an armed force of 25,000 guerrillas and terrorists forced Milosevic to move against them. It was when the Serbs began beating the KLA -- and perhaps committing some atrocities at the same time -- that the Clinton gang began bombing. And since the bombing began, the Serbs greatly stepped up their efforts against the KLA -- an entirely reasonable response on the part of the Serbs -- and at the same time forced Albanians believed to be sympathetic to the KLA to become refugees. Now the Serbs have destroyed the KLA, and so the Clinton gang wants to send in U.S. troops to take the place of the KLA.

Why did the Clinton government provoke trouble in Kosovo in the first place by arming the KLA? Could it have something to do with Kosovo's enormous mineral wealth? I don't know the full answer to that yet, but I do know that the lead, cadmium, zinc, gold, and silver mines in the northern part of Kosovo make it one of the most valuable pieces of real estate in the world. And I do know that there wouldn't have been any major conflict in Kosovo last year if it hadn't been for the arming and financing of the KLA. And there wouldn't be half a million or so cold and hungry Albanian refugees today if the Clinton gang hadn't started a war. So let's cut out the baloney about "humanitarian" bombing.

The one aspect of Clinton's war against Yugoslavia that cannot be overemphasized is the Jewish aspect. I know that many people don't like to hear about that aspect. It frightens them. Even some Serbs don't want that aspect of the war mentioned. They believe that it is not helpful to bring "anti-Semitism" into the issue. That's like a team of medical researchers looking for a cure for syphilis and afraid to mention spirochetes because they don't want to seem prejudiced against that particular type of pathogen.

The facts are simple. It's not just that all the members of Clinton's foreign policy and national defense team happen to be Jews. That's not a coincidence. As I told you on the air and in print, loudly and repeatedly, at the time this bunch took their posts, back in December 1996, they took over for the specific purpose of leading America into another war. And it's no coincidence that every major Jewish organization is in favor of this war. The Jews talk openly about this in their own publications. Half the reports coming from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency during the past three weeks have talked about the solid Jewish support for the war against Serbia. And that is why all of the Republican politicians have fallen in line with the Democrats in backing the war. It's not that they believe in "supporting our boys." The best way to "support our boys" is to bring them home now and don't send them out to fight a war unless it is to defend America. No, the politicians are behind the war because the Jews are, and the politicians are afraid to buck the Jews. When the Clintonistas began the bombing more than three weeks ago some of the Republicans in the Congress were saying, "Whoa! Wait a minute! What have the Serbs done to us? I don't think we ought to start a war with them." But as soon as they saw that all of the powerful Jewish organizations were for the war, the Republicans shut up in a hurry.

And the Jews are behind the war because it does serve their interests: not our interests, not America's interests, but Jewish interests. The Jews are all behind a concept they call "the New World Order." They're in favor of a New World Order in which all power is vested in a shadowy super-government which everyone in the world must obey -- a super-government which supersedes all national sovereignties and all individual rights everywhere -- and which is controlled by . . . guess whom?

By dominating the mass media in the United States at this critical time, a time when the United States still has the most powerful and destructive military force in the world as well as the most powerful economy -- and is nominally headed by a totally corrupt and irresponsible puppet under their control, a crippled chief executive who is wholly dependent on his Jewish cabinet and the Jewish media bosses and will do whatever they tell him without the least concern for the damage to America -- by dominating the mass media at this time, the Jews have a window of opportunity. With Clinton as their puppet they can impose just about any policy they want on the government, and a majority of the couch potato voters will approve it.

The Jews are wielding unprecedented power now, and not just in the United States. Only in Russia is there any significant degree of conscious opposition to them. They are understandably concerned not to let that Russian opposition get out of control and not to let opposition to them develop elsewhere, as in Yugoslavia, for example. Their chief method for preventing opposition is to kill any sense of national or ethnic consciousness through programs of multiculturalization, through mixing together of diverse ethnic groups, through preventing any sizable country from having a homogeneous population. Serbia is resisting becoming multiculturalized, and so an example is being made of Serbia. If Serbia can be crushed by the Clinton gang, who else will dare to oppose them?

Now, that's not the way Madeleine Albright or William Cohen or Sandy Berger or Richard Holbrooke explains the Clinton government's current war against Yugoslavia. They will give you more baloney about "saving lives" and "fighting aggression" and "defending America's interests," and "this is what we should have done before Hitler started the Second World War," et cetera. But that is just a smokescreen to conceal their own real interests in promoting this war. They are a tricky and deceitful bunch.

I'll give you an example of just how tricky they can be, just how brazenly they can lie. Everyone has heard -- over and over and over again -- how the poor, innocent, defenseless Jews were plundered during the Second World War: how their bank accounts and their insurance policies and their art treasures were stolen from them by the wicked Swiss and the wicked Germans and the wicked French and so on. And they've been mounting a huge extortion campaign to force Switzerland and Germany and France and the United States and everyone else to give them reparations, to compensate them for their lost bank accounts, to give them back their stolen art works, and so on.

One of these poor, innocent, dispossessed Jews, forced to flee from Czechoslovakia in 1939 when the Germans took over, is the chief warmonger in the Clinton government, Madeleine Albright. We all have read sympathetic accounts in the controlled media of how her family was forced to flee from Prague when she was a child because they were Jews. And she has been at

the forefront of those demanding reparations for the Jews. She is always ready to use the power of her office as secretary of state to pressure the Swiss government or a bank in France or an insurance company in Italy to cough up whatever the Jews are demanding in reparations.

Madeleine Albright also is the most bloodthirsty and aggressive Jew on the Jewish team running America's foreign policy and military forces. She is the vicious Jewess who has publicly justified the deaths of more than half a million Iraqi children caused by the Clinton government's bombing and embargo against Iraq. Before the bombing of Yugoslavia started last month she was frothing at the mouth in her eagerness to begin killing Serbs because they would not obey orders. She says that she is doing it for humanitarian reasons and to halt Serb aggression against Kosovo: aggression against one of their own provinces. And as for humanitarianism, this Jewess hasn't a humanitarian bone in her body. She cares no more for Albanians than she does for Iraqis. But she does like to start wars. She is the one who, more than anyone else in the Clinton government, has been itching to send ground troops into Serbia to kill Serbs more effectively than the cruise missiles can.

Now let me tell you about this great humanitarian and victim of the Nazis, this great Jewish heroine demanding reparations for her fellow Jews. Her family fled from Prague in 1939, but they came back in 1945, when she was eight years old. They took over the home in Prague of a German family who had been forced to flee from the Reds at the end of the war. Madeleine Albright's family moved into the home at 11 Hradsanke Street in Prague of Karl Nebrich, a wealthy German industrialist. The Nebrich family had been obliged to leave behind all of their works of art, expensive furniture, and other wealth. Albright's family simply appropriated it, and when they later left Czechoslovakia for greener pastures, they took all of the Nebrich family's belongings with them. They took the antique furniture; they took the linens and the tapestries and the chandeliers; they took the silverware; they took the paintings off the walls, including a Tintoretto and other priceless works by Old Masters -- millions of dollars worth of the Nebrich family's personal property altogether. A daughter of Karl Nebrich, Doris Renner, complained to the *Sunday Times* in London last month that Albright's family stole "even the nails from the wall."

It took the descendants of Karl Nebrich half a century to track down the thieves and begin seeking the return of their property. Finally, in 1996, they discovered that the American secretary of state, Madeleine Albright, had their family's stolen property. Nebrich's heirs have been trying to get it back ever since, but Albright has been stonewalling them. In February 1997 Philip Harmer, Karl Nebrich's great grandson, sent Albright a list of his family's stolen paintings and asked for their return. In a letter to Albright, Harmer wrote:

"You lived in our flat as an eight-year-old child, and I am sure you will remember some of the paintings on the attached list."

Albright had a State Department lawyer brush him off and tell him to seek restitution from the Czech government. Harmer told the *Sunday Times* last month: "I cannot believe the American secretary of state enjoys eating with my family's silver. These things must be handed over to my family."

Well, Mr. Harmer, don't count on it. Not as long as it can be kept out of the American media. Although London's *Sunday Times* carried the whole story in its March 28 edition, the controlled media in the United States have shown a singular lack of interest in the matter.

Anyway, that's Madeleine Albright, the head of Clinton's Jewish assault team against Serbia. She is the type of person running Clinton's government, while he drops his trousers for female interns and secretaries. She is just one of the reasons why no American can believe what this government tells us about its war against Yugoslavia or any other important matter.

The New World Order

Today let's talk about the New World Order. We've talked about it before, and we'll be talking a lot more about it in the future. I always used to feel a little funny about using that term. It sounds like the sort of terminology right-wing cranks use. And I think many people don't believe it's real. They think it's a concept invented by right-wing cranks who are paranoid about the United Nations. Even when I was being interviewed by the Voice of Iran last week, and I mentioned the New World Order, the interviewer in Teheran asked me what that is, as if it were something he had never heard of before.

Well, during the past few days it has become much easier to talk about the New World Order without having to worry about being considered a right-wing crank. That's because the whole Clinton gang has begun talking openly about it. Which is to say, the whole New World Order gang has come out of the closet.

Earlier this month Susan Estrich spoke her mind on Clinton's war against Serbia. Susan Estrich, remember, is the militant radical feminist lawyer -- a Jewess, of course -- who is a bosom pal of the Clintons and was under consideration for a cabinet post not so long ago. She's now a law professor at the University of Southern California and a big-shot Democratic Party activist. Estrich is ecstatic about the war. She just loves it. It is, she said:

". . . the first war of the 21st century: a conflict not about communism, but about race and ethnicity, being waged by committee, against a madman who is not himself a direct threat to the countries waging war against him. . . . [T]he President is committed, and the country is behind him. The number of Americans willing to take the war to the next step - committing ground forces - has in fact been increasing steadily. It speaks well for the future."

You know, that's really breathtaking. This radical-feminist Jewess loves this war because, first, it isn't against communists but is against people who are concerned about ethnicity; second, it is being waged by a committee -- feminists believe that everything should be done by a committee; and third, it is a war being waged by countries who have not been threatened in any way by the country they are attacking. In other words, it is not a war to defend America but solely to force a sovereign nation to change its internal policy to suit the tastes of Susan Estrich and company: to force Serbia to stop trying to establish ethnic homogeneity but instead to embrace multiculturalism. One gets the impression that this Jewess also would approve of a war against, say, Saudi Arabia to force that country to establish coed bathrooms in all public buildings.

She says that American public support for escalating the war against Serbia by sending in ground forces has been increasing steadily, and that makes her feel good about the future. This Jewess also felt good about Clinton's popularity polls during his impeachment. Basically, what she feels good about is the fact that her kinsmen in the media now have a majority of the American electorate whom they are able to manipulate in any way they choose. Just keep the ball games on TV -- and the "entitlement" checks in the mail -- and they'll cheer for the folks signing the checks and broadcasting the ball games. Just keep their refrigerators full of beer and they will give thumbs up to a President who has been publicly exposed as a perjuror, a rapist, a degenerate, a

draft-dodger, a traitor, a money-launderer, and a cokehead. They really don't care. Start a war somewhere which they can watch on TV, and they'll support that too, if Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather and Peter Jennings and the rest tell them to. When they get bored with watching the smart bombs blow up apartment houses and passenger trains and our fighter planes shoot up refugee columns, they'll cheer the sending in of ground troops so they'll have something more exciting to watch on their television screens.

Despite the fact that Miss Estrich is not a public official, her views are worth noting. First, she is a member of the Clinton crowd; she shares their values and opinions. Second, she is typical of the arrogant, noisy campus Jews who during the 1960s were trashing deans' offices and demanding all sorts of Politically Correct changes at American universities. They also were burning ROTC buildings in protest against the Vietnam war. That was a war against communists; remember? A bad war. These Jews have grown up and taken over most of our influential public institutions.

But what Estrich is saying is echoed by all the rest of the Jews and their collaborators. America's highest paid professional "Holocaust survivor," Elie Wiesel, showed up at the White House on April 12 to cheer the bombing of Serbia and announce his support for sending in ground troops. Ironically, Wiesel is the recipient of a Nobel Peace Prize -- but then so were Henry Kissinger and the late Israeli warlord Menachem Begin. That's what Nobel Peace Prizes are all about these days.

Probably the most important public figure to declare for the New World Order is Britain's Tony Blair, the tag-along, wannabee Clintonista that British patriots sneeringly refer to as "Bambi." In an essay in the April 19 issue of *Newsweek* magazine Blair declares:

"This is a conflict we are fighting not for territory but for values, for a new internationalism where the brutal repression of whole ethnic groups will no longer be tolerated, for a world where those responsible for such crimes have nowhere to hide."

That's interesting. The key words here are: "We are not fighting for territory" -- and he might also have added, "We are not fighting to defend ourselves or our national interests" -- "but we are fighting for a new internationalism," Blair said.

And of course, "a new internationalism" is simply his way of saying "a New World Order." And that really is a radical departure from the past, when America and Britain went to war to defend what they considered their national interests, not to impose "a new internationalism" on some other country which just wanted to be left alone. It's good for America's soldiers to understand that the reason they're deliberately bombing civilian targets in Belgrade, shooting up passenger trains, and so on -- and occasionally even risking their own lives -- is to impose "a new internationalism" on the Serbs. To people like Estrich and Blair and Clinton, having armed forces for the purpose of national defense is old fashioned, an outmoded, 20th-century concept. The really trendy thing now -- the 21st-century thing -- is to use your armed forces to impose the will of the New World Order on countries too small to hit back.

"Bambi" also said in the April 19 *Newsweek* that the Serb policy of ethnic cleansing must not only be stopped but also "reversed." Which really ties in with the insistence of the whole New World Order crowd that no ethnically clean countries will be tolerated in the 21st century. Only "multicultural" countries will be permitted.

General Wesley Clark, the Clinton gang's political general in charge of NATO and of the current effort to impose "a new internationalism" on the Serbs using cruise missiles, said it as plainly as anyone. Just a few days ago General Clark enunciated the general philosophy of the New World Order and the specific motivation for the assault on Yugoslavia when he told a CNN reporter:

"There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th-century idea, and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and we are going to do it with multi-ethnic states."

You know, the specific phrasing may be new, but the attitude, the mindset, behind it is quite old. We could subtract a thousand years from General Clark's statement, taking us back to the time just before the Crusades, and it would read something like this: "There is no place in modern Europe for pagans or heretics. Paganism is a ninth-century idea, and we are trying to transition into the 11th century, and we are going to do it with Christian states." A little later one could simply replace "pagan" and "Christian" with "Protestant" and "Catholic," respectively -- or vice versa. That mindset prevailed during Europe's numerous religious wars up until the middle of the 17th century, a cruel and bloody 650 years during which Europeans slaughtered not only Turks and Arabs but also each other in their "conflicts for values," as Bambi would have put it.

You know, my main theme is that this change in the reason for which we fight wars is not a good thing. It is not good to attack another country which has not harmed or threatened us in any way and begin killing its people in order to force them to run their country in accord with our beliefs -- assuming that the beliefs professed by the Clinton gang actually were our beliefs. That sort of ideological bigotry really smacks of the religious bigotry of the Middle Ages. But before we get into that, let us note that not even the Susan Estriches and Tony Blairs and Wesley Clarks really believe the ideological snake oil they're trying to sell to the public.

In his justification for the bombing of Belgrade and the killing of Serbs Tony Blair wrote in Newsweek:

"We need to enter a new millennium where dictators know that they cannot get away with ethnic cleansing or repress their peoples with impunity."

That's a crooked statement. Blair understands perfectly well that Slobodan Milosevic is no dictator repressing his people; he is the democratically elected leader of his people and has their strong support. And Blair also understands that the conflict between the government of Yugoslavia and the Albanians in Yugoslavia's Kosovo province arose in the first place because his good buddy Bill Clinton approved the covert arming and financing of the so-called Kosovo Liberation Army -- the KLA -- which aimed at driving out the Serbs and establishing an ethnically cleansed Albanian Kosovo.

But even if Bambi has conveniently forgotten these facts, he is not opposed to ethnic cleansing on principle. You can safely bet your bottom dollar that if Milosevic had not moved decisively and crushed the KLA, and the KLA were now doing to the Serbs what the Serbs are doing to the Albanians, Bambi would not be writing indignant essays about it for *Newsweek* magazine, and Madleine Albright would not be sending her cruise missiles against Tirana instead of against Belgrade. This New World Order gang, which makes such a pretense of being opposed to ethnic cleansing, has not lifted a finger to stop it in a dozen other parts of the world in the last few years. Israel's treatment of the Palestinians is the prime example of this, but many other examples also can be cited: Turkey's treatment of the Kurds, for example.

All of these New World Order "humanitarians" speak with forked tongues. The simple fact is that they have a plan for Yugoslavia, and for Serbia's mineral-rich Kosovo province in particular, and the Serbs don't want to go along. The New World Order gang want Kosovo under Albanian control, because Albanians will take orders from them, while the Serbs won't. That's what this war boils down to: making an example out of the Serbs because they're too independent and are in the way of a plan the New World Order gangsters have for rearranging Europe.

Now let's look, from a strictly American point of view, at what these gangsters are doing and what they are planning for the future. America's wars in the 21st century, they are telling us -- beginning, actually, with the war against Serbia now -- will not be wars to defend our territory or our vital interests but to force other countries to handle their internal affairs in accord with our ideas -- or more correctly, in accord with the ideas professed by people like Susan Estrich, General Wesley Clark, and Tony Blair.

Bill Clinton is a bit less forthright about this than the aforementioned gangsters: one of the reasons he has been giving us for the war against Serbia is that it is to protect American jobs by keeping Europe stable and prosperous so that it will remain a good market for American products. That explanation is, of course, sheer nonsense. The war against Yugoslavia is hardly doing anything to stabilize Europe, and Mr. Clinton, with his enthusiasm for Chinese imports, certainly isn't concerned about saving the jobs of American workers.

What the gangsters are doing is transforming America's armed forces from a national defense force to an enforcer for the New World Order. They are transforming American soldiers from defenders of the American people and the American nation to mercenaries in the service of the New World Order. And they're actually sending our armed forces out to bomb and kill under these new auspices. The Jewish radicals like Susan Estrich are all for it. The Jewish media bosses are all for it. The 1960s style leftists like Bill Clinton and Tony Blair who grew up chanting for Ho Chi Minh and trashing the dean's office are all for it. And the political careerists in the military, like General Wesley Clark, are willing to go along with it. The politicians in the Congress are willing to go along too, just as they are willing to go along with anything else the media bosses want.

But what about the American people? What about our Constitution? What about our traditions and our national interests? I realize that the Susan Estriches and Wesley Clarks and Bill Clintons of this world have only contempt for these 19th-century and even older things, but not all of us share their feelings. There are a lot of us who still believe that the affairs of our nation ought to

be governed by law, not by whatever the Jewish media bosses and the aging campus radicals left over from the 1960s decide is fashionable for the 21st century.

The men who wrote our Constitution certainly understood that we might have to fight wars in order to defend our territory or our national interests. They had just come through a war against Britain themselves for the sake of securing our freedom and independence. And in the Constitution they provided for such possibilities in the future. But they certainly did not condone the United States sending its armed forces off to meddle in the internal affairs of other countries which were not harming or threatening us. Nor did they intend for our armed forces to be the plaything of the President or anyone else in our government, to be used for furthering some pet project of his overseas. They specifically reserved to the elected representatives of the people the power to wage war against another country.

Now, Mr. Clinton may want to quibble over the meaning of the word "war," just as he quibbled over the meaning of the word "is" during the great national embarrassment that he visited upon us so recently, but not one of America's Founding Fathers would call what we are doing in Yugoslavia now anything but "war." And they would consider it war waged in violation of the Constitution, since the House of Representatives has not authorized it.

I hope you don't mind my quibbling about these details, about these old-fashioned legalities. I mean, I realize that the same rabble which didn't want Clinton impeached are happy enough with his war now. And the way the Clinton crowd looks at it, whenever a majority is in favor of something, then it's all right to do it. It makes no difference how debased and irresponsible that majority is; as long as you're ahead in the polls, you're OK. And of course, this Clinton-favoring, bread-and-circuses majority couldn't care less about old-fashioned legalities. And I'm sorry to say, the gang in the Congress isn't much more responsible than the majority which still approves of Clinton and his war. Congressmen can count heads as well as the pollsters, and they aren't going to make much of a fuss about not having actually voted for war against Yugoslavia as long as the media bosses are for it and the rabble don't care.

I suppose the real question here is not whether Clinton's war is illegal or not. I mean, we've pretty well established the principle now that it's OK for the President to do illegal things, so long as his polls are up. The real question is, what are we old-fashioned, 19th- and 20th-century-style Americans going to do about the misappropriation of our country and our future by the New World Order gang? These people, these Estriches and Clarks and Clintons, have agreed among themselves that from now on they'll run the world and tell everybody else what to do, committee style, because we're moving into the 21st century and the rabble will back them. We're supposed to go along meekly and not make any trouble for them.

Well, I'll tell you right now, I'm not going to do that. I've always been a law-abiding person, but I'm not inclined to let this gang interpret our laws in their way and tell me that from now on everything is going to be different because the polls say it's OK for them to do whatever they want. From my viewpoint it's the Clinton gang who are the outlaws, the violators of our Constitution and of all of our old-fashioned legal and moral principles, and anything that we do to oppose them is legal and is morally justified. Anyone who goes along with them is a traitor, in

the strict, old-fashioned sense of the word, and anyone who sits on his hands now and refuses to oppose the Clinton gang is not much better.

This trendy, new crowd, which likes to do everything with committees, really believes that all it takes to make anything legal and OK is a majority. I guess they call that democracy. When the majority is what it has become in the United States today, a better name is mobocracy. But really, it's much worse than mob rule. It is rule by a self-appointed elite of utterly evil and destructive people who have in their hands the tools for controlling and guiding the mob. They're pretty cocky now -- so cocky, in fact, that they're making statements of the sort I've quoted today. They're cocky because they believe that no one can take away from them their tools for controlling the mob, and that as time passes and America becomes darker and more degenerate, their grip on the mob will only become firmer. Our job is to prove them wrong. It's a big job, and we'd better get started.

Lies, Murder, and Jews

Today, before we begin talking about the murders being committed by our government overseas, let's note a few things about some murders committed recently in America. I'm thinking of the murders at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, last week, in which two students killed 12 other students and a teacher and then committed suicide. Right after the shootings rumors of all sorts were flying. The students who did the shooting were homosexuals who wore black trenchcoats and belonged to a homosexual gang called "the trenchcoat mafia," according to one rumor. Another rumor had it that the killers sought out Blacks and athletes as their victims, and that most of the victims were Blacks. And it also was said that they were fans of the "shock rock" musician who uses the name "Marilyn Manson," and that they were acting out some morbid Marilyn Manson performance. It also was rumored that as many as 25 students had been murdered.

I get most of the raw news that goes into these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts from the Internet, but I also watch the *NBC Nightly News* with Tom Brokaw every evening that I can. I watch Brokaw not so much to learn what's happened in the world during the past 24 hours, but to learn what the Jewish spin is on what's happened. I'm interested in knowing what the Jewish party line is. By watching Tom Brokaw mouth his lines every evening I get some idea of what Brokaw's Jewish boss, Neal Shapiro, the executive producer of the *NBC Nightly News*, wants us to think about the news.

Well, I was out of town on business on the day of the Colorado shootings and didn't have a chance to see the *NBC Nightly News*, but on the day after the shootings, April 21, I watched the news with special interest to see what spin Shapiro would put on the previous day's high school murders in Colorado. Tom Brokaw reported directly from Columbine High School, where he had been busy all day checking out the rumors and interviewing everyone in sight. So by the time of the evening news broadcast he knew how many victims there were, who they were, and just about all the other facts.

Brokaw began his report with the rumors -- or rather, with one rumor: the rumor that the killers were neo-Nazis who had chosen April 20 for the shooting because it was Adolf Hitler's 110th birthday, and that they were targeting Blacks and athletes -- especially Blacks. Then Brokaw interviewed a parent of one of the victims -- exactly one parent from among all those of the 12 students and one teacher who had been murdered. He was the father of a Black student, and he sobbed out the statement: "My son had two strikes against him from the beginning [sob]. He was Black, and he was an athlete." It really sounded as if he'd been coached. And the television screen filled with a snapshot of the Black student who had been killed. No portraits of other victims; no interviews with other parents; no mention of the homosexual rumors; no mention of the Marilyn Manson rumors; just neo-Nazis targeting Blacks. And especially no mention of the fact that only one of the 13 victims was Black. There were 12 White victims and one Black victim; Tom Brokaw and his boss knew this; and yet Brokaw's instructions were to make the viewers of the *NBC Nightly News* believe the rumor that the shootings were White-on-Black "hate crimes" by "neo-Nazis."

Oh, yes, and also no mention that one of the killers was a Jew. Although his father was a Gentile, 17-year-old Dylan Klebold's mother, Susan Yassenoff, was a synagogue-going, *shul*-trained Jewess. She attended Temple Israel. That makes her son a Jew according to Jewish law, although we would consider him only a half-Jew. But Brokaw and the other TV reporters never mentioned this. All we heard was that the two killers were neo-Nazis who liked German music and German insignia.

Now, this sort of deliberate deception happens all the time, unfortunately. Most Americans believe that the media are biased, but they don't understand how blatant the bias is. They don't understand how arrogantly and deliberately they are lied to by the media bosses. The *NBC Nightly News* program of April 21 is a good example. Perhaps you saw it yourself and remember the details I have just described for you. If you didn't see it, you can order a video cassette of the program and view it. An outfit called Burrelle's in New Jersey, which is in the business of recording and selling television news programs, will sell you a copy of the April 21 edition of *NBC Nightly News* for a reasonable price.

Now, it's clear enough why they engage in this sort of deception. They want to make Whites feel guilty. They want to paralyze our will to resist their "multicultural" policies. They want to morally disarm us. I talked about the details of this on a number of other programs, and I bring up the Littleton, Colorado, shootings simply because it is such a blatant example of this Jewish psychological war against White Americans.

And you know, it's a war they're winning. If you listened to any talk-radio programs after the shootings, you certainly heard Jewish callers pushing exactly the same party line as Neal Shapiro was pushing through his mouthpiece Tom Brokaw. "We have to do whatever it takes to stop these White racist gangs," they were saying. And guilt-stricken White women were falling into their trap right and left, agreeing hysterically with them about the big danger from White racist gangs and how we have to do something drastic soon to stop the racist slaughter, and, oh, isn't White racism just awful? Outlaw racism. Outlaw guns. Outlaw free speech.

Yes, the Jews know exactly what they're doing. But one really can't blame them. That's the sort of thing Jews always have done. It's in their genes. What's really disappointing and disturbing is the feminine response of our people to these Jewish lies. What's disappointing is our gullibility.

Anyway, while we're on the subject, let me remind you what the real reason is for this latest school massacre. You remember, we discussed this phenomenon of schoolyard killings more than a year ago. I predicted that we would see many more of them, because the social pathology that causes them is becoming worse. In a word, that pathology is alienation. Multiculturalism results in alienation. Always. You destroy a kid's sense of rootedness, his sense of belonging to a natural community; you rob him of his sense of identity, his sense of kinship with the people around him, and you'll have a frustrated kid. That's true even of Jewish kids, such as Dylan Klebold. You take away a kid's sense of responsibility to his biological community, and you're likely to have trouble. You're likely to have anti-social behavior.

If on top of that you destroy his respect for authority, you're practically guaranteed trouble. And so let me ask you: who in recent memory has done more than anyone else, by his own behavior,

to destroy the respect of young Americans for authority? I'll give you a clue: he lives in Washington, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Finally, we should note the effect of television on young people. Without going into a long-winded explanation, I'll simply point out that it blurs their sense of reality. You watch television four or five hours a day from the time you're able to talk, and by the time you're 17 you've seen at least 10,000 people shot to death or otherwise killed. In the real world, before television, you might see three or four real deaths while growing up, and you would have a much better appreciation for the reality of death -- and of life -- than the kid raised on television does. You wouldn't be quite so likely to confuse game-playing for real life.

Of course, multiculturalism is a religion these days: it is the Politically Correct religion. And its adherents tend to like Mr. Clinton and also to see television as a benign influence. So no one in public life is likely to place the blame for the growing plague of school massacres the way I did. They look only for Politically Correct explanations -- or at least, for explanations which are not Politically Incorrect.

Actually, most people are that way, to a greater or lesser extent. They don't want to have unpopular opinions. They don't want to be subjected to criticism or ridicule. They want to go with the flow. They want to be popular. They want to be like everyone else and think like everyone else.

That's the lemming factor. That's the way people are, and there's not much we can do about that. But the problem of schoolyard killings is real, and as I predicted quite a while ago, it's becoming worse. So it is important for at least some of us to understand what is causing the problem. So I'll say it again: the fundamental causes of schoolyard shootings are alienation, resulting primarily from the multiculturalization of our society; loss of respect for authority; and an altered sense of reality which is the consequence of being raised on television.

That doesn't mean that everyone who is alienated will become a killer or that everyone who watches television four hours a day will lose his ability to distinguish between reality and make believe. But it does mean that as alienation and the influence of television increase in the population, schoolyard killings and other destructive behavior will continue to become more common.

This also means that there is no quick and simple solution to the problem of school violence. In the long run, alienation can be reduced only by a radical restructuring of our society. As our society is going now, alienation will only become worse. Just because the problem is difficult doesn't mean that we have to ignore it, however; it doesn't mean that there's nothing we can do. One of the most important things for us to do now is to be aware of the lies that are being told about school violence and to help others become aware. I told you about the lies Tom Brokaw told on the *NBC Nightly News* the day after the shooting in Littleton, Colorado.

What it's especially important to understand is that this isn't just a case of media bias, of Tom Brokaw giving a bit of a slant to the news because of his own political ideas. This is a case of cold-blooded, planned deception. When Tom Brokaw reported the news on April 21, he and his

bosses at NBC knew who the victims were, yet they decided to tell us the lie that the killings were based on hatred for non-Whites. They deliberately created the false impression for their viewers that most of the victims were Black, when in fact only one was. They knew that one of the killers was a Jew, yet they deliberately told us that the killers were "neo-Nazis" and "White supremacists."

Since April 21, of course, most of the facts have leaked out to the public. Perceptive people already have learned the things I've just told you: the race of the victims, the Jewishness of one of the killers. But many elements in the mass media are continuing to talk about the shootings as being racially motivated and about the shooters as being "neo-Nazis" -- and that's what the lemmings still are absorbing. It's hard to overcome first impressions, and the media bosses, clever propagandists that they are, understand that quite well.

The killers apparently were Marilyn Manson fans and also liked to use some of the jargon of the Third Reich. So of course, Tom Brokaw and the rest of the media spokesmen have been saturating us with the claim that the two teenagers were "neo-Nazis," when in fact one of them was a Jew, and there is no evidence at all to indicate that they had the least interest in the ideology or politics of National Socialism. On the other hand, after the first wave of rumors subsided there has been almost no further mention of Marilyn Manson. Could that be because Marilyn Manson is under contract to Jewish media boss Gerald Levin, who runs Warner Brothers, among other things?

I'm reminded of the schoolyard killings in Jonesboro, Arkansas, last year, in which four students and a teacher were murdered -- all of them White, incidentally. One of the killers, 13-year-old Mitchell Johnson, had recently succumbed to the multicultural influence of gangsta' rap, a type of Black music which glorifies pimping and drug dealing and drive-by shootings and other forms of Black criminality. His English teacher, Debbie Pelley, testified before a Congressional committee in Washington after the killings that a few months before the massacre young Johnson had become obsessed with gangsta' rap. He would play the music on the school bus and even try to listen to it in class, his teacher said. His favorite rapper was Tupac Shakur, who himself was killed in a drive-by shooting in Las Vegas. His English teacher told the Congressional committee that she had seen Mitchell Johnson's behavior change after he began listening to the gangsta' rap. And yet Debbie Pelley's testimony was never mentioned by the mainstream Jewish media. Instead we heard the same sort of Politically Correct explanations for the Jonesboro murders that we are hearing for the Littleton, Colorado, murders. Again, perhaps the reason the media chose not to mention the testimony of Mitchell Johnson's English teacher about the effect of gangsta' rap on him was that the boy's favorite rapper, Tupac Shakur, was under contract to Interscope Records, a label owned by the Jewish media conglomerate MCA, which had been headed by Lew Wasserman, one of Bill Clinton's biggest financial supporters.

Anyway, that's the way it goes. The mass media bosses give us the news which fits, and they ignore the news which doesn't fit. More than that, they consciously and deliberately lie, when it suits their purpose, as in the case of the *NBC Nightly News* broadcast I cited a minute ago.

And you know, this cold-blooded, calculated, deliberate lying by the news media isn't restricted to schoolyard shootings. We're being lied to massively and deliberately by the Jewish media

about the war against Yugoslavia, for example. The Jewish media deliberately concocted the story that Serb soldiers were engaging in the mass rape of Muslim women and then cutting their throats. The media have portrayed the Albanians as harmless, inoffensive, peace-loving people and the Serbs as bloodthirsty monsters. The media bosses have sat down, made a deliberate plan for the lies they would tell, and now they're telling them. They want to turn American public opinion against the Serbs and Slobodan Milosevic, and they're lying in order to do that.

The facts are leaking out, of course. The perceptive observer can learn that the Albanians were committing atrocities against the Serbs long before this current crisis in Kosovo developed. The perceptive observer can learn that the Kosovo Liberation Army is more like a mafia organization than an army of patriotic freedom fighters, but Tom Brokaw and the rest of the controlled media will never tell you that. They tell us only what suits their purpose. And that's all that the mass of the American voters, the lemmings, ever will know.

The cover of *Newsweek* magazine two weeks ago had a picture of Slobodan Milosevic on it with the legend in big letters: "The Face of Evil." Really. They could more honestly have put Madeleine Albright's face on the cover with that legend. But that wouldn't suit their purpose, which is to demonize Milosevic, demonize the Serbs, portray the Albanians as innocent victims, and build public support for Albright's murderous war to beat Serbia into submission to the New World Order.

You know, it often has been said that in war, the first casualty is truth. Governments justify their lies in wartime in terms of the need to mislead the enemy and build patriotic fervor for an all-out effort to win the war. In the war against Yugoslavia the Clinton government certainly can't claim patriotism as an excuse for its lies, because it already has abjured patriotism as a motive; it already has told us that this is not a war to defend American national interests. And in this war the enemy the government and the media are trying to deceive with their lies is us, the American people. We are the enemy. They certainly aren't fooling the Serbs.

This does make a problem for those of us who are more interested in knowing the truth than in being Politically Correct. I mean, we know that the Jewish media over here lie to us massively on just about everything. But it's probably safe to assume that the Russian media and the Serb media also lie. The Russians are claiming now that more than 40 U.S. warplanes have been shot down over Serbia. The Jewish media over here are claiming that only one U.S. warplane, an F-117, has been shot down. How do we determine the truth? I've been a little suspicious about the Jewish claim of only one U.S. plane downed by the Serbs, because the A-10s the Americans are using now for attacking Serb armor are a lot easier to shoot down than an F-117; they fly lower and slower. But Tom Brokaw and the other spokesmen for the Jewish media over here are claiming no losses. I simply don't believe it. But I really don't know what the truth is. When I find out, I certainly will tell you.

Meanwhile, don't count on learning the truth from Tom Brokaw or any other spokesmen for the Jewish media bosses. As long as Madeleine Albright is able to keep running around from one country to another with her big checkbook in hand, writing out bribes to keep the politicians in the little NATO countries in line, promising her kinsman Primakov that if he keeps the Russians

out of it the IMF loans will keep coming, the killing in Europe will go on, and the lying about it over here will continue.

About all that decent people everywhere can hope for is that the Serbs will make good use of one of their submarines and take out a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Adriatic, or that they will get enough modern anti-aircraft missiles from somewhere to make the continued bombing of Belgrade prohibitively expensive for Albright and her Jewish crew.

And you know, that's a terrible thing for me to have to say. If this war were being fought to defend America, I could never say that. But when America's armed forces are being used by the enemies of the American people as a mercenary force to commit mass murder in Europe, that is how I and many other patriotic Americans feel.

The End of Patriotism

You know, what Madeleine Albright and the rest of the Clinton gang are doing in Yugoslavia is really something new, and it's taking me a while to become accustomed to it. This is the first time I've ever hoped that American bombers would be shot down or American ships sunk. It's a strange feeling, and I don't really like it.

I remember back during the Vietnam war how I despised people like Jane Fonda and Bill Clinton, who carried Viet Cong flags and demonstrated in favor of America's enemies, at a time when the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were killing an average of 100 young Americans every day. I never was enthusiastic about American involvement in Vietnam, but since we were involved I thought that we ought to win as quickly as possible and then get out. And of course, our opponents then were communists and they were non-White; I had no objections at all to killing them. And there was still the pretense that the war was a patriotic effort, an effort to protect America's national interests. Certainly, that's the way most of our troops felt about it. They felt that they were fighting on America's behalf, they felt patriotic, and they certainly resented the scorn directed at them by the pro-Viet Cong demonstrators over here.

How different Madeleine Albright's war against Serbia is! There's not even a pretense that killing Serbs is serving America's interests. The war against Serbia is the first war of the 21st century, the New World Order crowd is proclaiming. Defending national interests is out of fashion now. The fashionable thing now is to use multinational mercenary forces to compel other countries to conform their internal policies to the wishes of the New World Order folks or to rearrange boundaries to suit New World Order schemes. The people who are running this war -- nominally Clinton, but actually the gaggle of Jews he appointed to be in charge of America's foreign policy and national security after his re-election in 1996 -- never approved of patriotism, anyway. They always sneered at it. They were the crowd cheering for the Viet Cong back in the 1960s and 1970s. Now they're cheering for NATO.

They were never patriotic Americans themselves, even after they had been here five or six generations, but in the past they at least tried to use our patriotic feelings to get us to do their killing for them: in the Second World War, for example. Now they've decided that they can drop any pretense of patriotism. Now they believe that we'll simply fight whomever they pay us to fight. As I said, that's something I'm having a hard time becoming accustomed to.

The yahoos at the VFW clubs certainly will not understand this, but in fact Madeleine Albright's war against Yugoslavia has profound implications for the relationship between the citizens of a modern state and their government, and for the relationship between civilians and soldiers. Prior to the 20th century the concept of patriotism was generally understood to be the "family" feeling -- a blend of affection and loyalty -- one had for one's fatherland, the land of one's ancestors. A related concept was that of nationalism, the family feeling that one had for one's nation: which is to say, for one's people. The etymology of the word implied that one's nation was one's extended biological family: everyone in the nation was related by birth. If a nation had occupied a given geographical territory for a long time, then the two concepts were practically interchangeable.

Patriotism was much more than an intellectual construct; it was closer to an instinct. It was bred into a people because it had survival value. A tribe which could depend on the loyalty of its members was much more likely to survive than one which could not. Thus also the strong taboo against treason.

When North America was settled by Europeans in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, the meanings of patriotism and nationalism were strained a bit. Fairly soon, however, the descendants of immigrants from Germany, Ireland, Scotland, England, Norway, Poland, Italy, and other European countries developed a new sense of patriotism. There was enough similarity among the European immigrants to North America that one might even say that a new nation came into being, and with it a feeling of affection and loyalty for America and the American people.

There were exceptions, of course. While most Swedish, French, and other European immigrants soon transferred their loyalty from the land of their ancestors in Europe to the new land in America, non-European groups as a rule did not. Gypsies still thought of themselves first and foremost as Gypsies. And Jews remained Jews, with a loyalty only to the Jewish people, wherever they might live.

This transfer of loyalty on the part of European immigrants gave America the cohesion it needed to grow and prosper. Unfortunately, it also provided a handle for the Jews and their collaborators to use in manipulating public opinion in America and setting America against Europe in two fratricidal and horribly destructive world wars in this century. Patriotism is a powerful force even when it is misguided. Governments can use it for purposes which are not in the interests of the people. Even when the Jews don't have a hand in things, there still can be bad governments and unnecessary wars, but no government is likely to deliberately and consistently work against the interests of its own people over an extended period. The Jewish presence in America in the 20th century, however, has resulted in patriotism being used against the interests of the American people in a systematic way, at least through the Vietnam war.

Incidentally, recently published statistics from the Vietnam war provide powerful support for the suspicion which always has existed that, though Jews may manipulate the patriotic feelings of the rest of us, they themselves retain their own Jewish patriotism and do not share our patriotism. If one counts Stars of David in military cemeteries from the Second World War, one finds them conspicuously underrepresented in the fields of crosses.

In a book published just last year, *Stolen Valor,* a study of the Vietnam war and its veterans, B.G. Burkett and Glenna Whitley cite a 1992 study of Department of Defense records by Massachusetts Institute of Technology Professor Arnold Barnett and West Point's Captain Timothy Stanley which provided much more precise data on the matter of Jewish patriotism. Draft-age Jews in America, it turns out, suffered losses in Vietnam at a rate less than one-fifth their proportion of the population. This was not simply a matter of rich boys avoiding service while poor boys got killed: young White men -- that is, White Gentiles -- from high-income families suffered approximately the same overall casualty rate as low-income Whites. Although some high-income Whites avoided the draft as university students, Whites from high-income families made up most of the officer corps, which suffered a disproportionately high casualty

rate, and the average death rate for high-income Whites was nearly the same as for low-income Whites.

For Jews, however, the difference is striking: making up slightly over 2.5 per cent of the population, Jews accounted for only 0.46 per cent of the GIs killed in Vietnam. This remarkable difference reflects a remarkable difference in attitudes between Jews and Whites.

Even as late as the Vietnam war, with Bill Clinton and his Jewish and leftist friends demonstrating for the Viet Cong, traditional American patriotism remained a powerful force. Most young White men still looked on military service in time of war as a patriotic duty. Phrases such as "serving your country" were still taken seriously. There was great respect for military heroism and military sacrifice. And although many Vietnam veterans were offended by being called "baby killers" and the like by leftist demonstrators in the United States, the general feeling in the White population remained that men in military "service" deserved the support of everyone on the home front. There still was the feeling that America's armed forces were "defending America."

Now we have a quite different situation, even though the yahoos won't realize that for a while yet. In Madeleine Albright's war against Serbia there's not even a pretense that America's armed forces are "defending America" or performing some sort of "service" for the American people which deserves moral support from the home front. The politicians may still mouth hypocritical slogans about "supporting our boys" in order to keep the votes of the yahoos, but no one with a brain takes such slogans seriously any longer. It is clear that America's armed forces have become a purely mercenary operation. Joining the armed forces these days is an equal-opportunity employment choice, not a patriotic act. Soldiers are paid to enforce the will of the New World Order crowd, not to defend the American people, and they deserve no more support or respect from civilians than the members of any other occupational group: bus drivers or construction workers, say. If an F-117 is shot down, its replacement cost comes out of our tax dollars, but that's also true of the government's spending for highway maintenance or new prisons. There just isn't any emotional dimension to it.

And when it comes to a conflict between American military personnel fighting under NATO or United Nations command on one side and Serbian military personnel on the other side, there no longer is a moral obligation to cheer for the Americans. They are not defending us; we don't have to support them. They're not even on "our" side any more than the Serbs are. And at least the Serbs have an all-White army.

As I said, this is really a big and important change in the nature of things. The Jews always were impatient with our old-fashioned sense of patriotism. It gave them a handle for manipulating us, but they always were a little afraid of it, always a little worried that it might turn against them someday. So now they've changed the equation of patriotism. Now they've dropped the pretense. That's one more step in the remaking of America in the Jewish image, and judging from what some of the more reckless Jews have been saying recently, they feel pretty good about it. At least, they don't have to apologize any longer for the sort of statistics I just cited on Vietnam casualties. Now they can simply cite their success in evading service as proof that they're smarter than we are.

My view of the matter is that they have moved a little prematurely on this and eventually will come to regret it bitterly. Based in instinct as it is, patriotism cannot be gotten rid of so easily. They have succeeded in invalidating the moral contract which used to exist between America's soldiers and her civilians, just as they invalidated the concept of popular democracy when they put together a majority coalition of welfare rabble, non-Whites, homosexuals, feminists, and ball-game fans under their control which could elect something like Bill Clinton to the White House twice in a row, even though everything about the man offended decent and responsible Americans.

You know, not everyone is adaptable enough to accept this new situation. There is a strong conservative tendency in most people which resists change. Just because something like democracy has become institutionalized in our society, they will continue to accept it and respect it even after it has been subverted and turned against them. They will continue to salute the concept of democracy reflexively, even when our deadliest enemies are using that concept to destroy us. When the Jews have put together a coalition of voters they can count on to elect public officials under Jewish control, many decent Americans will simply permit themselves to be voted into slavery or voted into the slaughterhouse rather than abandon the institutionalized and revered concept of democracy.

I believe that the true patriot is one who puts the survival and freedom and progress of his people ahead of any theory of government, institutionalized or not. The true patriot is one who, when confronted with the reality of the Clinton coalition, will not simply bow his head and accept the will of the majority but will plan instead to do whatever is necessary to make the will of the patriotic minority prevail over the Clinton majority. If that means turning that majority into a minority by thinning out some of its components, then so be it. And if it means abandoning the concept of democracy itself, at least temporarily, then so be it.

And, just as many conservatives will let institutionalized democracy destroy our people rather than oppose it, so also will many conservatives not be willing to come to grips with the subversion of America's armed forces which has taken place. Because respect and support for the armed forces have been institutionalized, any recognition that respect and support no longer are appropriate will be resisted by conservatives. For example, at the end of my broadcast last week I said that decent people everywhere can hope that the Serbs will use one of their submarines to sink a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Adriatic, and I received some shocked and indignant responses to this statement -- as I expected I would. One or two listeners suggested I "got carried away" by my hatred for the Clinton government. For these listeners the old taboo is still in effect. We still must "support our boys," even when they are taking orders from Madeleine Albright.

Well, let me assure you, I never get carried away. I meant what I said -- but it was hard for me to say it. I always have had a stronger than average admiration and respect for military traditions and virtues. I always have been very conscious of the moral contract between the armed forces and the civilian population, which is why I was so outraged during the Vietnam war by the behavior of people like Bill Clinton and Jane Fonda. And so I understand that it is very difficult for conservatives to accept what I said.

Nevertheless, let me carry my thoughts on this subject a bit further. The U.S armed forces have been brainwashed and trained for some time now to be used against rebellious U.S. citizens. Don't worry about the legalities of the matter; they *will be* used by the Jews and their allies against Americans whenever the Jews feel threatened. They are being used now to kill people who are a lot like us, people whose thinking is a lot healthier, a lot closer to that of the average White American of 50 years ago than to the thinking of the people who voted for Clinton three years ago. They really are a mercenary force, and their leaders would just as soon use them against White Americans or Europeans as against Haitians or Somalis.

More so, in fact. Perhaps you will remember that in my broadcast two weeks ago I quoted for you what General Wesley Clark had told reporters about his own motivation for killing Serbs. General Clark, remember, is the military boss of NATO, the man directing the New World Order's murderous bombing campaign against Serbia. Clark said:

There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th-century idea, and we're trying to transition into the 21st century, and we're going to do it with multi-ethnic states.

I commented in that same broadcast about the politicization of America's armed forces, with General Clark as an example of the new breed of political generals, military leaders who mouth the political slogans of the New World Order and are as ready to sacrifice the interests of America in the service of what British Prime Minister Tony Blair calls "the new internationalism" as are Albright, Cohen, Berger, and the rest of the Jewish gang around Clinton.

Well, two weeks ago, I didn't realize just how close General Clark's ties to that gang are. I didn't realize that he is a blood-member of the gang himself. You know, Jews are so scarce in our armed forces that I just assumed that none of our top military leaders are Jews. I just assumed that they are politicians, amoral careerists who will do whatever they are told to do by the Jews around Clinton. But I have just found out that Clark is more than a politician mouthing Jewish slogans in order to advance his career. Clark's biological father was a Russian Jew named Benjamin Jacob Kanne. Clark's grandfather had left Russia with the name Jacob Nemerovsky and sneaked into the United States with a forged passport, using the name "Kanne." Clark's father died when the boy was five years old, and his mother married a Gentile, Victor Clark. His mother and stepfather raised him as a Christian in Little Rock, Arkansas.

His Jewish blood relatives kept in touch, however, and more than 30 years ago began bringing him into the Jewish network. That was when Clark was at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, about the same time Clinton was. Rhodes scholarships seem to be almost a membership initiation requirement for the New World Order gang, like certain types of tattoos for prison gangs or the chopping off of part of a finger for the Japanese mafia, the *yakuza.*

Clark welcomed his new Jewish contacts, and they may have helped him up the political ladder to his present position. Otherwise, it just seems too much of a coincidence. I have a suspicion that when Clark has finished his NATO duties he will have a leading role to play in the military in the United States. He would be the ideal choice for using the Army to politically cleanse the United States, rounding up any remaining patriots and putting them away so that they can never pose a threat to the Clinton coalition.

And really, that's coming. I don't know what methods or what pretense they will use. I don't know what the timetable will be. But I know that it's coming. That's what the New World Order gang has spent 50 years getting our armed forces ready for. That's what General Wesley Kanne Clark is being groomed for.

You know, despite what you might think from listening to the politicians in Washington, despite what you might think from looking at what our armed forces have become, despite everything the Jews have done to brainwash Americans, there still are a great many patriots left here. The patriotic instinct is still here, waiting for a new way to express itself. But if it is to express itself effectively -- if patriots are to prevail over those who believe that only multi-ethnic states should be permitted to exist in the 21st century -- then one of the first things we must do is understand clearly that the old contract between soldiers and civilians is broken. We must understand that the people now killing Serbs in our name, the people who later will be used in an effort to kill us -- these military people are no longer "our boys."

The Bigger War

Perhaps by now you are tired of hearing me talk about Madeleine Albright's genocide against the Serbs. There certainly are plenty of other interesting things we could discuss: more horrifying Black-on-White crimes that the Jewish media have hushed up, more shocking details of Clinton's treasonous sale of American security to China, more of the fallout from that school shooting in Colorado last month and what it reveals about the corruption of public life in America. All of these things are important -- but none is quite as important as Madeleine Albright's war against Serbia.

And it's not just that Albright murders more people in Serbia every day than are killed in a year of schoolyard shootings in America. It is the fundamental lessons for us, the fundamental warnings, which are spelled out so clearly by the NATO murder campaign against the Serbs. An advantage which sometimes comes from studying foreign events instead of domestic affairs is that the distance lends clarity to the lesson. Looking at events happening seven thousand miles away in Serbia, we can see the whole forest without the trees getting in our way.

Actually, I'm sticking my neck out a bit in talking about the war in the Balkans at this time. The war may be over by the time I'm on the air. Today, as I prepare my commentary, there's talk that a Russian delegation may soon be on its way to Belgrade to pressure the Serbs into surrendering to NATO. The Albright gang in America are smirking and rubbing their hands and laughing among themselves as they tell each other that it's an offer Milosevic won't be able to refuse.

Here's the idea: Russia is supposed to be Serbia's only ally. It's not that the Russian government has given the Serbs any tangible assistance, but among the Russian people there is almost unanimous support for the Serbs, so Russia is said to be Serbia's "ally." The nominal head of the Russian government, of course, is a chronically sick, alcoholic clown, Boris Yeltsin, who serves much the same role in Russia that Bill Clinton serves here: he is simply a Russian front man for the Jewish billionaires and the Jewish mafia bosses who are bleeding Russia dry.

And alongside Yeltsin, as the prime minister of Russia, until last Wednesday, was Yevgeny Primakov -- who was born with the name Pinchas Finklestein. So heading the Russian government at the time it agreed with NATO last week on the demands to be made on Serbia we had a front man for the Jews and a Jew -- which meant that any support, diplomatic or otherwise, the Serbs might receive from Russia was likely to be purely illusory.

With Primakov/Finklestein's departure a few days ago things are a bit up in the air at the moment, but if the Kremlin delegation does go ahead and present Albright's demands to Milosevic, he will be under a great deal of pressure to surrender. If he doesn't surrender, then the Russian government -- which is no more a truly Russian government than the Clinton government is an American government -- can wash its hands of Serbia, saying, "We tried to help, but he rejected us." That will leave Serbia all alone, and Albright and her crew can continue their campaign of genocide against the Serbs, pretending that they tried to negotiate, but the Serbs wouldn't listen to reason. And if Milosevic does accept the Kremlin offer, it will be equivalent to surrendering to NATO. It will amount to yielding his country's rights to its own

territory and turning it over to the international criminals who have been bombing and killing his people.

Now, why is this important to Americans? Why should we care whether Albanians or Serbs or NATO runs Serbia's Kosovo province? Certainly, we don't really care when some bunch of Blacks in Africa fights with another bunch over who will run some bantustan. What difference will some little theft of territory in the Balkans make to us?

I've explained this before, and I'll explain it again: the outcome of this war to take Kosovo away from Serbia is important because it is a new kind of war, which will help to establish a new principle if it is successful. That new principle is that the New World Order, as embodied in NATO or the United Nations or whatever other supranational body the board of directors of the New World Order chooses, can tell any country in the world how to govern itself and then destroy anyone who doesn't obey. It will mean an end to national sovereignty. It will mean an end to national independence. It will mean an end to freedom.

Now, I know that there are a lot of liberal nitwits out there who think that will be just wonderful. Sovereignty and independence are bad words to liberals. They believe that interdependence is much better than independence. They believe that everything will be much nicer when there are no more sovereign nations and the whole world is ruled by a committee: no more rich and powerful nations, no more poor and weak nations, everyone equal. And no one will be mistreated; governments will be forced to be nice to their citizens. Of course, we may have to break a few eggs -- Serbia, for example -- in order to make this wonderful omelet, but it will be well worth it in the end, the liberals believe. In the end we will have true democracy and equality everywhere.

You know, the liberal mind is a strange thing. I am sure that they really do want their omelet, and they really are willing to break as many eggs as it takes, to commit as much genocide as they have to. But they certainly don't believe in democracy or equality. No one with any sense at all believes in equality. And as for democracy, look at what's been going on in some of the countries they've got signed up for their current egg-breaking foray in the Balkans. This is not a war that the people of the NATO countries voted for or that they wish to continue. It is enormously unpopular in most of them, but the politicians at the top are sure that they know better than the voters what's good for them -- that is, what's good for the politicians that Madeleine Albright has been bribing to stay in her war against Serbia. Even the voters in the world's prime boob hatchery, the United States of America, are beginning to have second thoughts about the wisdom of running around the world kicking sand in everyone's face, just because we're big enough to get away with it. Not even Mr. Clinton's coalition of brain-dead rabble, who in the past have given him his high poll ratings, are solidly behind his genocide against Serbia any longer. Last Saturday U.S. voter support for continuing the bombing was down to 43 per cent and falling. Even the flag-waving yahoos at the American Legion are sick of the senseless slaughter. Last week the Legion's national executive committee unanimously called on the Clinton government to stop the bombing and withdraw all U.S. forces from the region immediately.

But that's all right: the Jews and their ever-worshipful liberal-elite followers know what's best and are determined to continue their murder campaign down to the last Serb if Milosevic doesn't surrender, regardless of what the voters think about it.

They already have gotten away with so much that they really believe that they can do whatever they want with impunity. Did you hear the news last week when the Clinton government in effect admitted in court that it had no credible evidence to justify blowing up a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan last year? I told you at the time that Clinton had no justification for firing his cruise missiles last August 20 at a pharmaceutical factory in Khartoum, Sudan, which he claimed was a nerve-gas factory. I told you that he destroyed this factory just because he felt he needed to do something to prove that the United States isn't powerless against terrorists of the sort who blew up two U.S. embassies in Africa. What he actually did was prove that the United States has itself become a terrorist country, which will fire its missiles wherever it damned well pleases, without worrying about any sort of legal or moral justification. Mr. Clinton proved that the United States will kick sand in the face of anyone it wants to. Sudan just happens to have the misfortune of being in Osama bin Laden's part of the world. Well, the owners of the bombed pharmaceutical factory sued the U.S. government, and the government caved in last week, declining to provide any evidence to support its claim that the pharmaceutical factory was anything but a pharmaceutical factory. The owners will win their case, and the Clinton government will hope that everyone forgets about it as soon as possible.

Letting a government get away with that sort of lawless activity is not a good policy. The attitude which was behind the attack on the pharmaceutical factory is the same attitude which is behind the attack on Serbia. The Clinton government got away with it in Sudan. No one was even sent to prison for that totally irresponsible act of terrorism. If the Clinton government wins in Serbia, then the people who do this sort of thing will believe that nothing can stop them. They will believe that whenever they want to change some country's borders or force some country to change its internal policies, all they have to do is fire off a few cruise missiles.

That is why I fervently hope that Slobodan Milosevic will not surrender to Madeleine Albright. That is why I hope that he will tell Yeltsin and whoever takes Primakov's place, "Thanks for your help, but no thanks. We will continue to defend our country against aggression, even if we must do it alone. We will not permit foreign troops on our soil." I hope that is what he will say, even though the murderous thugs running NATO certainly will continue their bombing and will kill more Serbs -- for a while.

I don't want more Serbs killed, but even less do I want Albright and her gang to get away with their aggression. I believe that if Milosevic and his Serbs can hold out against the NATO gangsters for a few weeks longer, international pressure against NATO will continue to build, and eventually they will slink away with their tails between their legs. We need for NATO to have that setback. The world needs it. The world will be greatly indebted to Serbia if the Serbs hold out against NATO now.

You know, last week when I reaffirmed a statement that I'd made the week before to the effect that it would be good if the Serbs were to sink an American warship in the Adriatic, some listeners disagreed with me. One listener told me that he has a nephew on the aircraft carrier USS

Roosevelt in the Adriatic, and he is distressed that I should want any harm to befall his nephew. After all, he says, most servicemen haven't any idea about the real issues here. All they know is the official propaganda line taught to them by their bosses in the Pentagon. They aren't to blame for what's happening, and they shouldn't be punished. The hatred against American servicemen is building up everywhere in the world, and I shouldn't add to that hatred, he says.

Well, of course, I don't want this listener's nephew to drown in the Adriatic if the USS *Roosevelt* is sunk -- or anyone else's nephew. But the fact is that our people -- that is, Europeans, White people -- are being killed every day by Madeleine Albright's rockets and bombs because the USS *Roosevelt* and other U.S. warships are in the Adriatic. I'm willing to accept that this listener's nephew doesn't understand the issues and isn't really an evil person. I'm willing to accept that he's just an unwitting pawn in Albright's murder machine, and I wish him no harm. But the machine is being used to kill our people in Serbia. And undoubtedly many of these Serbs that Albright's murder machine is killing are no more valuable members of our race than this listener's nephew. Undoubtedly there are some criminals and some drunkards and some lawyers and some welfare cases among the Serbs being killed in Belgrade and in Kosovo. And certainly, there are many Serbs who have no more a clue to the real issues here than the sailors on the USS *Roosevelt.* But the Serbs aren't part of Madeleine Albright's murder machine, and my listener's nephew is. That is the key difference here.

The fact is that we are in a bad position now -- all of us are in a bad position: I and the Serbs and my listener and his nephew, our whole race -- because we have let Madeleine and her murderous tribe get the upper hand over us. That is the problem we have to deal with. Until we get Madeleine and all the rest of her tribe off our backs, our people will be lied to, our people will be exploited, and our people will be killed. So we need to focus on getting Madeleine and her tribe off our backs. Anything which takes us closer to that goal is good, and anything which diverts us from that goal is bad. Let's keep our eyes on the forest, not just on the trees.

I hope I have made myself clear. What we want to see come out of this war specifically is a defeat for NATO, regardless of how that comes about. We would like to see that defeat come about without any more losses for our people, whether Americans or Serbs. But there almost certainly will be more losses, at least among the Serbs, because the gangsters running this war won't give up easily. They will continue killing as long as they can. As public disapproval of this war grows, both in America and elsewhere; as more U.S. embassies around the world are burned; as more organizations such as the American Legion, God bless those yahoos, raise their voices against the war; and as more politicians over here follow the polls and become more concerned about the desires of their constituents than about pleasing the Jews, a defeat for NATO -- and for Madeleine Albright and for the New World Order -- will become more likely. But the Serbs must hold out until that happens, and if the sinking of the USS *Roosevelt* will help them keep up their morale, then so be it.

But you know, if we want to get Madeleine and her tribe off our backs -- if we want, someday, to make an end to them and their scheme for a New World Order, with us as their serfs -- we need to do more than hope for a NATO defeat in Serbia. We need to do everything we can. We need to speak out. If we belong to an organization, we need to do what we can to make the organization follow the example of the American Legion. We need to write letters to every

newspaper which has a public opinion page. We need to get on the telephone and make ourselves heard on every radio talk show. And when there are demonstrations against the war we need to participate in them, even if we don't agree with everyone else in the demonstration on every issue.

And I should say this also: In responding to this current war, it will behoove us to think about it in its larger context. Making NATO back down this one time will not stop Madeleine and her crew from trying something else just as bloody and destructive the next time they see a chance. To them it's not just NATO against Serbia. They always think about the struggle in its larger context. And as I said, we need to do the same.

To Madeleine Albright and James Rubin and William Cohen and Sandy Berger and General Wesley Kanne Clark, this isn't a war of America versus Serbia or of NATO versus Serbia; it's a war of their people against our people. NATO versus Serbia is only one little episode in a bigger war they have been waging against us for thousands of years and which they believe that they are now on the verge of winning, once and for all. They have totally corrupt Gentiles as their front men in the United States, in Britain, and in Russia. They have a death grip on the mass media. They have the wealth and military might of the United States at their disposal. They have bribed and intimidated the politicians of 20 nations into going along with their war against Serbia. It may seem like a rather precarious house of cards they have built, but if they can keep it together long enough to prevail over Serbia, they will have greatly strengthened their position and will be much more likely to prevail over their next victim.

They may beat us in this NATO versus Serbia battle, or they may not, but if we are to have any hope of beating them in the long run -- if we are to have any hope of winning the bigger war and not just this battle -- then we must understand the war the way they do. We must learn to think in the bigger context the way they do. We must think in terms of what is good for our people, for our race, in the long run -- not what will help the Democrats or the Republicans win the next election, not what will give the Protestants an advantage over the Catholics or vice versa, not what will give our people who speak French an edge over our people who speak English, not what will allow Americans to show Serbs that we have more cruise missiles and B-2 bombers than they do, not what will allow any part of our people defined only by geography or language or religion or politics to prevail over any other part of our people. We must think in terms of blood, of family, of race first and foremost. We must understand that we and the Serbs are of the same family, the same blood, the same race -- and that Madeleine Albright and James Rubin and William Cohen and Sandy Berger and Richard Holbrooke and General Wesley Kanne Clark and all of the big media bosses who are behind this war against Serbia belong to a different family, a different race, a race which always has been hostile to ours.

For too long we have allowed them to manipulate us, to set one part of us against another part in wars they cooked up for their own advantage. That has never been truer than in this war against Serbia. It is a Jewish war, and only Jews can benefit from it. We should not be involved in it. We should do everything we can to ensure that the Jews lose it. But regardless of what happens in the Balkans in the next few months, we need to continue building our new way of looking at the world and judging things, our way based on family and blood and race. That's the only way we

can beat these New World Order thugs in the long run. That's the only way we can keep the Jews from using their age-old trick of setting one part of our people against another part.

And you know, for those of us who just like to fight, those who enjoy a family squabble, we can go back to fighting among ourselves in the future if we really must -- but only after we have beaten the enemy of us all, the world enemy.

What They're Aiming For

When I spoke with you a couple of weeks ago I mentioned the recent firing of a White radio disk jockey in Washington, DC, who made a Politically Incorrect remark on the air. Doug Tracht, who is known as the Greaseman, was by far the most "popular personality" on Washington radio station WARW-FM. His listeners were nearly all Whites, and they not only liked the music he played for them, but they also enjoyed his sometimes risqué or Politically Incorrect remarks on the air. For example, back in 1986, when the subject of making a holiday out of the birthday of Martin Luther King came up, the Greaseman, who was very popular in Washington even then, had said, "Hey, kill four more, and we can take a whole week off." That's the sort of thing which endeared him to his White listeners, if not to station owners.

Well, last month the Grammy awards had just been handed out by the folks in Hollywood who decide what sort of music we should listen to, and one of the winners was a Negress, Lauryn Hill, who had won a Grammy for a hip-hop record. That's not the sort of thing the Greaseman ordinarily played for his White listeners, but in light of the Grammy award he decided to play her record. Well, he stopped the record in disgust about halfway through and commented, "No wonder people drag them behind trucks."

It didn't take but a few minutes for the Hollywood bosses to hear about that, and the word came back quickly. The Greaseman was out of a job within hours. The same day he was fired from his part-time job as a deputy sheriff in suburban Falls Church, Virginia. It's not just that the Greaseman had made a Politically Incorrect reference to the trial which was taking place in Jasper, Texas, at the time; he had in effect contradicted the Hollywood media bosses as to what type of music White people should listen to. The media bosses have been pushing a program for years to popularize Black music among Whites. It's not only a way to disconnect young Whites from their own European roots, but it encourages more racial mixing. And the Greaseman had bucked the program. He had told his White audience that they didn't have to like hip-hop. It was okay not to listen to the trendy sort of non-White music the Hollywood media bosses wanted them to listen to. Perhaps the Greaseman could have gotten away with that back in 1986, but not in 1999. Things have gotten a lot more Politically Correct in the last 13 years.

I'll give you another example of this trend. Three weeks ago the superintendent of New Jersey's state police, Carl Williams, was fired by New Jersey's very trendy and ambitious female governor, Christine Whitman. Why? Because Williams, in an interview with a reporter for the Newark *Star-Ledger* had said that non-Whites are more likely to be involved in importing and dealing some types of illegal drugs than Whites are. The state police superintendent, in talking about New Jersey's drug problem, had told the reporter:

If you're looking at the methamphetamine market, that seems to be controlled by the motorcycle gangs, which are basically . . . White.

Now, that much was okay. Nothing wrong with saying that the methamphetamine trade is controlled by White motorcycle gangs. But then State Police Superintendent Williams continued:

If you're looking at heroin and stuff like that, your involvement is more or less Jamaicans.

Oooh! He really shouldn't have said that. Very Politically Incorrect! And Williams also told the reporter:

Today . . . the drug problem is cocaine or marijuana. It's most likely a minority group that's involved with that. They aren't going to ask some Irishman to be a part of their . . . [gang] because they don't trust him.

Well, sir, as soon as Governor Whitman heard that, she fired Williams, ending his 35-year career in law enforcement. His comments to the reporter, she said, were "insensitive." And today, you know, in the Clinton era, that's what really counts: not being an effective law enforcement officer, but being sensitive; not telling the truth, but being Politically Correct; not locking up the criminals, but feeling their pain.

Now, the enforcers of Political Correctness these days are mostly Whites. They may get their orders from the Middle Eastern clique in Hollywood or New York, but the station manager who fired the Greaseman and the governor who fired Superintendent Williams are trendy Whites. The non-Whites, however, have been quick to see the trend and to hop on the bandwagon. Just as they were screaming for the Greaseman's blood in Washington a few weeks ago, they also were baying and yelping in New Jersey when Williams went down. New Jersey State Assemblyman LeRoy Jones pompously said of Williams:

His views are dastardly; his thoughts are ill . . . and he's unfit to hold such a critical, important office . . . . He's a racist of the worst kind, because he doesn't even know it.

Did you hear that? The worst racists are those who don't even know they're racists. They're those White males who try to be Politically Correct, but they just aren't sensitive enough to keep up with the very latest trends in Political Correctness. They just don't feel the pain of all of those underprivileged and persecuted minority drug gangs and feminists and homosexuals the way a truly sensitive man like Bill Clinton does. And so, of course, those who aren't like Bill Clinton will just have to go. Making an example of them will help all the rest of us become more sensitive, more responsive to minority needs.

You know, I find the sort of thing that happened to New Jersey State Police Superintendent Carl Williams really funny. Here's this poor jerk trying as hard as he can to be sensitive, trying as hard as he can to jump through the hoop, and he just can't make it, so he's thrown to the dogs. Wonderful!

The only people I really feel sympathy for are the ones who don't even try, the ones who are too honorable and too dignified -- too White -- to try to be Politically Correct. I still have a warm spot in my heart for Dan White. Remember him? That was 20 years ago. Dan White was the conservative San Francisco supervisor who had been a policeman himself and who was supported by the San Francisco police department at a time when the minions of Political Correctness were attempting to force a gay agenda on the cops. In 1978 the mayor there, a fellow named George Moscone, thought White wasn't sensitive enough to the needs of San Francisco's

homosexual population, who had wormed their way quite thoroughly into the political power structure there. The mayor and the homosexuals were attempting to ease White out of his supervisor's position, so that he could be replaced by someone who would feel the pain of the gay community. Well, on November 27, 1978, old Dan White just walked into the mayor's office with his service pistol and blew away the mayor and his head homosexual, a fellow named Harvey Milk. Of course, that didn't go very far toward solving San Francisco's homosexual problem, and it did cost Dan White five years in the state penitentiary, but it was a nice symbolic gesture. It's really too bad that Police Superintendent Carl Williams didn't handle his problem with New Jersey's oh-so-Correct governess the same way -- and with Assemblyman LeRoy Jones at the same time. That would have been another nice gesture. You can understand now why these Politically Correct types are so eager to replace straight, White cops everywhere with non-Whites, lesbians, and so on.

What Dan White did 20 years ago is much less likely these days, of course. These days going quietly, like Carl Williams did, is more likely, unfortunately. The country has been substantially sensitized. This is the Clinton era. Anyway, one of the points I want to make today is that there is a very unhealthy trend in America: a trend toward punishing Politically Incorrect speech, the way the Greaseman and Police Superintendent Williams were punished. And there's also a trend toward passivity, toward non-resistance, in much of the population. Ordinary people are more likely to let themselves be pushed around now than they were 20 years ago and also to discipline themselves, to be careful not to say anything Politically Incorrect, regardless of what they're thinking.

But really, meekness and self-discipline on our part are not enough for the zealots of Political Correctness. They want to be able to put us in prison for making Politically Incorrect statements or thinking Politically Incorrect thoughts. That's why the media bosses and the Clinton government are pushing hard for so-called "hate crime" laws now. If they had had a "hate crime" law in place when Dan White dispatched Harvey Milk and the mayor of San Francisco, they could have put him away for a lot longer than five years. They could have used the fact that he didn't approve of homosexuals to give him a much stiffer sentence for shooting Milk. Perhaps they could have had someone testify that he didn't like Jews either, and then they could have sent him to the gas chamber.

They will deny this, but you had better believe me when I tell you that the media bosses and the Clinton government are aiming not only for new laws against what they like to call "bias-motivated" acts, which punish people for what they were thinking when they did something; they're also aiming for laws against Politically Incorrect speech that's not associated with any act. Of course, they will tell you now that they're 100 per cent in favor of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, but in fact, they fully intend to do away with those freedoms.

I know that this is what they intend to do, because I've seen their counterparts do it in a dozen other countries, and they always tell the same lies. They always say that they're in favor of freedom, but that new laws are necessary to put an end to "hate." They will have their cheerleader squads chanting, "Freedom doesn't mean freedom to hate." And of course, hate means whatever they say it means. Just as they have the kiddies learning in school now that the Second Amendment only guarantees the right of state militias to keep and bear arms, not the

right of individual citizens to defend themselves, they will have the kiddies learning that the First Amendment only guarantees the right to say non-hateful things. I mean, who would want to say hateful things anyway? Who needs that kind of freedom? And really, as long as the lemmings still can buy their horoscope magazines at the checkout stand and watch their ball games on television and keep their fiberglass speedboats in their driveways, they will believe they are free.

I know that this is the way it will be because, as I said, I've seen it happen in many other countries. In Canada the lemmings believe they are free, but any Canadian who publishes the text of this broadcast is liable to arrest and prosecution by the secret police. The same is true in Britain and in France and in Germany and in Switzerland and in a dozen other European countries. In Germany hundreds of patriots are rotting in prisons now because they dared to say Politically Incorrect things. But the average German -- the German lemming -- isn't bothered by this; he thinks that anyone who would want to say something which is Politically Incorrect must be a very strange person who probably is dangerous and probably should be locked up.

And the trend in America is plain enough: the lemmings already have been prepared to relinquish their freedom. They are ready and willing to give it up. And the non-lemmings are being conditioned. They are being taught to hold their tongues. They are being taught that it is dangerous to say Politically Incorrect things or even to have Politically Incorrect ideas.

Yes, it is dangerous even to have Politically Incorrect ideas or to read Politically Incorrect books. Imagine: you wake up one night to find a Black or mestizo burglar in your bedroom. You shoot him. When the police come to make a report, they notice racist books and magazines in your house. Aha! Now your shooting of a burglar has taken on the character of a "hate crime." You shot the burglar because he wasn't White! At least, that's the way it will go in court. That's the way Tom Brokaw will explain it on the *NBC Nightly Evening News.* How lucky those Canadians and Germans are to have had their Politically Incorrect books outlawed, so that they can't get themselves into that sort of mess.

Anyway, in America the trend toward enforced Political Correctness is here. The fear already is present. The laws will be here shortly. And now the most interesting question for us is, "Why?" Why is it so important for the media bosses and the Clintonistas to silence Politically Incorrect Americans? Why not leave us free to hate them and their policies and programs? The lemmings have been conditioned. Mr. Clinton's popularity polls are still up. Why do they care what we say?

Well, they care because silencing their critics will be important later. Stifling dissent will be essential as they continue implementing their programs. You know, they are trying to build a very complex house of cards. It may seem relatively stable now, when the economy is good and the lemmings are happy. But when the economy no longer is so good, their house of cards will be much less stable, and it may not be able to withstand much dissent. What the Jewish media bosses -- and in fact, the Jewish establishment generally -- are aiming for is total control, total ownership. For many years they were able to work behind the scenes, quietly acquiring control of the media, corrupting politicians, implementing their government programs very cautiously. Observant individuals tried to warn the people what they were up to, but it really sounded very far-fetched. People didn't believe it, because everything was still pretty much under cover.

Now things are approaching a climax. It's no longer possible to work just behind the scenes. Now things are becoming more visible. Look at the crew controlling the Clinton government. The United States has never before had such a Jew-ridden government. There have never before been anywhere near as many Jews out in the open, in visible control of the powerful posts.

And look what they are doing. Consider foreign affairs, for example. It's not just their genocidal policy against Iraq, in order to make the Middle East safer for continued Israeli expansion. It's their policy in the Balkans too. It's unfortunate that the Albanians and the Serbs can't get along and seem to enjoy cutting each other's throats and gouging out each other's eyes. But that's not the reason that Madeleine Albright and her kosher crew are so hot to send U.S. troops into Kosovo. Their reason is control. It is to set an example. It is to demonstrate that no country is any longer truly independent. It is to show the world that any country which doesn't obey orders will have so-called "peacekeeping" troops rolling through its streets in tanks in short order.

And you know, that's a very risky business. As clever as the Jews are, they do make mistakes. An attack on Serbia could backfire. The Clinton government's policy of intervention could suddenly become very unpopular. And they don't want dissidents like me to be free to say, "I told you so," and to explain to the public what the real reason is behind Madeleine Albright's policy.

Or consider domestic policy. If there's one thing I've been harping on that even the lemmings agree with me on, it's the necessity for the United States to halt the flood of Third World immigrants into this country. But it's quite clear that the Jewish establishment intends to keep the floodgates open. For years they have been pretending to be concerned about illegal immigrants and have pretended to be making plans to beef up border security, but it's really obvious now that they have no intention of stopping the flood. They want more and more "diversity," as they like to call it. They and the trendy Clinton supporters are looking forward to a non-White majority in America, and the sooner the better.

The Jewish leaders are aiming for a totally diverse, totally fragmented country, in which there will be no group able to challenge their control. But as this flood of Mexicans and Haitians and Nigerians and Chinese and God only knows what else continues pouring into the country and taking over our schools and our neighborhoods and our jobs, there will be many unhappy White people: White people who may not be upset yet, because they haven't felt a personal impact yet. But they will, and then a lot more of them will be paying attention to what I and others have been saying. And so it's important to shut us up before the pinch comes. It's important to shut us up now, because by God we will tell the people who has wrecked their country and why. And the people will listen.

That is, the people will listen if I and other dissidents have not been outlawed and silenced. What the media bosses and their collaborators do now is fire people who say anything Politically Incorrect. They apply pressure behind the scenes to force radio stations to stop carrying *American Dissident Voices.* And they generate a huge amount of propaganda -- as, for example, in the case of the recent trial in Jasper, Texas -- to persuade the thoughtless that "hate" is something that needs to be dealt with by more laws. The next step will be the enactment of such laws, and then we'll have a legal situation in America similar to that in Canada and Germany and elsewhere.

Of course, ultimately their plan for world domination, for world ownership by Jews, will fail. Ultimately something will go wrong, and the house of cards will come tumbling down. But it is better -- far better -- for us to bring down their house sooner rather than later: far better for us to be able to do it simply by speaking the truth instead of having to use other means.

Stopping the Hijacking of America

Today I want to simply state a few facts -- and make a few simple statements about what I believe. First, I want to tell you why I make these broadcasts every week. I make these broadcasts because America is being hijacked, and I want to stop the hijacking. America used to belong to me and to people like me, people whose ancestors came over here from Europe, settled the land, fought the Indians, and built a civilization here: a civilization based on the values and ideals that they brought here with them from Europe, values and ideals which have belonged to my people for thousands of years.

But America is being hijacked. It is being taken away from my people, so that it can become the property of an alien people instead. It is being changed, perverted, to suit their tastes and their needs instead of the tastes and needs of my people. I want to stop this hijacking. I want to take America back and make it the heritage of my people again.

Now I will tell you how America is being hijacked and how I believe we must oppose the hijackers. This is a little longer, a little more complicated, but I will try to keep it as short and simple as I can. My people who came to America from Europe had much in common. They were of one blood and one set of ideals. They came from many nations -- from England and Scotland and Ireland and Norway and Sweden and Poland and Germany and Ukraine and Italy and France -- but they had a common history, when viewed from a perspective of thousands of years.

There were bad people, weak people, corrupt people among my ancestors -- and many very stupid and credulous people -- but among my people there also were many very good people, strong people, honorable people, and many wonderfully wise and creative people. All together, the good and the bad, the strong and the weak, our people formed a society with common values and a common heritage, and this society, this community of common blood and common traditions and common interests, overcame every obstacle and built a new country here in the Western Hemisphere. We knew how to cope with adversity and with our own bad elements. When someone like Bill Clinton popped up, we would give him a public flogging and put him in the stocks on a platform in the village square for a few days. If that didn't make him behave himself, we would drag him off to gallows hill, hang him in public, and be done with him.

We had conflicts among our people of course. We had struggle and injustice and pain in our lives. That's the way it always had been in Europe, and that's the way it was here too. That's what had made us strong: the conflict and the struggle. It had made us strong, because on the whole the better and the stronger of our people prevailed over the rest. Despite the pain and the injustice, we had joy in our lives because it was our world. It was the type of world we had lived in for countless thousands of generations, and we were adapted to it.

But in America we became careless -- as we often had been careless in Europe too. After we had whipped the Indians and tamed the frontier and built cities and railroads in America, we admitted into our midst a different and very dangerous sort of person, who did not share our blood or our history or our values. We admitted the Jews, who in many cases looked physically similar to our own people, but whose souls were the product of quite a different evolution: they were the

product of the marketplaces of the Middle East, where they had been bred for hundreds of generations. They came to us with false faces and false tongues, and we didn't know how to deal with them. They presented themselves as persecuted victims seeking freedom and justice, when in fact they were persecutors and victimizers seeking new victims. They spoke to us of the virtues of tolerance and diversity and openness and acceptance, when in fact they were the most exclusive and intolerant people on earth. They thought of themselves as a select race, a Chosen People, superior to all other peoples and the rightful owners of all the wealth of every nation.

In Europe they had fomented revolutions and wars. One of them, Karl Marx, began a movement which eventually murdered 60 million of our people -- and that's much worse than it sounds, because the murdering was done selectively, targeting the best of our people to be killed. Marx's movement never really caught on in America, as a movement, but its basic ideas did: principally egalitarianism. In America the Jews focused from the start on acquiring control of public opinion, control of the dissemination of information and ideas, control of the images of reality presented to our people. That really began in the 19th century, but for most practical purposes it was in the 20th century that it became effective. The 20th century has been the Jewish century. It has been a century during which Jewish control of the mass media of news and entertainment has been used not just to consolidate Jewish political power and ownership of a vastly disproportionate share of America's wealth, but also to promote Jewish ideology, a Jewish vision of America. And when I say Jewish ideology and a Jewish vision of America, I don't mean the ideology and the vision that the Jews have among themselves; I mean the ideology and the vision that they want us to have in order to facilitate their hijacking of America.

Part of the ideology they have promoted among us, as I just mentioned, is egalitarianism. That is the notion that all human beings are born essentially equal in their capabilities, whether male or female, whether Black or White, whether from a family of achievers and creators or a family of chronic losers. Jews did not invent this notion and introduce it to America all by themselves in the 20th century, of course. It is a notion which has been around a long time among certain elements of our own people. The Jews took it away from the cranks and crackpots, exaggerated it a hundred-fold, and popularized it, mainstreamed it.

And throughout this century it has been the Jews who have been the foremost promoters of the doctrine that tells us that if Whites are more successful than Blacks, it is only because White racism has held the Blacks down. If more men are top corporate executives than women, it is only because of sexism. If one White person achieves more in his life than another, it is only because he was given advantages that the other did not receive. The egalitarian ideology also carries with it the notion that equality is not only a scientific fact but also a moral fact. If people are not equal then they ***should*** be. It is our moral obligation to try to make them equal. It is our moral obligation to fight against racism and sexism and homophobia and every other tendency to make people unequal or to consider them as different in some way. It is our moral obligation not to discriminate among people in any way: not to prefer women over men for certain roles in our society or men over women for other roles, or to prefer Whites over Blacks for neighbors or schoolmates, or to think of heterosexuals as being healthier or more wholesome in general than homosexuals.

That's part of the ideology the Jews have promoted among us. And another part is the ideology of individualism. That is the notion that each us is an island entire of itself and should think of himself as such. We should not think of ourselves or of others as members of a race or a sex or any other collectivity, but only as isolated individuals. When we see a Gypsy or a Black or a Jew, we mustn't think, "Oh, there's a Gypsy," or, "Oh, there's a Black," or, "Oh, there's a Jew." We're supposed to think, "Oh, there's an individual," and we're supposed to shut out of our minds everything that experience has taught us about the general nature of Gypsies or Blacks or Jews.

Individualism also carries with it the notion that each individual has a responsibility only to himself. A pregnant woman has no responsibility to the unborn child inside herself. A man has no responsibility to either his ancestors or to his posterity -- and certainly no responsibility to his race.

But ideology is only part of what the Jews have been promoting among us. They also promote feelings and emotions: the feeling of White racial guilt, for example, and White self-hatred. That is done on a huge scale and very skillfully, very successfully. It is especially effective with women, but also with men who are overly socialized, men who look to the crowd around them, rather than within themselves, for their opinions and attitudes. The entertainment media -- especially Hollywood and television -- do this indirectly, almost subliminally, in their screenwriting and in their casting of heroes and villains. They also do it quite directly in their contrived coverage of the news -- and I have given you some very cogent examples of that in recent programs.

The result is that it has become fashionable among the most highly socialized Whites to cheer the news that there soon will be a non-White majority in America. It has become fashionable to cheer for the Indians instead of the cowboys, just as it is fashionable to cheer for the Jews in any conflict with Gentiles, to cheer for the homosexuals in any conflict with heterosexuals, to cheer for non-Whites in any conflict with Whites. They have made Political Correctness fashionable.

And even those Whites who believe that they successfully have resisted becoming Politically Correct have for the most part been intimidated to such an extent by the atmosphere of coercive conformity generated by the media that they are terrified of breaking the most fundamental taboos: of saying or doing anything which may be thought racist or sexist or homophobic. They feel compelled to pay lip service to diversity and democracy and feminism and egalitarianism and individualism.

This is what the Jews have done with their control of America's mass media in this century -- mostly in the past 50 years. They have morally disarmed White Americans. They have disconnected us from our roots. They have alienated us from our own race, from our own heritage. They have made a substantial portion of us ashamed of our own race, consciously hostile to our own people, and they're working on the rest of us. That's what they've done with propaganda alone.

But they haven't left it at propaganda. They are intent on destroying us physically as well as morally. That's why we have the ruinous immigration policy we do, which is flooding America with non-Whites from the Third World. That's why they are behind feminism: why most of the

leaders of the feminist movement during this century have been Jewesses. That's why they're promoters of large-scale abortion, why so many abortionists are Jews. That's why they are virtually all in favor of gun control and of so-called "hate crime" laws. That's why so many of them have come out from behind the scenes in just the last decade and assumed formal posts of power in what used to be our government. And that's why they love Bill Clinton so much -- not because he can't control his zipper, but because he lets them control the government: our Treasury Department, our Defense Department, our State Department, our National Security Council, our relations with the United Nations; they control them all.

If the Jews are able to continue their programs of moral and physical destruction for another 50 years -- if we simply let them continue doing what they are doing now -- they will pretty well have finished their hijacking of America. There will be no single group in America with the numbers and the will to oppose them. The country will be simply a conglomeration of mutually hostile and disorganized minorities, controlled by the one truly organized minority. The Jews will control everything and own everything. And we will continue breeding ourselves into extinction, voting ourselves into extinction, hating ourselves into extinction.

That is how America is being hijacked.

What can we do about it? How can we stop the hijacking? You know, I've answered this question in a dozen different ways on earlier programs. Today I'll try to answer it in yet one more way. But first I'll take this opportunity to respond to two types of letters which I've been receiving from listeners.

There are some listeners who tell me that all is lost, that it's too late to stop the hijacking, that we should have started 50 years ago, that all we're doing now is talking, while the Jews continue consolidating their position. And occasionally one of these listeners will run out and do something premature and foolish, commit some act of desperation, because he is convinced that all ***is*** lost, and it doesn't matter what he does. These listeners believe that unless we are on the barricades actually shooting at the hijackers and their collaborators we aren't accomplishing anything.

And on the other hand there are listeners who tell me that they agree with everything I say, except my occasional hints that violence may lie in our future. They tell me I should never say anything which indicates that we will have to do anything other than vote our way out of our present predicament.

I will answer listeners in both of these groups in this way: We must not bind ourselves with the notion that there is only one tactic which can lead to success. We must not believe that violence is the only tactic which can accomplish anything. If we believe that, then certainly all will be lost. But we also must not believe that voting is the only path to success, because that belief also will lead us to failure and extinction.

We must understand that there are certain fixed principles which always must guide us, but that our tactics always must change to suit our present conditions and our present needs. We must be

bound only by our vision of our ultimate goal and by our principles, but never by an inflexible commitment to one tactic or another.

But you know, I promised to keep my comments today simple. So I'll not talk too much about ultimate goals. I'll just say that we want our country back. We want our world back. We want to live among our own kind and in accordance with our own ways, our own traditions. We want to stop the hijacking and begin repairing the damage caused by the hijackers. That's what we're aiming for.

And our most basic principle is that we will do whatever we must do in order to achieve this. Life is the most important thing for us: the life of our people. We will do what we must, sacrifice what we must, in order to safeguard and further that life, just as our ancestors did what they had to do to preserve and protect the life of our people, the life of our race.

And as for our tactics, let us remember that they are not based on principle, but only on intelligence, only on a careful calculation of what is needed at the moment. And at this moment talking is needed, much more talking, because that is our way of reaching out to others, of helping others to understand, of motivating others. If our talk were not important and also effective, our people's enemies would not be trying so hard to silence us.

Did you know that for every radio station now broadcasting this program, the Jews have succeeded in forcing the owners of ten other stations to cancel their contracts with us? The Jews apply pressure to a station's advertisers, they threaten the owner, sometimes they even organize demonstrations outside the station in order to intimidate the people who work at the station. In the last few weeks we have lost stations in Cleveland, in Houston, in St. Louis, in Austin, and in Monterey, California, as a result of these Jewish tactics. But we continue to find new stations, and the number of our listeners continues to grow.

Talking is needed when it is directed toward a purpose, when it is not just idle chatter with those who already understand but is directed toward those who need to understand. And I am doing more than talking. I am reaching out to people through other media besides radio. I am reaching out with the printed word and with music, and I will be reaching out through video and through every other medium. Outreach at this time is essential. Building understanding is essential. Building our numbers and our resources is essential. Organizing the people we reach -- or at least some of them -- also is essential.

The truth is that despite what the Jewish media would have you believe -- despite their television image of an America consisting of a mindless, multicultural mass of happy lemmings; despite Bill Clinton's popularity polls -- there are millions of serious and concerned Americans out there who are appalled at what the Jews are doing to their country, to their civilization, and to their race. There are millions of them who see the grinning, bloodthirsty predators behind the masks worn by our enemies, millions who are horrified that our nation's armed forces are in the hands of the Jewish gangsters in Washington: gangsters who are ready and willing to use their control over Bill Clinton to start a war whenever they think it suits their purpose, a war against Iraq or against Serbia or against anyone else who refuses to obey their orders and who stands in the way of their greedy, megalomaniac dream of total world domination. There are millions of people

who perhaps have been intimidated into silence at the moment, but who still have eyes to see and minds to understand and hearts to hate what is being done to us. And they will hate what is being done even more as the Jews proceed with their filthy business.

And so once again, how will we stop the hijacking of our world? We will do it by reaching out to the millions of our people who care about the future, who care about their race, who care about the sort of world their children and their grandchildren will inherit and who have not joined the degraded mass of lemmings who dance mindlessly to every tune played by the Jews and think only of conforming and consuming. We will reach out to them, we will help them to understand, we will try to help them find courage, and we will organize the best of them to reach out to others.

That's what we are doing now. And when conditions change, we will do whatever else is called for. And you can be -- you should be -- a part of what we're doing. If you understand, if you have a sense of responsibility and a sense of honor, then you must join forces with me.

The Value of Talk

If there is any good thing to come out of the Clinton gang's murderous expedition against the Serbs it is the stark demonstration it provides of the total corruption of the political system which governs America. I'm talking about the whole system, not just the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party proved what it is made of back during the impeachment and trial of Clinton. Its members kept their eyes on the polls and continued to support a leader they knew to be a liar and a rapist and had good reason to suspect of treason as well, in his dealings with China.

The Democrats traditionally have been the war party: Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson, Bill Clinton. Starting a war and killing a bunch of people in some other country seems to be the Democrats' favorite ploy for getting the voters' minds off of domestic problems -- or for paying off some of their behind-the-scenes supporters. Now we have the spectacle of Republican politicians trying to outdo the Democrats in warmongering, calling for an invasion and military occupation of Serbia by U.S. ground forces. It's almost as if they're afraid of being considered wimps by the voters if they're not even bloodthirstier than the Democrats in their statements about Serbia.

Actually, it's not the voters they're concerned about: it's the Jews. Pick up any publication by a Jewish organization -- the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; the American Jewish Committee; the Simon Wiesenthal Center; the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, which is an umbrella group including hundreds of other Jewish organizations; you name it -- and you'll see the Jews howling for Serb blood. You remember last week I reported to you that the American Legion, America's largest veterans' organization, had issued a resolution calling for an immediate halt to the war against Serbia and the removal of all U.S. military forces from the Balkans. Contrast that with a statement issued by the Jewish War Veterans of America. This all-Jewish group has taken a stand opposite to that of the American Legion and urged an intensification of the bombing.

Now, so far as I'm aware, Slobodan Milosevic has never said or done anything against the Jews. He just happens to be in their way. His country is in the way of their program for a New World Order. They've made it quite clear to every politician in Washington that they want Serbia gotten out of their way, and the politicians are scrambling to oblige, Republicans as well as Democrats. Arizona's Republican Senator John McCain is a good example of the type of Republican politician who's hot to kill as many Serbs as will please the Jews, and to do it in the name of the American people while patting himself on the back and pretending to be a "patriot." Senator McCain seems to believe that because he was a POW during the Vietnam war no one will question his motives. If Senator McCain says that we ought to kill as many Serbs as possible, then it must be because that will be good for America. Right?

Wrong. It's because whenever the Jews whisper in his ear, "Jump," Senator McCain whispers back, "How high?" All it would take now to make him a pacifist on Yugoslavia is for the Jews to decide that they really don't need to get rid of Milosevic after all. But that isn't likely. It's pretty clear that their long-range strategy is to cripple Serbia as a prelude to doing the same to anyone

else who gets in their way. Eventually, they want to put Russia in a position where it won't be able to resist their plans for that country.

You know, it's possible for patriots to disagree on policy matters. It's possible for one patriotic legislator to believe that more money ought to be spent on missiles and aircraft carriers, and for another to believe that the money ought to be spent on education, say, or on public health measures instead of on the military, and for both men to have America's best interests at heart. That's possible -- if you can find two patriotic legislators in the U.S. Congress these days. But no legislator who will let his country be led into a foolish and unnecessary war which does not serve America's interests is a patriot by any standard. No politician who will watch this happening without protest is a patriot.

But really, what can you expect in a country where the top politician will sell America's most sensitive military secrets to China for a sufficiently large cash donation to his reelection fund? With a President like that in the White House -- a President that the politicians are afraid to throw out because his polls are up -- we shouldn't be surprised to see America's armed forces being used to advance the private interests of a small minority at the expense of everyone else.

There is a saying to the effect that every country will have the government that its people deserve, and I guess that's as true of the United States as any other country. We can blame it on the controlled media, but the fact is that we have an electorate which thinks Bill Clinton is an OK guy. Sure, that's what the media bosses taught them, but anybody who can be made to believe that Bill Clinton shouldn't simply be dragged out of the White House and hanged has serious problems that can't be blamed only on the controlled media. These are the 400-pound housewives with plastic hair curlers that you see in the supermarkets with their slack-jawed, beer-bellied husbands stocking up on enough beer every Friday evening to get them through a whole weekend of TV ball games. And these are the air-headed twits who buy the celebrity tabloids at the checkout stands.

Fifty years ago, when only ten per cent of the White population were like that, we didn't worry about it. But when 20 per cent have become like that, and the Jews have organized them into a majority voting coalition with the non-Whites, we have a lethal problem. To state it in stark and simple terms, America will not survive: certainly not America as we have known it. About all we can realistically strive for now is the survival of some White Americans -- and much more important, for the survival of our race on this planet.

If we still had an electorate consisting of a White majority with normal intelligence, normal judgment, decent standards, and some sense of responsibility, we might hope that this White majority could elect some patriotic leadership which would strip the Jews of their media control and get the country back on a proper course. But that simply will not happen now. It is only self-delusion to plan on getting ourselves out of this mess through the electoral process, as long as the Jews retain control of our mass media, and the bulk of our electorate remains what it is. And the bulk of the electorate certainly will not improve of its own accord; it will only become more degraded with each passing year.

On the other hand, if responsible Americans controlled the media, we could work out a long-term plan for dealing with a degraded electorate, and meanwhile patriotic media could control the slobs as well as the Jewish media do now. But imagining that we can take television away from the Jews is as much self-delusion as imagining that we can elect leaders not under their control. The Jews fully understand the power of the media, and they certainly will not relinquish control voluntarily. Only a revolution can free the mass media from their death grip.

These are important conclusions, and I believe it's worth our time to restate them. We have two very fundamental problems in the United States: Jewish control of the mass media and a degenerate and irresponsible electorate which can be manipulated totally by the mass media. Both of these problems have crept up on us during this century, but they are real, and they are decisive. There is no easy way around them.

I've been warning about the danger of Jewish media control for 30 years. When I began my warnings we still had a majority White electorate, which may have left much to be desired, but at least it would not have tolerated the sort of shenanigans Bill Clinton has inflicted on us. The signal that the electorate had passed the point of no return came from Clinton's popularity polls during his impeachment and trial, when a majority of the voters told us that they still liked Clinton, even after his lies had been exposed, and they wanted him to remain as President. They liked his smile, and he felt their pain, and that's all that was really important.

So we will not vote our way out of our mess, and as long as we keep trying to, our situation will continue becoming worse. I know that there are many decent people who still are not ready to accept this conclusion. They will say, "Oh, yes, we know the situation is bad, but not all the politicians are crooks. Not every politician is in the Jews' pockets. Senator So-and-so is a good man, and Congressman Such-and-such actually has spoken out against Clinton's war. We will vote for Senator So-and-so and Congressman Such-and-such, and they will get us out of this mess."

Well, I'm sorry, but they won't. Voting won't do the job. Of course, you could say to me that talking won't do the job either. You could remind me that I've been talking for 30 years, and the situation has just continued to get worse. And you're right: talking won't get the job done either. But there's one difference between the effects of voting and talking. While you've been voting, the crop of politicians has been getting worse and worse. There may still be one or two who say some of the right things, but 30 years ago there were more of them. Thirty years ago the Senate would have convicted Clinton and removed him from office.

On the other hand, when I began talking 30 years ago almost no one was listening. My message was too radical for nearly everyone. My talking hasn't changed the government or the facts of Jewish media control or the declining quality of the U.S. population -- but at least, many more people are listening today than were listening 30 years ago. Thirty years ago I wasn't on the radio. Thirty years ago I didn't have a worldwide audience on the Internet. And today, although the essence of my message hasn't changed, it no longer seems too radical to a lot of people. Today many more people are listening, and many more people are agreeing. And although my talking alone won't get the job done, talking is one essential part of what's needed to get the job done.

Another essential part, unfortunately, is the sort of thing the Jews are doing to the Serbs now. I can talk until I'm blue in the face about the Jews' plans for a New World Order and the dangers of Jewish media control and the corruption of our political system, and hundreds of thousands of people can listen and agree with me, and it's still just talk. Even to the people who understand and believe what I'm telling them, it's not quite real. But every time Madeleine Albright shoots up another passenger train in Serbia and kills 30 or 40 women and children -- every time she drops another load of cluster bombs on a hospital in Kosovo, while the politicians keep sitting on their hands, afraid to say anything because the Jews are still beating the war drums -- the reality of what I have been saying is brought home.

Every time General Wesley Kanne Clark, NATO's Jewish military commander, bombs another village and slaughters another 100 or so civilians, then tries to lie his way out of it and blame it on Slobodan Milosevic, people remember my predictions of this war more than two years ago, at the time Madeleine Albright became secretary of state; they remember what I have been telling them about Jewish war plans and the lies of the Jewish media and the corruption of the politicians in Washington. My words may not have seemed quite real at first, but the blood and the bombs and the torn bodies of our White brothers and sisters in Serbia seem real enough, and these things lend reality and cogency to my words.

And as I said, it's unfortunate that it has to be that way, but an element of human nature seems to be that people's understanding doesn't become fully engaged -- people won't take action on their understanding -- until they actually begin feeling the pain and realize that disaster is upon them: not around the corner or down the road, but on top of them. The things that I was warning about all during the 1970s -- non-White immigration, changing demographics, declining school standards, racial trends -- have hit enough people over the head now and drawn blood, have caused real pain, so that their understanding finally is becoming fully engaged. And what is happening in Yugoslavia now also ought to be causing a little pain among Americans who understand the things I've been talking about for so long. It ought to be causing a lot of Americans real distress to know that what is being inflicted on the Serbs is being done in our name. Jews like General Clark and Madeleine Albright are butchering our people and making self-righteous statements about it, but in the eyes of the world it is all of America which is being blamed and all of America which eventually will pay the penalty for the butchery.

If you think about it for a minute, I believe that you'll agree with me that my talking has left us a lot better off in this situation than would be the case if I hadn't been talking. The disaster would still be upon us, but there would be a lot less understanding than there is. People still haven't acted on any significant scale as a result of my warnings, but at least there is much more understanding, and that understanding provides the necessary basis for effective action in the future. It provides a direction for us, so that when we do act we will act correctly and effectively.

Some of you may remember another prediction I made, at the time the Jews launched their war against Serbia two months ago. I predicted that this war would turn out to be a big mistake for them. Specifically, in the March issue of the membership bulletin of the National Alliance, I wrote:

". . . [T]he Jews and the Clintonistas . . . misjudged badly both the character of the Serbs and the reaction of the rest of the world. At the very least they will emerge from this foolish and bloody adventure with a drastic loss of prestige and credibility."

And in my radio broadcast two weeks ago I again suggested that the Jews' enthusiasm for the New World Order had caused them to act prematurely in launching their latest war. Old-fashioned American patriotism of the sort Bill Clinton and Jane Fonda were so contemptuous of when they were marching for Ho Chi Minh during the Vietnam war may be almost dead, but it's not yet completely dead, and it may still bite the Jews as a result of their latest murder spree.

More than that, our new patriotism, based on race instead of on geography or language or religion, is gaining ground. What is happening in Yugoslavia now gives our new patriotism a powerful boost. I've been talking for years about the need to broaden our sense of patriotism to include all of our brothers and sisters in Europe, and when the Jews actually kill our people some of what I've been saying begins to take hold. Again, the importance of my talking is that it permits more people to understand these things when they happen than otherwise would be the case.

The Jews thought that this business of bombing Serbia into line with their plans would be an easy and successful enterprise for them. They thought they had all the angles covered. After the sheeplike behavior of the Congress during the trial of Clinton they figured they wouldn't have any opposition from the politicians. They already had gotten Clinton to promote one of their own creatures, General Wesley Kanne Clark, ahead of the other generals and put him in charge of NATO. They already had gotten their own creatures in as secretary of state and national security adviser and secretary of defense. They already had been using their mass media for the past couple of years to demonize the Serbs and prejudice the American people against them in their news reporting on the conflict in Bosnia.

Well, they figured correctly that the politicians wouldn't oppose them, but it's clear that they were hoping for more support from the yahoos than they're getting now. They figured they could bomb Belgrade into rubble, and the yahoos wouldn't notice, as long as it didn't interfere with their ball games. They figured they could drop cluster bombs on Serb hospitals and shoot up Serb passenger trains, and the American voters wouldn't care. After all, it's not Jews being killed, so what difference does it make? Isn't that the lesson we were supposed to learn from 50 years of "Holocaust" propaganda?

Well, Hymie, one of these days you'll find out what difference it makes. You and Abe will be surprised when you find out how many of us haven't been spending all our time watching ball games. I'm sure you're already complaining among yourselves about how many Americans aren't supporting your effort to destroy Serbia. I'm sure that among yourselves you're attributing this lack of support to "anti-Semitism." Well, let me tell you, Abe and Hymie and Madeleine and Wesley, mixed in with the anti-Semitism there's also a little bit of understanding of what you're up to. Before you've finished in Serbia there'll be even more understanding. I intend to do everything I can to increase that understanding.

As for us, let us remember that the Jews will continue doing the sorts of things they always have done. They will continue pushing and pushing and pushing. They will continue their efforts to destroy our world, to remake our world in their image and to control it. And they will continue making mistakes, and the understanding among our people must continue growing. I will continue to talk, and the Jews will continue to provide the pain which makes my talk real and effective. Talk and pain together lead to understanding. When the Jews make a mistake like they did in starting this war against Serbia, our people must understand what is happening and why. They must not be confused. They must be enraged, and their rage must have a direction. And then, one day soon, there will be meaningful action, cleansing action. That's the value of talk.

Fooling the People

One of President Abe Lincoln's most memorable statements about the government of the United States was to the effect that it is able to fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but that it can't hope to fool all of the people all of the time. He made this statement as an argument for honesty in government: since the government can't fool all of the people all of the time, it is bound to lose its credibility if it tries.

Well, that was about 140 years ago, and things really were quite different in the United States at that time. For one thing, there was no television. For another thing, there were virtually no Jews. Even without Jews we had plenty of liars, of course: plenty of men who aspired to fool as many people as they could for as long as necessary. These men who aspired to deceive others tended to go into the business of selling used horses or into the ministry or journalism or the practice of law or to run for public office, but for the most part Lincoln's observation about the pitfalls of trying to fool all the people all the time held true, and the amount of damage done by these deceptive men remained within reasonable bounds.

As I said, that was 140 years ago, and things have changed in America. One of the most depressing aspects of the situation in America today is the extent to which the government and the controlled media, collaborating with one another, are able to deceive most of the people all the time. In fact, if Lincoln were making his observation about deceiving people today, it would sound something like this: "The government can't fool all of the people all the time, but in a democracy that's not necessary. In a democracy all the government has to do is fool most of the people most of the time, and if the controlled media and the government are working together that's easy." Since Bill Clinton became President, the government and the mass media have been collaborating to an unprecedented degree.

In past programs I've given you a number of examples of this government and media deceit, especially with regard to race. Actually, where the media are concerned, the deceit works at two levels. First there is the false portrayal of reality and the pushing of certain destructive ideas by the entertainment media.

Consider the casting in films, for example, of heroes and villains. The Jews who own Hollywood and the television industry have some very strong notions about what a villain should look like. He definitely should be blond. Blue or gray or green eyes are a definite plus. The more he fits the "Aryan ideal" the Germans were fond of 60 years ago, the better. And come to think of it, it will be good if he also has just a trace of a German accent -- or if a German accent doesn't fit the story, a Southern accent will do. Think about all of the films you've seen with villains who fit that casting model. Amazing, isn't it?

And as for heroes, the Jews in Hollywood have never met a Black film character they didn't admire. Compare the number of Black directors of the Central Intelligence Agency, Black generals, Black Presidents of the United States, Black rocket scientists or Black brain surgeons or brilliant Black computer hackers you've seen in Hollywood films with the number you've seen

in real life. Is there a discrepancy there? Then obviously it's because our racist society has held Blacks back. At least, that's what the Jews would like the viewers of their films to believe.

By chance I happened to view a film last night called *Kiss the Girls:* a very forgettable, very unexceptional 1997 film produced by Paramount, which is owned by Sumner Redstone's Viacom Corporation. The screenplay, written by David Klass, is about serial killers and sexual deviants who kidnap girls and keep them locked up in their basements. Although there are several weirdoes in the film, the principal weirdo -- the one who kidnaps the heroine and keeps her locked in his basement with several other women -- is a blond.

The hero is a Black detective who also has a doctorate in psychology and has published widely read research papers in psychology. He also just happens to be an expert in pharmacology, who is able to recognize certain obscure drug effects which trained White doctors can't. When he introduces himself to one White female doctor, her immediate response is, "Yes, I've read your work." This Black savant detective thinks circles around all of the White cops in the film, of course, most of whom have a sort of Southern cracker attitude. And of course, the White heroine in the film -- a real feminist, naturally -- just can't keep her hands off the Black hero. As I said, this is a very forgettable, very unremarkable film -- but it is typical of thousands of others with the same distortion of racial reality. And really, this sort of racial casting is deliberate. It is carefully planned. It is intended to implant certain ideas in the subconscious minds of White viewers. It is intended to change their self-image and their opinion of Blacks and their attitudes toward racial mixing and interracial sex. Jews Sumner Redstone and David Klass know exactly what they're doing. And they fool most of their viewers most of the time.

But the deception doesn't stop with entertainment. It extends to the news. On earlier programs I've discussed the way in which the news media deliberately misrepresent interracial crime. I devoted a program to a detailed examination of the way the news media deliberately emphasized and exaggerated the egregiousness of the killing of a Black ex-convict in Jasper, Texas, who was dragged behind a pickup truck by three White ex-convicts. I pointed out that the news media carefully avoided mentioning the fact that the Black victim was a convicted criminal who had spent time in prison. I pointed out that the White man who was being tried, John King, had acquired his intense hatred of Blacks when he was himself imprisoned with Blacks and exposed to sexual attacks by them. The news media portrayed the Black victim as a choir boy, and they implied that John King was born with his completely baseless hatred of Blacks because that's just the way Southern, rural Whites are. White racism is sort of an "original sin" that we all must do penance for.

Most of all in that program I contrasted the enormous news coverage given to the trial of John King for the Jasper killing, making it the number-one national news story for weeks, with a trial taking place at exactly the same time in a Denver courtroom. In Denver a mestizo was being tried for his part in the abduction, brutal gang rape, unspeakable sexual torture, and murder of a 14-year-old White girl, Brandy Duvall, by members of a mestizo gang, the Bloods, and it was totally blacked out; it was not mentioned even once in the national news.

In another program I contrasted the news coverage of the shooting of a convicted Black drug dealer and his girl friend by a White soldier, James Burmeister, in Fayetteville, North Carolina,

in December 1995, with the gang-initiation murder last August of two pretty, young White women, Tracy Lambert and Susan Moore, in Fayetteville by members of the Black-and-mestizo Crips gang. The shooting of the Black drug dealer and his girl friend was spotlighted and given national news coverage for weeks, while the gang-initiation murder of the two White girls was totally blacked out.

Please note the two distinct ways in which the public is fooled by this deceptive coverage. In the first way there is the emphasis on news which fits the propaganda themes of the Jewish media bosses, and the blackout or at least de-emphasis of news which doesn't fit. For the news which fits, they trot out the politicians and the Christian ministers and put them in front of the television cameras to lecture us on the evils of White racism and the need to silence the "haters" like me and to enact new "hate crime" legislation. And you never hear the news which doesn't fit, such as the murder of Brandy Duvall or Tracy Lambert or Susan Moore.

The second way in which they fool the public is to distort the news they do report: for example, not mentioning that one of the Blacks shot by James Burmeister in Fayetteville was a drug dealer just out of prison on a drug conviction, and not mentioning that the Black, James Bird, dragged behind a truck in Jasper last summer was also an ex-convict. They want to present the slain Blacks to the public as paragons of virtue -- bright and useful citizens whose lives were brutally snuffed out by hateful, racist Whites.

They're doing the same sort of distortion of the news to make it fit in the case of the recent school shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. Perhaps you remember that when I first spoke about the Colorado shootings a little over a month ago I pointed out that the media deliberately were trying to create the impression in the minds of the public that the two boys who did the shooting were "racists" deliberately targeting Blacks and that they were "neo-Nazis" who spoke German to each other and chose Adolf Hitler's birthday for the shooting.

I reported that the day after the shooting, newscaster Tom Brokaw interviewed for the *NBC Nightly News* exactly one parent of the 13 slain students, and that was the father of the one Black who was shot. Brokaw didn't tell us that only one Black was shot, of course, but he spoke only of this one Black victim. He spoke of none of the 12 White victims. He deliberately prolonged the false impression that most of the victims were Black. He and other media spokesmen also continued to hint that the boys were "neo-Nazis," even though they knew that one of the boys, Dylan Klebold, was a Jew. They didn't say anything about Klebold's Jewishness to the public, of course.

Once the media bosses had planted the idea in the minds of the public that the two killers were "racists" and "neo-Nazis," the subsequent revelation that all except one of the victims were White didn't change this impression. Preachers and politicians were still giving us tearful little sermons about "ending the hate" in connection with what happened at Columbine High School. Guilt-stricken White women were still becoming hysterical for the television cameras and babbling about how "hate" and "racism" were responsible. Jewish organizations such as the ADL used the confusion as an opportunity to push for their pet project, which is censoring the Internet to halt the propagation of what they define as "hate."

Well, one bit of news which Tom Brokaw and the other network spokesmen forgot to mention was what the Columbine killers talked about on the Internet. One would think that it would be wonderful grist for the Jewish media mill, showing the public the "racist" ravings on the Internet of the two "neo-Nazi" killers. But Brokaw and the others were silent on the subject. A little digging, however -- actually, just scanning the *New York Times* web site -- was enough to turn up the following material from Eric Harris's web site. "You know what I hate?," Harris wrote, "Racism! . . . Don't let me catch you making fun of someone just because they are a different color." Harris also wrote that people who don't like, "blacks, Asians, Mexicans or people from any other country or race besides white-American" should "have their arms ripped off" and be burned. All the indications are that the killers, far from being the Politically Incorrect independent thinkers the Jewish media would have us believe they were, actually were strict conformists to the Jewish party line on racial matters.

Despite this reality, of a Jewish killer and a partner who raved on the Internet about wanting to "rip the arms off" racists, the Jewish media bosses were able to use the Columbine High School tragedy to fool a substantial part of the public into believing that the two killers were White racists and "neo-Nazis." They were able to fool the public because they already had fooled the public so often in the past that they had the public conditioned to accept anything which fit the notion that White racists and "neo-Nazis" are dangerous and are likely to kill their neighbors, and that when someone does kill his neighbors, the chances are that he is a White racist or a "neo-Nazi." That's why we need more laws to keep guns out of the hands of White racists and to keep "neo-Nazis" off the Internet.

One can imagine the Jews in the Anti-Defamation League rubbing their hands and laughing among themselves at how easy it has been to fool most of the people in this matter. And they're still busy keeping the people fooled about the Colorado shootings. Dozens of Jewish publications still are commenting about these shootings, and every one of them is deliberately deceptive. An example that I have in front of me now is the May 24 issue of *The Jerusalem Report*, which attempts to use the shootings to build public support for censoring the Internet. Without ever mentioning Klebold's Jewishness or the Politically Correct tone of Harris's anti-racist web site, *The Jerusalem Report* refers to "the racist and Nazi undertones" of the shootings, and suggests that they may have been inspired by "extremist" Internet sites such as that of my organization, the National Alliance. That sort of breathtakingly brazen lying is what the Jews proudly call "chutzpah."

If one reads more of the ravings on Eric Harris's web site, it becomes clear that he had a badly impaired grip on reality. He apparently had watched so much television that he really couldn't distinguish between normal social behavior in the real world and the sort of sociopathic behavior portrayed by the Jews on television in thousands of films. Harris babbles on narcissistically about killing anybody who won't let him do whatever he likes:

"My belief is that if I say something, it goes. I am the law. If you don't like it you die. If I don't like you or I don't like what you want me to do, you die."

Another area where most of the American people have been fooled deliberately and massively by the media is the nature and character of Bill Clinton. I think that I already have made my opinion

of the man clear in earlier broadcasts, but my opinion doesn't jibe with the image of Clinton presented to the public by the Jewish media. Recently, however, a ray of light was cast on the subject by the publication of the book *All Too Human* by George Stephanopoulos, a former senior White House adviser and one of Clinton's closest personal confidants.

Stephanopoulos himself is a pretty sick puppy, not unlike the other liberal nutcases Clinton is surrounded by in the White House, but Clinton's behavior during the Monica Lewinsky scandal was too much even for Stephanopoulos, and he quit. Now he's written a book about what Clinton is really like at a personal level, and it makes interesting reading. In fact, Clinton, as described by Stephanopoulos, sounds a lot like Columbine High School killer Eric Harris. One of my favorite Clinton quotes from *All Too Human* is: "I believe in killing people who try to hurt you." There are many more of the sayings of Chairman Bill in the book, but that one really sums it up.

And since Stephanopoulos spilled the beans, other present and former "insiders" and "friends of Bill" are coming out of the closet. One of them, newspaper reporter Walter Erricson, is now retired, but he used to cover Clinton when the latter was the governor of Arkansas. He says:

"Only an idiot would buy the public persona of Bill Clinton. He is an incredibly profane individual. He is now and always has been an angry man, who wants to inflict as much pain as possible on his enemies."

"Only an idiot . . . ": well, I guess that includes a great many Americans. When the Jews realized, many years ago, that Bill Clinton could become a useful tool for them, they decided to fool the American people as to what sort of man he is, and they have succeeded in keeping most of them fooled most of the time. Clinton, of course, has made this deception easy for them, because he himself is an extraordinarily skillful liar and actor. He is very manipulative, and he is very careful to put on his false face whenever he is on camera.

The American public saw only a few brief glimpses of his real personality when he gave a video-recorded deposition to Ken Starr's prosecution team last year, but those who know him personally have seen everything. They all report that Clinton habitually curses like a sailor, has temper tantrums when he doesn't get his way, and raves about wanting to kill people. One White House staffer reports that during the impeachment investigation by Ken Starr Clinton demanded at a White House staff meeting that the IRS should audit everyone on Starr's team. Several staff members told Clinton that wasn't a good idea. Clinton became enraged. The staff member reports, "He slammed his fist down on the table and said:

'I can do any goddamned thing I want. I'm President of the United States. I take care of my friends, and I fuck with my enemies. That's the way it is. Anybody who doesn't like it can take a hike.'"

Pardon my language, but I wanted to give you an exact quote.

The principal difference between Bill Clinton and Eric Harris, it seems, is that Harris only had a shotgun, while Clinton has cruise missiles and cluster bombs -- which brings us to another area where the Jewish media have been successful in keeping most of the American people fooled,

and that's Mr. Clinton's murderous war against the Serbs. The media have lied about every aspect of the war: about the reasons for beginning the war, about what the Serbs were doing to the Albanians and why, about the American conduct of the bombing campaign, about the effects of the war on the Serb people, and just about everything else. And again they have succeeded in fooling most of the people.

The facts about the war are leaking out, but they're not getting to most of the people. Most of the people don't get any national or international news which doesn't come from a network television program, and that means that the Jews are able to keep most of them fooled all the time. In a democracy that's more than good enough. I want to share with you some of these facts about the war against Serbia which are not getting to most of the American people, but I'll have to postpone that until next week. Why don't you get a few friends who are interested in learning what's really going on in this war to listen with you. I'll try to make it interesting for them.

State-Sponsored Terrorism

The people who are trying so desperately to destroy Serbia now are a pretty weird bunch. The latest tactic they've come up with is to have computer hackers and cryptography experts in the "dirty tricks" division of our Central Intelligence Agency break into the computers of various banks around the world where Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic is rumored to have his personal bank accounts, so that they can steal his money from him. It makes me think that the word "Intelligence" needs to be removed from the name of the agency.

I mean, what a dumb stunt! But it's about what one would expect of these Viet Cong enthusiasts left over from the 1960s who are trying to be movers and shakers on the world scene today by bullying little countries into doing what they say. Milosevic won't take orders from Tony Blair and Bill Clinton and the rest of these aging adolescents who haven't a clue about the effective use of real power, so they will punish him by stealing his personal bank accounts. There must have been a lot of giggling going on among them when they came up with this scheme.

You know, I really hope they go ahead with this idiotic plan to hack into the bank computers and steal Milosevic's savings, and I hope the plan is successful. It's not that I wish Milosevic ill, but such a stunt will go a long way toward sawing off the branch all these birds are sitting on. It will do wonders for people's confidence in the security of banks and will push this whole, rotten structure just a little closer to the brink.

They also arranged to have Milosevic indicted as a war criminal and have an international warrant issued for his arrest. That doesn't do much to persuade Milosevic to surrender to NATO, but it does set an interesting precedent. I like it on both grounds. I was becoming a little worried that Milosevic would make some sort of compromise settlement with NATO; now he has another strong reason not to. And I look forward to the day when a bunch of real war criminals, including one at 10 Downing Street and another at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, can be put on public trial, convicted, and hanged, along with all of their willing accomplices in the government and the media. The criminals themselves are in charge of the International War Crimes Tribunal at the moment, but fortunes change, and it's good to have this precedent. I mean, compare what Milosevic is alleged to have done -- killing 340 Albanians, according to the indictment -- compare that with what the Clinton gang clearly has done. What could be more criminal than engaging in the systematic bombing of another country which has not in any way harmed or threatened us; a systematic bombing intended to destroy the country's infrastructure and which already has killed more than 2,000 civilians? Ted Kaczynski and Jack the Ripper were pikers compared to Bill Clinton and Tony Blair.

Milosevic undoubtedly has treated the Albanians roughly, but let us remember that there was a large, well-armed terrorist army of Albanians -- the KLA -- operating in Serbia's Kosovo province. Milosevic crushed them last year, and his police dealt harshly with Albanians they suspected of aiding the terrorists. But that was nothing compared to what is happening now. When Madeleine Albright began dropping her bombs on Kosovo in March of this year, real suffering was inflicted on the Albanians. Virtually all of the Albanian refugees who have fled Kosovo or who still are in Kosovo became refugees after the bombing started.

Many of them are fleeing the bombs, and for good reason: about as many Albanians as Serbs have been killed in Kosovo by Madeleine's bombs, rockets, and missiles. Whether a bomb lands on your village by accident or on purpose, the consequences are the same for you, and so the villagers head for the border to get away from the bombing. And some of the Albanians are fleeing the stepped up anti-terrorist efforts of Milosevic's police. These efforts have been stepped up because of the bombing, not despite it. One may tolerate a certain degree of disaffection in time of peace, but in time of war one cannot afford to be so tolerant. The Serbs are cracking down on Albanians inside Serbia now for exactly the same reason Americans cracked down on Japanese inside the United States after Pearl Harbor. I am sure that this crackdown on the Albanians is rough and in some cases atrocious, but the Serbs are fighting for the preservation of their country and their people. Most Americans cannot even imagine what that is like because they never have experienced it -- yet. They just sit on their couches and watch the war on TV, then switch channels to the ball game. The Serbs have to worry about being killed at any second, and so they sometimes act in a way that may seem rough or intolerant to American couch potatoes.

Clinton and his Jews, of course, are blaming the suffering of both the Serbs and the Albanian refugees entirely on Milosevic. Their reasoning is that if Milosevic would just surrender to NATO, then the bombing could stop, and no more people would be killed or injured. "As long as you refuse to surrender, then you have only yourself to blame for the bombing." That's like blaming a robbery victim who is shot during a holdup: "If you had just given him your wallet like he demanded, then he wouldn't have shot you. You have only yourself to blame, because you resisted." I guess a lot of Americans see nothing wrong with that sort of reasoning. We've really been feminized. American men have been conditioned to think and react like women.

But even Americans should be able to understand that stealing the money from Milosevic's personal bank accounts and then issuing an international warrant for his arrest so that he can be tried as a war criminal doesn't make sense in the context of the stated war aims of the Clinton gang, which is to force Milosevic to sign the agreement they have prepared. If Milosevic has a few million dollars stashed in a foreign bank account and can retire to a life of ease somewhere, and if he really is just a typical politician like those in Washington, with no real patriotism in him, then he might be persuaded to surrender and let the Clinton gang have its way with his country. But with no money and nowhere to go where he and his family can be safe, he'll fight to the bitter end, patriot or not. Wouldn't you? So either these thugs in the Clinton government are really stupid, or they've been lying to us all along about their intentions in Yugoslavia, just like everything else.

Well, I promised you last week that I'd tell you about some of the lies the government and the media have been using to fool us about the war, and this question of just why the Clinton gang started the war is a good place to begin. The Clinton gang all tell us that their reason for starting an unprovoked war against Yugoslavia was to protect the Albanian ethnic minority in the country from the Serb majority. The war is strictly a humanitarian effort to keep Albanians from being brutalized and massacred by the Serbs. Madeleine Albright figured that the best way to show our humanitarian concern for the Albanian minority was to drop cluster bombs on Serb hospitals and schools and use F-16s to shoot up Serb passenger trains.

Now, let me tell you, these people do some dumb things, but they really aren't quite as stupid as this lamebrain excuse for starting a war would indicate. Madeleine Albright is no "humanitarian," I'll guarantee you. Just look at that cold, cruel, predatory, Jewish face on her.

In the Clinton gang, of course, the abolition of national sovereignty everywhere, establishing the supremacy of the New World Order, and making sure that there is a proper "racial balance" in every country -- a proper amount of ethnic and racial "diversity" -- are cocktail party clichés. The twittering Gentile air-heads in the gang are as enthusiastic for these goals as are the Jewish heavyweights who have been writing the script. But forcing the Serbs to be good multiculturalists is not really the ultimate reason for the current bombing of Serb schools and hospitals. In the long run the New World Order enthusiasts plan to "multiculturalize" everyone -- except themselves, of course. But multiculturalism is really only a means to an end, and that end is world domination, world ownership. The principal threat to that goal is nationalism. Multiculturalism is their antidote against nationalism.

And Serbia makes a good choice for their first victim for several reasons. For one thing the Serbs are strongly nationalistic; they are a nut that sooner or later would have to be cracked. For another they are in a part of the world that the New World Order gang are interested in for other reasons, a principal one of which is Russia. When the Soviet Union self-destructed at the beginning of this decade, the New World Order gang saw an opportunity not for peace, stability, and coexistence, but for aggressive expansion into the power vacuum left by the defunct Soviet Union. They've been working hard in recent years to cement relationships with a number of former Soviet republics, to integrate them into the New World Order in a preliminary way. In recent months NATO and U.S. delegations have been to Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan -- all formerly parts of the Soviet Union -- promising them aid and encouraging them to distance themselves from Russia politically, economically, and militarily.

The governments of Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan already have formed an alliance with three other former Soviet republics -- Georgia, Ukraine, and Moldavia -- all of whom also are being pulled into a NATO orbit. Only Romania separates Moldavia from Serbia. The Serbs certainly are more pro-Russian than any other country in the region. In the conflict between Muslim Albanians and Christian Serbs, the New World Order gang certainly have taken into consideration the fact that the three former Soviet republics they have been wooing most intensely during the past year -- Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, and Turkmenistan -- are all Muslim. In addition, the latter are the key to acquiring control over the enormously rich Caspian petroleum resources. Why not cripple Serbia now, take her mineral-rich Kosovo province away from her, and acquire the image of a friend and protector of Muslims? I doubt that that will impress Osama bin Laden and other Muslims who have a major grievance against America, but it might help a bit with the Azerbaijanis.

There's more than oil and other minerals involved here. Russia is still big enough and well armed enough to defend itself. As in Serbia, there's much nationalist sentiment in Russia, and the New World Order gang are quite concerned about what may happen if Russia ever acquires patriotic leadership. They have tried hard to prevent that. They worked hard behind the scenes to get Boris Yeltsin elected, and they have propped him up with loans and promises. Yeltsin is a front man for the Jewish billionaires and mafia bosses who are bleeding Russia dry. But there are genuine nationalists among the Russian leaders who may replace Yeltsin, and there is a great deal of

public hostility to the Jewish despoilers of Russia. With a strong nationalist leader enjoying popular support, it is entirely possible there could be a crackdown which would leave Jewish plutocrats and mafia bosses alike swinging from lampposts all over Moscow and Saint Petersburg. A rebuilt Russia under nationalist leadership could derail the entire New World Order.

This is a good time to deal with one other deception about this war. That is the effort to persuade people -- including the American public and the Serbs -- that this isn't a Jewish war. Go to just about any antiwar demonstration in the United States today, and among the speakers there will be a Jew on the platform who will proclaim the friendship of the Jews for the Serbs. "You were on our side against Hitler during the Second World War," the Jewish speaker will announce, "and we never will forget that. Now we are on your side." And the foolish Serbs will clap and cheer. Perhaps they forget that it was the Americans who really pulled the Jews' chestnuts out of the fire in the Second World War. Do the Serbs see any evidence of gratitude for that in what the Jews have done to America in the last 50 years?

And I also have had listeners to my broadcasts write to me that they have found several Jewish groups on the Internet or have heard Jewish callers to talk radio programs saying that Jews support the Serbs and are against the NATO bombing. And in response to that I will tell you that this business of confusing and disarming the opposition by pretending to be on both sides of an issue is one of the oldest tricks in the Jews' book.

Consider the effort to take guns away from Americans. Jews are overwhelmingly in favor of just about every gun control move that has come along. The Jewish media are hysterically opposed to the private ownership of firearms by American citizens. Furthermore, most of the leaders of the gun control effort in the Congress are and have been Jews. At this time the noisiest and pushiest of these is New York's Senator Charles Schumer.

This doesn't mean, of course, that there aren't plenty of feminized, feather-brained Gentiles who believe we'd all be better off if we had no means to defend ourselves. And, with six million Jews living in the United States, I am sure that there are a few individual Jews among them who do not favor gun control. But the fact remains that the Jew-controlled mass media and Jewish legislators and powerful Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith are the primary moving force behind the effort to abolish the Second Amendment, and knowledgeable patriots always have recognized this fact.

So a few years ago a handful of Jews set up an organization called Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, and their principal activity has been to proclaim loudly that gun control is not a Jewish but a "Nazi" scheme. They run around the country announcing, "We're Jews, and we're against gun control." They also buy advertisements in gun magazines which assert that Hitler's first move after he became chancellor of Germany was to round up all privately owned firearms, so that the German people could not rebel.

That is the opposite of the truth. Actually, Hitler's government abolished many restrictions on buying and carrying firearms which had been established by the preceding, liberal government. The Nazis believed in self-defense and encouraged firearms ownership and proficiency among

German civilians. Hitler was the most popular leader the Germans have had in this century, and he was not afraid of his fellow citizens. He rode slowly through crowds of cheering Germans in an open car. No bulletproof glass, no police screening of the people who were allowed to shake his hand, no metal detectors. Quite a difference from Bill Clinton!

When I first encountered the lies of Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, I went to the trouble of digging up the original German law digests from the 1920s and 1930s which contained the exact texts of the German firearms laws, published at the time the laws were enacted, and I translated them into English and published my English translations along with photo-facsimile copies of the original German laws. And yet the Jews have succeeded in confusing many patriots -- an all too easy task, unfortunately -- and convincing them that Hitler was the father of all gun-grabbers, that Jews in America are divided on the issue of gun control, and that people who propose new gun control laws are likely to be admirers of Hitler.

The Jews who confuse the issue of the war against Serbia by claiming to be on the side of the Serbs today are like the Jews who confuse the issue of gun control by claiming to be against it. The fact is that every major Jewish organization in the United States has publicly declared its support for the war against Serbia. In fact, they were behind this war even before it started. Anyway, I have in front of me dozens of press releases, news interviews, and advertisements in the *New York Times* by Jewish organizations supporting the war. On March 29 -- that's five days after the bombing started -- B'nai B'rith International put out a press release headed "B'nai B'rith Supports U.S.-NATO Action in Yugoslavia." B'nai B'rith, which is the parent organization of the Anti-Defamation League, claims branches in 57 countries and bills itself as the world's largest Jewish organization. On April 3 a reporter for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency interviewed a number of prominent Jewish leaders and summed it up with the statement:

The organized Jewish community has . . . declared unwavering support for U.S. intervention in Kosovo.

And what the organized Jewish community is supporting now is nothing less than state-sponsored terrorism and genocide against Serbs for the purpose of advancing Jewish schemes for a New World Order. The Jew-serving politicians in Washington and in NATO are talking now about re-arming the KLA and sending that gang of drug smugglers, cutthroats, and professional terrorists into Kosovo against the Serbs ahead of NATO troops, sort of a human shield.

Do you know what terrorism is? Jadranka Djordjevic, a 64-year-old Serb woman who lives in Belgrade, does. She worked in the U.S. Embassy there for 30 years. She's dodging missiles and bombs now and worrying about how to stay alive. When a newspaper reporter told her recently that Hillary Clinton had said that the flight of the Albanian refugees from Kosovo reminded her of "Holocaust" scenes in the Steven Spielberg film *Schindler's List*, Ms. Djordjevic replied, "People who learn history from Spielberg movies should not tell us how to live our lives." When told that one of the aims of the NATO bombing is to demoralize the Serbs and make them rise against the government of Slobodan Milosevic, she noted that that exactly fits the internationally recognized definition of terrorism: violence against a civilian population intended to destabilize a government. She said that the people responsible for the terror-bombing campaign against Serbia

should be put on trial by the International Court of Justice. "You cannot terrorize civilians in this way," she said. "We are talking about millions of people who are deprived of basic necessities."

Well, Jadranka Djordjevic, you are wrong. You can terrorize millions of people, if B'nai B'rith and all of the other New World Order boosters are behind you.

How They Rule

You know, it's a frustrating and infuriating thing watching Clinton and his crew of nation-wreckers gloating over their successful bullying of Serbia. Madeleine has been screeching and squawking like the Wicked Witch of the West, and Bill has been wagging his finger at the Serbs, looking serious, and telling them that they will not get a cent to help them repair the damage done by NATO until they get rid of Slobodan Milosevic and choose an "approved" president.

You know, I was pretty disappointed in Milosevic for caving in to the NATO gangsters, and I was about to write him off. I mean, what can you expect from a former communist? But if Clinton and his Jews hate Milosevic so much, then maybe there's something good about him after all. I remember how the Clinton gang a few years ago was applying pressure to Russia in every way it could to get Boris Yeltsin elected and then reelected. The message was essentially, "No loans from the West unless Boris is your president."

I've said this before, but it's a pretty good rule to remember, a rule which has been confirmed over and over again by events: If the Jews hate someone, then he can't be all bad, and anyone they praise in public needs to be shot as quickly as possible.

Anyway, it's pretty much out in the open now how the New World Order gang intend to get control of things: they wreck a country with bombs and missiles -- or they simply steal its wealth without using bombs and missiles; then when the country's people are sufficiently miserable and desperate, they hold out the offer of money for rebuilding if the people will elect the leaders chosen by the gangsters. That's what they call democracy: the will of the people -- the will of the Chosen People, that is. And of course, it's our money, our hard-earned tax money, that's used for the bribes to subvert the democratic process in other people's countries. In Russia they used communism and corruption -- stealing -- to bankrupt the country, and then when it was bled dry they began clearing out for Israel and the United States. In Serbia there were very few of the Chosen People to start with, so they used bombs and missiles to wreck the country: faster that way.

They're even collecting subsidiary benefits from Russia and Ukraine now: an estimated 2,000 attractive young Russian and Ukrainian women every year are taken to Israel by the Chosen People and forced into prostitution.

That's not my estimate, by the way; the figure of 2,000 Russian and Ukrainian women a year comes from the *Jerusalem Post.* I'm reading now from a copy of the December 28, 1998, issue of the *Jerusalem Post:*

"Women are sold into the sex business in Israel for between $5,000 and $15,000, while the pimps who buy them can earn between $10,000 and $50,000 a year per woman. . . . According to the Israel Women's Network, 2,000 women are brought to Israel a year from the CIS and forced to work as prostitutes."

"CIS" is an abbreviation for Commonwealth of Independent States, primarily Russia and Ukraine.

You know, the Clinton government is full of "humanitarians" who justified their destruction of Serbia on the grounds that the Serbs were persecuting the Albanians in Serbia. When do you think these "humanitarians" will get around to doing something about the persecution of Russian and Ukrainian women in Israel? Did you know that it is legal to buy and sell human beings in Israel today? Non-Jewish human beings, that is.

If the New World Order bribery is successful in Serbia -- "we'll lend you money for repairing the damage we did with our bombs and missiles if you get rid of Milosevic and choose the right president for your country," was the way Mr. Clinton so subtly put it on television the other day -- if the New World Order gang get one of their creatures in to run Yugoslavia like they got Boris Yeltsin in to run Russia, then I expect that we'll see a steady stream of attractive, young Serb women being smuggled out of Serbia while corrupt Serb officials look the other way, being taken to Israel, and providing even more $50,000-a-year-per-woman business opportunities for enterprising young Jewish businessmen that the *Jerusalem Post* can write about.

You know, the wrecking crew did their job on America back in the 1960s -- actually from the late 1950s through the mid-1970s -- not with missiles and bombs, but just as effectively with television and the music industry and their influence in our universities. Among young people they promoted marijuana and LSD and beads and long hair and the idea that the world owes us all a living, and we owe respect to nothing. They gave us all sorts of new "civil rights" laws and "affirmative action" and wide-open borders, so that the wretched refuse of the Third World's teeming shores could come flooding into America and shift our electoral demographics in a democratic direction. They taught us that "gay" is good, and the cause of all the world's problems is White racism. They began the feminization and multiculturalization of America.

Older listeners may remember how they screamed and moaned about "McCarthyism" back at that time: "witch hunt!" they whined; "anti-Semitism!" In fact, they still moan about it every time they have a chance: "Hollywood blacklist! *Oy, veh!"* You know, if it hadn't been for McCarthyism making them keep their heads down a bit, they would have done an even worse wrecking job on America.

God, how I wish we'd killed the whole bunch of them back in the 1960s, instead of spending all our time trying to figure out what they were up to. Think how many of our own people could have avoided having their lives ruined. Think how much better off America and the world would be today. But of course, we didn't kill them. Even if we had figured out exactly what they were up to in the 1960s, we didn't have the means to oppose them effectively. They had the mass media just as much in their hands then as now; they had half the government secretly helping them with their wrecking job; and the other half was too afraid of being tarred as "anti-Semitic" to oppose them.

So here we are today: The United States is still rich and prosperous primarily because the groundwork for our prosperity was laid before 1960 -- the building of an enormously productive agricultural enterprise, for one thing, and the beginning of the microelectronics revolution based

on the work of the late William Shockley and his colleagues, for another thing. With our wealth and our technological head start, we were able to equip our armed forces with high-tech weaponry that permits us today to destroy any country which lacks such weapons, even if man for man their soldiers are better fighters than ours. Of course, there's more to a military operation such as our destruction of Serbia than the fact that we have high-tech weapons and the Serbs don't. There's the fact that the Jews could count on their man Boris Yeltsin not to provide any Russian assistance to the Serbs -- not even to let them have any modern air-defense missiles while we were bombing Serbia.

Well . . . at least they can count on Yeltsin when he's sober and has Boris Abramovich Berezovsky at his side to whisper instructions in his ear. Admittedly, that's not a perfect system, and it becomes a bit shaky at times, as when those Russian troops showed up unexpectedly at the airport in Pristina ahead of NATO last week and refused to budge. I think that we can attribute that to Yeltsin's need to bolster his image with the Russian people. He doesn't want it to be too obvious that he's the Jews' lapdog, so he throws a tantrum now and then and pretends to be refusing to cooperate. That sort of little-league defiance goes over well with the Russian public, but on really substantive matters he does what he's told. Even the Russian troops at the Pristina airport, however, caused his masters to reveal their hand a bit. They had to reprimand Yeltsin and tell him to behave himself, or there would be no more handouts from the West. Last Sunday Tony Blair's defense secretary, George Robertson, said on BBC television that if Yeltsin continued to act up then the world's financial bosses might decide to withhold his allowance when they meet in Cologne next week.

And of course, they're already dangling the promise of loans in front of the Serbs in an effort to gain the same sort of control through corruption over Serbia that they have over Russia. To a large degree, it's a similar sort of corruption which holds NATO together and allows people like Madeleine Albright to manipulate it. In some cases they have arranged to have a Gentile member of their New World Order gang running things: Tony Blair, for example, is a corrupt, trendy, ambitious little jack-in-the-box who is sort of a British version of Bill Clinton and really is counting on being allowed to be one of the owners of the New World Order's global plantation after the rest of the pieces are in place.

In other cases, they have simply managed to keep genuine patriots away from the centers of power and keep men -- or women -- they can deal with in charge. Whenever a nationalist anywhere begins attracting enough votes to be considered dangerous, they unleash all of their trained media hounds on him and begin supporting his rivals. So far that has been sufficient. That's why they love democracy so much and insist on it as the form of government everywhere. It's so easy to manipulate most voters with the mass media.

In summary, the enemies of our people base their power on three things: First and by far the most important is their control of the mass media. Even in countries where they don't actually own the major newspapers and the television stations and control the content and slant of news programs, the Jews are able to extend their influence through the entertainment media. Most of the countries in the world -- certainly, every country in Europe -- receives much of its entertainment from Hollywood. And everything which comes from Hollywood contains the Jews' spiritual poison: their sometimes subtle and sometimes not at all subtle propaganda for

equality and multiculturalism and racial mixing and feminism and passivity and White guilt and surrender.

It was Jewish entertainment from Hollywood as much as anything else which destroyed South Africa. Until 1977 there was no television entertainment in South Africa, because the White *apartheid* government there, fearing its subversive influence, would not permit it. The government finally gave in to the pressure in 1977 and permitted commercial television broadcasting, and it took just 17 years of television viewing, much of the material coming from Hollywood, for White South Africans to have enough Jewish spiritual poison pumped into them so that they could be persuaded to vote for mass White suicide in 1994. Most of them still haven't figured out what happened to them.

The second element in the Jews' power base is money. They have an uncanny drive and ability to acquire money -- an inherited drive and ability, I believe -- and, what is at least as important, an understanding of how to use money to buy power and a willingness to do it. There are many very wealthy Gentiles, of course, men whose wealth in the past was based in land and these days is based primarily in enterprise: Carnegie, Ford, Gates. But there still is a special relationship between Jews and money. Whenever you see a breakdown of wealth according to ethnicity or religion, you will see the Jews at the top of the list. Why is it that Jews never go into farming, for example? Did you ever in your life meet a Jewish farmer or even hear of one? Why do they all want to be lawyers or merchants? Or lacking that, cosmetic surgeons or psychiatrists? They do have an instinct for money. You begin reading a news story about some huge Medicare swindle broken up by the FBI that has bilked the government of hundreds of millions of dollars, or some crooked telemarketing scheme that has robbed thousands of retirees of their life savings, or some Wall Street insider-trading racket that has raked in billions of illicit dollars, and even before you get to the names of those who were arrested, you can guess what those names will be: Boesky, Levine, Goldblatt, Kaplan, Milken, Cohen, and the like.

The third element in their power base is organization. Lock any three Jews in a room together, and within a week they will have formed six different Jewish organizations. Look in the Yellow Pages or in the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, which you can find in nearly every library, count the number of specifically Jewish organizations listed, and compare that with the number of, say, Lutheran or Baptist organizations and with the percentages of these groups in the population. You'll find that the Jews have a far larger number of organizations per capita than any other ethnic or religious group. Some of these organizations focus on the Jewish community itself -- on maintaining a high level of Jewish self-consciousness, a high level of ethnic identity -- and others focus on applying organized pressure to the Gentile community. These organizations allow the Jews to use their small numbers much more effectively. And the Jews support these organizations. They understand that in organization lies strength -- which is something it would behoove our people to learn.

Jews not only put their money into Jewish organizations, they use it, in conjunction with their mass media, to determine the outcome of the electoral process. A dirty, little secret which every politician in Washington knows, but which no one is supposed to talk about is that Jewish money is the key to winning elections. Approximately a quarter of all the money donated to Republican political candidates comes from the two and a half per cent of the U.S. population which is

Jewish. For Democratic candidates, approximately sixty per cent of the money comes from Jews. Amazing, isn't it? Anyway, it helps us to understand why the majority of Bill Clinton's appointments to ambassadorships, to Cabinet posts, to the Supreme Court, and to other high government positions have gone to the Jewish minority.

And of course, it's not just individual bribery or just political campaigns that the Jews' money is used for -- and it's not just their money. When Madeleine Albright was running around from one country to another during the bombing of Serbia, bribing the various political leaders to keep them from responding to public demand and pulling out of NATO, it wasn't her personal money she was promising them. It was our money, our taxes.

So that's the essence: media, money, and organization. That's what makes up the apparatus of power. That's what allows a tiny minority to control the majority -- and to wreck nations and to commit genocide and get away with it and to aspire to total world domination under the aegis of the New World Order.

There's more to it, of course. There's the unique inner nature of the Jews. I've just described for you the external apparatus. It's the apparatus they use to control the Clinton administration -- and more generally, to control America.

And with a few modifications it's the apparatus they plan to use to acquire total world domination. It is adapted especially to the control of democracies, but whenever they encounter a country which is insufficiently democratic to be controlled by propaganda and bribery, then they use bombs to soften things up to the point that their style of controlled democracy can prevail. What has happened -- and is happening -- to Serbia is a perfect example. "Get rid of Milosevic and choose a politician acceptable to us as your leader, or you'll freeze in the dark this winter."

As I said before, this system of the Jews, although it has been successful so far to a large extent, is a bit shaky, like any highly leveraged system. There are several things which can go wrong with it: several things which provide hope for us. In some of the countries where the habit of democracy has not sapped the strength of the people as much as it has in the West -- in Serbia, say, or even more hopefully in Russia -- there remains the possibility of nationalist resurgence. Perhaps Slobodan Milosevic is a nationalist, but there are other political leaders in Serbia who are far more nationalist than he. Two weeks ago the Serb Radical Party, under Serbian Deputy Prime Minister Vojislav Seselj, resigned their parliamentary positions and vowed to carry on the fight for Serb freedom by other means when Milosevic caved in. Let's hope that they do -- and do so effectively. And within the next year we may see a really dramatic move toward nationalism in Russia, and what the Jews have done to Serbia may make a nationalist victory in Russia more likely.

Everywhere there will be a much greater incentive than before to acquire or produce weapons of mass destruction. Little countries certainly understand now, if they didn't before, that if they want to retain their freedom they must have some way of fighting back against NATO or whatever other guise the New World Order may appear in when it tells them how to run their internal affairs. Since they can't hope to match America's high-tech conventional weapons they will turn to unconventional weapons.

The threat of massive retaliation by the United States eventually will cease to be an effective deterrent. When a small country with a genuine nationalist leader has its back to the wall and is threatened with conquest, it may do whatever it must to punish the aggressor. And as the number of small countries which have learned to hate and fear America grows, it may be difficult for the folks in the CIA to figure out which one of them has unleashed an unconventional weapon of mass destruction on the United States.

And believe me, that's coming. What Madeleine Albright and her pals have done to Serbia guarantees it. The bright side of that is that it will do Americans good to freeze in the dark a bit themselves. It will weed out a lot of those who voted for Clinton, and it will strengthen the spines of the rest.

Anyway, while we're waiting for that just retribution to strike, what we must do is continue building our means to reach all our people. We must continue building our media of communication, building our organizational strength, building our financial strength. As things are now, it will take a long time -- too long -- for us to build our media or our organizational strength or our financial strength to the point where we can compete effectively with the Jews. But you know, things are not likely to remain as they are -- certainly not as likely as before the Clinton government's recent campaign of mass murder against the Serbs.

Smell the Blood

During the past few weeks we've been talking mostly about the Clinton government's war against Serbia, and I've sometimes gotten a little hot under the collar. Some listeners have accused me of becoming intemperate.

Well, perhaps so. But let me assure you, I do bite my tongue pretty hard to avoid saying what I really feel sometimes, because the FBI certainly would lock me up if said everything I felt like saying, and Janet Reno would file all sorts of charges against me. But I must tell you, I do not believe that it is intemperate of me to say that this monstrosity of a government we have in Washington is an evil thing which must be destroyed, by any means necessary. I believe that everyone who serves this government, of whatever party, is a traitor to our country and an enemy to our people, and should be dealt with accordingly.

You see, that's the sort of statement which some listeners believe is intemperate, but which I believe is merely a statement of fact. And it's a statement which needs to be made, because people need to think about it. I really have a hard time trying to reason with people who can remain calm when their government is murdering our kinsmen in another country wholesale. People get excited when a couple of nutcase teenagers in Colorado kill 13 of their classmates; they wring their hands and say, "Oh, isn't it just awful! What will we do about violence in our society?" But they remain calm when their government deliberately murders 7,000 or so -- that's seven thousand -- of our kinsmen in Europe in order to make them obey the orders of a bunch of nutcase, would-be commissars for the New World Order.

It's big news for weeks when Timothy McVeigh blows up one building in Oklahoma City, but when our government, using our armed forces and our tax money, blows up dozens of buildings and kills hundreds of people every day in Serbia, the news is just ho-hum stuff; it's likely to be pre-empted by a basketball game. Maybe part of this lackadaisical attitude about the government's mass murder in Serbia is due to the feminization of American society and of the American male that I've complained about. Men's mental horizons have been contracted to the point where murder is real only when it happens next door; if it happens in another country it isn't real. It's just something one sees on television.

Or maybe some people just play too many video games. I guess that's the case with our military people. They don't seem to have any problem with killing people wholesale for no good reason when it's all done with "smart" weapons and video screens. You press a button, use a joystick to guide the bomb to its target, then "boom!" just like in a video arcade. That's not like having to get up close and stick a knife in your victim and listen to him scream or shoot him in the head and get splattered with his blood and brains.

But you know, the latter way is really much better -- at least, from a moral standpoint -- because when a normal person, a moral person, has to kill another person up close, he needs a good reason for doing it: a better reason anyway than that's what he's being paid to do. Too many of our military people have the attitude that they're just being paid to play an exciting video game

when they guide their "smart" bombs to their targets, but in fact they're being paid to murder the men, women, and children who are blown to bits by those bombs.

And you know, it's not just the murder of Serbs that people should be concerned about. They should be concerned that it's their government committing the murders, not someone else's government that's none of their concern. We have a gang of homicidal maniacs running our country. People should be concerned about that.

Do you think I'm misusing the word "murder"? Listen, I understand that sometimes people need to be killed. I can think of a lot of people in Washington and New York and Hollywood that need to be killed, and the sooner the better. I have no problem with killing people who are trying to kill us; I have no problem with self-defense. I don't consider that murder. In this era of total government corruption I don't consider the assassination of a politician or a bureaucrat to be murder. I don't consider the killing of a domestic enemy of our people to be murder, or of a foreign enemy, when the killing is in defense of our people in time of war.

But when a gang of Jews and wannabee commissars for the New World Order deliberately kill people who are not our enemies, who have not harmed or threatened us, and with whom we are not at war; and when the people being killed are our fellow Europeans; and whether the excuse for killing them is that we need to stabilize Europe so that it will remain a good market for American products, as Mr. Clinton claimed, or that we're doing it for humanitarian reasons because the Serbs were being too rough in putting down a KLA insurrection, as Madeleine Albright claimed, or that we need to force the Serbs to choose a different president and learn to like multiculturalism, as General Wesley Kanne Clark claimed -- regardless of the excuse -- it is murder. The people who ordered the killing are murderers. The people who did the killing are murderers, even if they were being paid to do it. The people who helped in any way in the killing or who gave aid and encouragement to the killers are accessories to murder.

It is murder whether the people being killed are soldiers or civilians. It is murder even if the bomb accidentally missed the target and hit something else instead. When anyone is killed, accidentally or not, during the commission of a felony, it is murder. You don't get off by saying, "Judge, I didn't mean to kill the man. I intended just to part his hair and scare him so that he would hand over his wallet, but my aim was bad and the bullet accidentally hit him between the eyes." That excuse doesn't work when you accidentally kill one man on the street trying to persuade him to give up his wallet, and it doesn't work when you accidentally kill a couple of thousand civilians trying to persuade a nation to surrender its territory to you.

The fact that you are a high-ranking government official -- a president, say, or a secretary of state or a secretary of defense or a general -- does not excuse murder. It does not give you a warrant to commit murder. A lot of Americans seem to think that it's all right for a government to do whatever it wants to do -- including killing people. But you know, the conditions under which our government is permitted to kill people are very tightly circumscribed. A government official can't legally kill people just because he wants to persuade them to change their ways, even if those people happen to live in another country -- unless that country is at war against us.

Indeed, the fact that the killings in Serbia were ordered by a gang of high-ranking government officials in Washington makes these killings far more reprehensible than if they had been done by a gang of international jewel thieves or some deranged Muslim sect. The fact that they were done by a government -- our government, in fact -- makes them far more worrisome for us. I would sleep a lot better at night if the murderers in Washington simply liked to slip out of the side door of the White House at night with an axe or a ice pick and kill some hapless citizen on the sidewalk for the thrill of it. That would be far less dangerous for America than having a government which plans mass murder as an act of state and claims the right to do so.

And really, it's even worse than that. The mass murder of Serbs by the official gangsters in Washington is only one act in a program that ultimately will involve the mass murder of lots of other people.

These gangsters have been planning for many years their move to replace the governments of sovereign nations everywhere with their New World Order. The Gentile liberals in the gang are adherents to the very trendy idea that nation-states are passé and ought to be abolished. These deracinated liberals find abhorrent the idea of a tribe, a nation, a group of people with common blood and a common culture, common roots, a common religion, having their own territory where they can do things their way without asking anyone else's permission and can keep other people out if they choose. To these liberals that's very bad, very backward. It's exclusive rather than inclusive. It doesn't leave much room for diversity and multiculturalism and the other things liberals are so fond of.

Worst of all, it doesn't allow the liberals to meddle. It doesn't allow the liberals to choose what sort of government the people should have. It doesn't allow the liberals to impose their own social ideas on the society. And so these Gentile liberals in the New World Order gang are quite certain everything will be much better, much more modern and progressive, when all national governments have been abolished and replaced by a single world government -- under their control, of course. With a world government they can meddle to their heart's content. They can plan the economy. They can make sure that everyone has the most progressive form of government. They can make sure that there is a proper racial balance everywhere. They can make sure that everyone is equal. They can decide what the kiddies everywhere will learn in school. No more sexism, no more racism, no more homophobia, no more inequality, no more bigotry or intolerance: everything controlled completely by liberals who know what's best for all of us. Won't that be wonderful?

I mean, this one-world-government idea, this New World Order idea, really does appeal to these nutcase liberals. Of course, it will mean the end of freedom, but to the liberals that's not really important. What's much more important than freedom, they are quite sure, is security and comfort. We won't even have to worry about making any big decisions in the future. They all will be made for us.

There won't be any more war, they believe, because wars are between nation-states, and when nation states are abolished, how can there be war? Well, as for civil wars, they plan to mix everyone up enough, homogenize the population everywhere to the point where civil wars won't be possible either: no possibility that one part of the world society will be different enough from

another part that they will want to fight each other. And as for rebellions, well, they plan to keep a close eye on everyone who looks like he might think any unapproved thoughts, everyone who refuses to go with the flow. If we have to double or triple or quadruple the size of the secret police, well, that will be a small price to pay for the security of knowing that the FBI is keeping the loners and the independent thinkers under control.

This whole concept of abolishing freedom so that everyone can be more secure and comfortable, this idea of making everyone's decisions for him, is very feminine, and it has gained more adherents as our whole society has lost its masculinity and become more feminized. And of course, the idea won't work. But the liberals like to pretend that they believe it will, and they have been very fond of this pretense for a long time. Most of the time they have been fairly discreet about it, because they have realized that if the *hoi polloi* realized what they were planning they might be lynched. So they disguised their plans. They led the public everywhere to believe that they really didn't intend to go much beyond the United Nations, sort of an international mutual-aid organization -- but no interference with national sovereignty. But they got tired of these half-measures, tired of the limitations, tired of holding themselves back. They decided to go for it.

So they told the government of Yugoslavia that it couldn't put down the Albanian rebellion in Kosovo. It told the Serbs that they could not suppress the KLA terrorists and rearrange the demographics of their Kosovo province to suit themselves. It wouldn't be permitted. The Serbs, of course, told them to go to hell, to mind their own business. And so the New World Order gang began killing Serbs with bombs and missiles. The liberals have begun their grand program to eliminate national sovereignty everywhere and make everyone subject to the New World Order. They've come out of the closet.

Of course, they didn't bother to ask for our approval of their project. They knew we wouldn't approve. We're too backward and old-fashioned and racist for their grand idea of a New World Order. So they just did it. They just murdered 7,000 or so Serbs and forced the Serbs to submit. And so far they've gotten away with it.

One of the reasons they've gotten away with it so far is that they planned it very carefully and chose the right moment. The right moment was when they succeeded in getting Bill Clinton elected to a second term. If the American people would accept Bill Clinton for a second term as their President, knowing what a piece of filth he was from their experience with him during his first term -- if the American people would accept Bill Clinton again, they would accept anything. And the right moment was when they had their own pliable tool, Boris Yeltsin, as head of the government of Russia, the only country in Europe which might put up any serious obstacle to their plans. And as a bonus they also had their own man, Tony Blair, in as head of the British government. So when Clinton was reelected in 1996, they decided the time was right to make their move, to come out of the closet.

So immediately after Clinton's reelection they had him put Jews into every key post in the U.S. government that would be involved in the implementation of their move to begin enforcing the will of the New World Order. They had him choose a Jewish secretary of state and staff all of the top posts in the State Department with Jews. They had him choose a Jewish secretary of defense

and a Jewish national security chief. Those Jewish appointments were what tipped me off that they intended to start a major war at some time before the end of Clinton's second term, and I predicted this war in my broadcast of December 21, 1996, right after Clinton's new cabinet appointments were announced.

The reason I was convinced at that time that this rash of top-level Jewish appointments signaled that a major war was being planned is that Jews always have been at the core of the conspiracy to suppress national sovereignty and establish a New World Order dictatorship. The trendy, liberal, jet-setter Gentiles, who have become thoroughly deracinated and have no trace of patriotism or any sense of racial consciousness or racial obligation, make ideal collaborators for the Jews -- but they are only collaborators. The Jews always have been the leaders and the planners of the New World Order conspiracy. They have been at it for 3,000 years, while the Gentile liberals have been helping them only for the last century or so.

The idea of a world owned and dominated by Jews has been the cornerstone of the Jews' religion since Old Testament days. I've quoted from the book of their so-called "prophet" Isaiah before in this regard, but it's worth at least paraphrasing again now. Isaiah, supposedly speaking for the Jews' tribal god Yahweh, tells his fellow Jews that at some time in the future all the wealth of the Gentiles will be delivered to the Jews, and all of the Gentiles will become the Jews' servants, and any nation which refuses to hand over all its wealth to the Jews and become their servants will be destroyed. Every religious Jew for the past 2,700 years has read this and considered it holy writ. And, of course, this prophecy of Isaiah fits right in with the Jews' even older claim, as set down in the books of their number-one prophet, Moses, to be divinely "chosen" to rule the world, to be a "holy people" above all the other peoples of the earth.

Now, that, of course, is the Bible, which is pretty old and primitive stuff. You may believe that it's simply not relevant today and that it proves nothing.

But it is relevant to understanding the thinking and the motivations of the Jews. The Jews would have us believe they are simply a religious group, like the Methodists, say, who go to their own church but are otherwise pretty much like everyone else: a little smarter, perhaps, a little more moral and trustworthy, a little more admirable, a little more picked on and persecuted than anyone else -- but just normal people, no more conspiratorial or greedy or lusting after power than any other group. That's the way they portray themselves to us in the media they control. But they themselves certainly don't believe that they're pretty much like everyone else. They believe that they are special, that they are "chosen," and whether they are religious or not, Isaiah's 2,700-year-old prophecy is one of the things which hold them together, one of the things which define their identity. They're all familiar with it, and in one sense or another they believe it.

That's why it's relevant to the problems our own people are facing today. That's why every one of my listeners who is really concerned about what's happening in the world today, who is really concerned about what the New World Order gang is up to, and who wants to understand the Jews' role in the gang must read what's in the Jews' Bible. Really: read at least the five books of Moses and the book of Isaiah. That's only 300 or so pages. Read it. Think about it. It is important. It will help you understand. And remember, it applies to non-religious Jews, it applies to the Jewish media bosses and the Clinton cabinet members and the White-slave traders in Israel

and the billionaire Jewish gangsters around Boris Yeltsin just as much as it does to the funny-looking religious Jews you see in New York wearing long sideburns and black suits and yarmulkes. It applies to everyone who considers himself a member of the "chosen" people.

You know, the biggest problem our people have with understanding these things is not lack of intelligence, and it's not that the information is hard to find. The problem is that our people are too credulous, too easily deceived. And deception is what the Jews are really good at. In the Soviet Union they set up the bloodiest, the most murderous apparatus of repression the world has ever seen, based on the scheme of the Jew Karl Marx, with Jewish commissars like Lazar Kaganovich murdering millions of Ukrainians and Russians, and now they have us feeling sorry for them because the Russians and Ukrainians don't like them.

Well, perhaps the crimes of the communists in the Soviet Union seem too far in the past to be real, but the blood we shed in Serbia in order to advance another Jewish scheme . . . that blood is still fresh. They have made murderers of us the way they made murderers of the Russians. It's time for us to smell the blood and stop being fooled by their lies.

Our Revolutionary Right

Usually in these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts I address myself to all interested people of European ancestry, regardless of their ideology or personal inclinations. Today I want to speak only to people who consider themselves racial nationalists, White nationalists, and who understand the concept of personal responsibility. If you don't already have a strong sense of European racial identity and a conviction that every adult man and woman of our race has an unavoidable responsibility for the survival and welfare of the race, then you should tune to another station now.

If you're a libertarian or an egalitarian or a liberal, or if you're some sort of right-wing intellectual dilettante who likes to observe what's happening but feels no sense of obligation to participate personally, to make any personal sacrifice or take any personal risk, then you won't be interested in what I have to say today, and you probably will find it offensive. So just tune out, because I won't be speaking to you anyway.

You know, it's not enough for patriots to shake their heads in disapproval over this shameful thing which their government has done to Serbia. It's not enough to say, "Well, I was against the war from the beginning. I didn't vote for Clinton." If you are an adult citizen of the United States -- or of the United Kingdom -- you are responsible for what your government does, whether you approve or not. Even our enemies understand that. It was in accord with that principle of a citizen's responsibility for the actions of his government that Serb schools and hospitals have been pounded into rubble. Serb women and children were murdered wholesale because Bill Clinton and Tony Blair didn't approve of the policies of their government. When the bombs and missiles came, it didn't help them to proclaim that they were in favor of multiculturalism all along and that they were against ethnic cleansing. Their government refused to take orders from the New World Order gang, and so they were killed by NATO's mercenaries.

If you're an Englishman or a Scot or a Welshman, you can say that you're against NATO's genocide in Serbia, you can say that you don't believe in waging war against another country except in self-defense, you can say that you never voted for Tony Blair or his party, but you still are morally responsible for what that mincing, prancing, smirking little piece of filth who heads your government does.

And if you're a White American, you can't blame Bill Clinton and his policies on the 400-pound welfare moms who voted for him. You can't even blame the murder of our fellow White men and women in Serbia on Madeleine Albright and Jamie Rubin and Sandy Berger and William Cohen and Richard Holbrooke and the other Jews who give Clinton his orders. This was our country. It was our government. And if we sat on our hands while the Jews took it away from us, it is our fault. It is our responsibility to take this government down and to establish a decent one in its place. It is our responsibility to take the franchise away from the welfare moms and to take the media away from the Jews and to cleanse our society of them.

In his first inaugural address, on March 4, 1861, Abraham Lincoln said:

"Whenever . . . [the people who inhabit this country] shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

You know, rights never stand alone; they always entail responsibilities, and in particular that last right mentioned by Lincoln is accompanied by the inescapable responsibility to exercise it when it becomes appropriate to do so. And when our constitutional right of amending the government has in effect been taken away from us by the subversion of the democratic process in the Clinton era, the appropriate time has arrived. When a mass of slobs, instructed and guided by Jewish media bosses, are able to determine the outcome of elections, then it is time to stop voting and turn to other means.

People tell me, "Oh, you must not advocate doing anything illegal." My answer to them is that I have been a law-abiding man all my life. I believe in law and order. I believe that we must have a society governed strictly by laws, not by mobs or by any tyrant's whims of the moment -- or by any clever tribe of alien manipulators who have gained control of our mass media. But does anyone really believe that we have a society governed by laws today? Let us remember that we are living now in the era of O.J. Simpson and Bill Clinton. We have laws on the books, and we have police and courts which have the theoretical responsibility for enforcing those laws. And when it is Politically Correct to do so, they will.

In reality, what we have today is the illusion of a lawful society, the pretense of justice and accountability under the law -- and not much of a pretense at that. We have a government which commits mass murder at home without so much as an apology, as when the Clinton administration slaughtered nearly 100 members of the Branch Davidian Church in Waco in 1993 because they refused to surrender, and which bombs hospitals and schools in Serbia without apology today because the Serbs also refused to surrender. In each case the only justification has been force: "We're bigger than you, and so you must do what we say or we'll kill you." The Clinton government launches an unprovoked and undeclared war against another country and demands that the president of the country it has attacked be tried as a war criminal, while the attackers run free.

We obey the laws of the U.S. government today not because of any moral obligation to do so, but because the government is stronger than we are, and we are not yet ready to take up arms against it.

Other people tell me that whatever solution we seek to the problems our people are facing today must be a solution without violence. And my response to that is that I am a peaceful man. All my adult life I have been a scholar and a teacher, never a man of violence. But look at the behavior of our opponents! All they know is violence and coercion and murder. I do not want violence, and I am determined to avoid it as long as I can. I certainly do not want to provoke violence when we are not strong enough to match the violence of our enemies. But let us not make the avoidance of violence any sort of moral principle, because in the long run it cannot be avoided. Our guiding principle is that our people must live and must be free, and in the long run we will do whatever we must do to ensure that.

It is clear that more than talk will be required. And I must tell you that I am disappointed and worried by the tendency I see in our people today to do nothing but talk -- and many are unwilling even to do that. I see too much passivity in our people, too much willingness to tolerate evil, too much reluctance to take action where action is justified.

There has hardly been a situation which called for action more than the Clinton government's murderous attack against Serbia. Why did American patriots offer so little protest to this? Clinton and the Jewish gang around him not only have murdered thousands of our fellow Europeans in Serbia while we sat on our hands, they dishonored America in doing so.

This was not just an attack on Serbia, it was an attack on America as well. This was a case of the common enemies of Serbia and America using American military and economic resources against Serbia now, with the plan to use them against America in the future. If the New World Order gang successfully compels everyone to toe the line, it will be American freedom which will be sacrificed as well as Serb freedom. Clinton and his Jewish gang are the enemies of every person on this earth who loves freedom. So don't tell me that you believe in freedom if you failed to take a stand against the Clinton government's war.

I am sure that if Americans were more manly in their behavior and their thinking, we would not have gotten ourselves into this situation where we must contemplate revolutionary action against the government. If we had only the courage to speak out in a straightforward way against evil and injustice and corruption, to stand up as a matter of course for what we believe in, we could have avoided much of the need for violence in the future. I hear often from university graduates -- and others -- who explain to me that they are forced to be Politically Correct, that they cannot say what they believe, because it might jeopardize their careers. They tell me that later, after they have acquired a greater degree of financial independence, when their careers are more secure, then they will speak out, then they will not be afraid to tell people what they believe, then they will be ready for action. My opinion is that grown men who lack the courage to stand up for what they believe in now, when the Clinton government through its policies and its actions makes the distinction between good and evil so sharp and clear -- these men never will have the courage that a man ought to have.

This willful destruction of Serbia, the murder of her citizens, by the New World Order gang, acting in our name and using our armed forces as their mercenaries, when the Serbs have not threatened or harmed us in any way, is something so evil, so alarming, so provocative that it is difficult for me to understand how any intelligent, perceptive, and morally responsible adult American or Briton can just go on about his daily affairs as if nothing is happening. This is not a theoretical discussion. This is armed aggression against our kinsmen. This is the mass murder of our kinsmen. This willful shedding of the blood of the Serbs calls for the shedding of the blood of the aggressors. This willful killing of Serb women and children calls for the killing of those who planned and ordered this war. If ever there was justification for the overthrow of a government, this is it. If ever there was a moral imperative to act, this is it.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not calling for any blind, impulsive action for the sake of action, for the sake of making the actor feel good. I don't want anyone to go out and blow something up just to show his dislike of the Clinton government. I am calling for a deliberate,

clear-headed decision now on the part of every American patriot to begin a course of careful, planned, and coordinated action aimed at destroying America's domestic enemies and regaining complete and permanent control of our own country, so that the New World Order gang cannot do to Americans what they have done to the Serbs. If we do that in America, then I have confidence that patriotic Britons can deal appropriately with "Bambi" and his cabinet of Jews and homosexuals, that patriotic Russians can send Boris Yeltsin and Boris Abramovich Berezovsky and the rest of that crew to their just reward, and that the remaining members of the New World Order gang and their willing collaborators can be hunted down and dealt with, wherever they may try to hide.

I'll be more specific: I'm calling for patriots to join forces with me in the National Alliance, to help me reach out to others, to continue building our strength until we can do what must be done.

You know, I said a minute ago that it's hard for me to understand how any intelligent and perceptive patriot can remain uninvolved when the U.S. government is doing something as criminal as the deliberate and unprovoked destruction of a sovereign nation which in no way is our enemy. Let me back off a bit from that statement. I believe that part of the problem is that many patriots, despite their intelligence, are too credulous. They let themselves be hypnotized -- or at least, confused -- by the controlled news media, and the confusion results in moral paralysis and inaction, which is what is intended.

When the television cameras focus on some little Albanian girl who finally has been reunited with her family after becoming separated and lost when the family fled to a refugee camp in Macedonia two months ago, one cannot help but feel sympathy for the plight of the refugees. One cannot help but want to see an end to their misery and discomfort. But the television cameras do not show us the bleeding body of the little Serb girl killed by a NATO bomb. And of course, the news commentators do not tell us that the family of the little Albanian girl who was lost for two months, fled from their home and became refugees because of the NATO bombing. The commentator implies that it was Slobodan Milosevic rather than Madeleine Albright who made refugees of the family, whereas in fact well over 90 per cent of the refugees were caused by Albright's bombing, not by Milosevic's ethnic cleansing. The news coverage, in other words, has been slanted so as to generate sympathy for the Albanians and hostility toward the Serbs, and to undermine the average American viewer's opposition to the war. This slanting is calculated and deliberate.

Another example, and a prediction: The so-called "Kosovo Liberation Army," the KLA, started the conflict in Kosovo in the first place by attempting to drive the Serbs out of the province, take it away from Serbia, and make it a part of Albania. It was because of KLA terrorism against Serbs that Milosevic was forced to take strong measures last year against the KLA and its Albanian sympathizers in Kosovo. He had whipped the KLA and was bringing the situation under control when Albright and other members of the Clinton gang used the Serb police action against the KLA as an excuse for starting their war, claiming that the war was to protect Albanians from ethnic cleansing by the Serbs. Now a rearmed KLA, supported by NATO troops, is preparing to move back into Kosovo and resume an even more brutal terror campaign against the Serbs.

The official NATO spokesman, Jamie Shea, whose sneering and viciously biased commentary we've been hearing throughout the war, said at the beginning of this week:

"As the Serb forces pull out and the NATO forces move into Kosovo, we expect the Kosovo Liberation Army . . . not to try to take advantage of the situation. . . . More specifically, we hope the Kosovo Liberation Army will renounce violence."

That's exactly what the NATO spokesman said: he hopes that the KLA, which is largely a gang of cutthroats and gangsters, will renounce violence and not try to take advantage of the situation.

It's clear that a lot of Serbs are going to get their throats cut during the next few days, but you can bet your bottom dollar that the controlled news media in the United States will not be showing you any heart-rending views of the victims, and Madeleine Albright won't be making any statements about the need to protect the Serbs from ethnic cleansing by the Albanians. During the next few weeks, in fact, the media will manage to make many of our more thoughtless fellow citizens proud that we whipped the Serbs. We won the war. We showed them. The Serbs lost, and now they will pay the price of defeat. *Vae victis.* In America we have come a long way from the time when our third President, Thomas Jefferson, wrote:

"If there be one principle more deeply rooted than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest."

And those two great humanitarians, Bill Clinton and Tony Blair, will be grinning and posturing for the TV cameras while the Serbs are being butchered behind the scenes. And you know, it will be our fault, because it will have been our government which made it possible for the KLA to butcher the Serbs. KLA terrorists will be doing the raping and wielding the knives, but because we tolerated the monstrosity of a government which we have in Washington -- we obeyed the monster, we served it, we did not pull it down soon enough -- because of this we are responsible.

I'll give you one more example, much closer to home, of the way in which the media bosses keep Americans confused about what is happening in the world and thereby paralyze their will to take appropriate action. I am sure that you remember the killing of a Black ex-convict in Jasper, Texas, last summer. Three White ex-convicts had been drinking one night. They gave a ride to a Black ex-convict they knew. And then they killed him by dragging him behind their pickup truck. We have hardly had any bigger media circus than the one the controlled news media organized for us in connection with that killing. They painted it as a uniquely horrible crime. It was a wonderful opportunity for them to make the more impressionable elements of the White population feel guilty for being White and to beat the drums for a Federal "hate crime" law.

So rather than spoil the effect of the Jasper killing, the media bosses completely suppressed the news of another dragging murder. This other murder happened just two months after the Jasper murder. Last August 1, a 26-year-old Black ex-convict, Christopher Coleman, dragged a 46-year-old White woman, Patricia Stansfield, to her death near the little Illinois town of Streator. The Black stole a car belonging to a friend of Patricia Stansfield and dragged the White woman two miles along Illinois State Road 18 from Streator into the countryside while she screamed and pleaded for her life as her body bounced and scraped along the pavement.

I would have told you about this sooner, but the media bosses blacked out the news of this murder so completely that there wasn't even anything about it on the Internet. I had to have a friend get the details from a small-town newspaper, *The Pantagraph,* in nearby Bloomington, Illinois. The murder trial of the Black has been set for July 12, but -- hey! -- don't count on seeing anything about it in your newspaper or on your television screen next month. Just as the murder of Serbs by KLA terrorists doesn't fit, this dragging murder of a White woman by a Black doesn't fit either.

So again I appeal to every man and woman of honor, every man and woman of principle, every man and woman with a sense of responsibility and patriotism: let us not permit this to continue! Let us take down this government; let us take back our news and entertainment media; let us wage war on America's domestic enemies until we have prevailed; let us drive the New World Order gang out of our country. Join me in speaking out; join me in reaching out to other patriots; join me in building a revolution which can cleanse America.

Knowledge and Discipline

As I was preparing this week's broadcast, the news story causing the most excitement in the controlled media was a series of drive-by shootings last weekend in Illinois and Indiana by a 21-year-old student at the University of Indiana, Benjamin Smith, who killed himself as police were trying to arrest him. In addition to himself Smith killed only two other people -- not much to get excited about by today's standards, when drive-by shootings are a nightly occurrence in a number of our larger cities. What really had the media people stirred up about Smith, however, was the fact that he was a member of a pro-White church, and his targets were all non-Whites: Blacks, Jews, and Asians. A Black and an Asian died.

I don't know anything about Smith except what was on the television news and the Internet, but I cannot help but feel some sympathy for him. Smith, according to those who knew him, was intelligent, quiet, and serious. He was a student of criminal justice at the University of Indiana. Most notable, however, he was racially conscious. He was unhappy about the destruction of our White society in America and the perversion of our European culture by the program of multiculturalization promoted by the government and the media. He distributed leaflets on the University of Indiana campus in Bloomington expressing his views, and the university administration harassed him for it. He distributed leaflets off the campus in Bloomington and in the Chicago suburb of Wilmette, Illinois, where he grew up. Leftists, feminists, and Jews organized a public demonstration against him in Bloomington in an effort to stop his leaflet distribution, and the police in Wilmette arrested him. Blacks repeatedly smashed the windows of his apartment in Bloomington to show their disagreement with Smith's "racist" views. It must have been very stressful for Smith, trying to exercise his freedom of speech in a society which pays lip service to our Bill of Rights but which actually tries its best to make life difficult for anyone who doesn't toe the party line.

Finally something snapped, and Smith began shooting at Jews, Blacks, and Asians. He apparently had given up completely at trying to make a difference with his leaflets, and his shooting was an expression of his frustration. He obviously didn't intend to survive. He didn't try to conceal his identity. He simply drove up to groups of non-Whites in his car in broad daylight and began shooting, then drove off until he saw another group of non-Whites and began shooting again.

Now the media people are wringing their hands and asking the question: "How did this man's talk about hate lead to a racist killing spree?" And the media are trotting out all their Jewish experts to ask similar questions. I saw Rabbi Marvin Hier, one of the head Jews at the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and Mark Potok, a Jewish expert at the Southern Poverty Law Center, both on television asking, "How can we stop hateful talk like that in Benjamin Smith's leaflets from leading to hateful acts like this series of shootings?" And from the leers on their Jewish faces when they ask this question you can see what they're thinking; you can guess what they want the television viewers to think. They want to plant the suggestion that the way to stop racial violence and hostility is to stop what they call "hate speech." If no one is permitted to say hateful things, they suggest, then people will be less inclined to do hateful things. That's the sort of feminine reasoning which seems to be agreeable to America's couch potatoes.

You know, I haven't seen any of Benjamin Smith's leaflets, but I wouldn't be surprised if there was nothing hateful at all in them. What the Jews call "hate speech" these days, what they want to have outlawed, is any Politically Incorrect speech. They don't care about crude or vulgar expressions of hatred, because they don't see that as very persuasive or effective. The speech they want outlawed is any speech which might be dangerous to them, any speech which exposes their schemes or interferes with their plans.

As I said, I cannot help but feel some sympathy for Benjamin Smith. When I lived in Washington, DC, I was almost constantly enraged by what I saw all around me. In Washington it wasn't just the presence of the Blacks and the Jews and what they were doing; it was at least as much the behavior of the Whites which enraged me. It was the effeminate and pusillanimous behavior of the members of the White majority, who really didn't like Blacks and Jews much more than I did but who were terrified of being thought "racist" or Politically Incorrect if anyone found out what they were thinking.

It was the trendy, liberal airheads, mindlessly parroting every cliché they learned from television and eagerly embracing every fad which came along, no matter how degenerate or destructive. It was the homosexuals and the pushy, obnoxiously assertive feminists, who knew they were on a roll and were determined to make the most of it.

And it was the utterly corrupt and deceitful behavior of the politicians and the bureaucrats and the media people in Washington which enraged me. If anybody in this country really needs to be put to death, it's not the convicted serial killers sitting on death row in the various state prisons: it's the people sitting in public offices in Washington -- all of them. And it's the lying, treacherous minions of the controlled media, panting and wagging their tails frantically in the hope of receiving a pat on the head from their Jewish masters every time they slant the news in the required direction or put the proper "spin" on a story.

Washington is really the armpit of the universe, where nothing is too corrupt or treacherous or destructive, and I did find it frustrating being there and watching all of the degenerates and criminals doing their filthy work and not being able to stop them. There were times when I had some pretty violent thoughts. But I am not suicidal, and perhaps I have a little more self-discipline than Benjamin Smith had. Perhaps I am a little better able to postpone my gratification. And so I wrote books instead of going on shooting sprees. But I still sympathize with Benjamin Smith. It's just a shame that he didn't have a little more self-control.

The media circus resulting from Smith's activity last weekend is what we have come to expect from the Jews who control the media. It was another excuse for them to harp on the dangers of permitting Whites to think "racist" thoughts and express "racist" sentiments. And this time they even had the titillating twist of a White "racist" church to work into the story.

It's really too bad that they had virtually nothing to say about a Black church which has been involved in the racially motivated murder of Whites. The charges recently brought against one of the members of this Black church for the murder of a White man would have given them an opportunity to tell us about some far more interesting things than the two killings by Benjamin Smith. The Black church to which I'm referring is the Black Hebrew Israelites, led by Yahweh

ben Yahweh. The murderer I mentioned is Robert Rozier, a Black former National Football League player. On March 23 of this year -- that's just three and a half months ago -- Rozier was charged with the ritual murder of a White man outside one of his church's meeting places in Newark, New Jersey. Rozier and another Black member of the church, John Armstrong, stabbed 52-year-old Attilio Cicala to death as a ritual sacrifice of a White man to their Black leader, Yahweh ben Yahweh, who was born with the name Hulon Mitchell.

The murder charge against the Black football player Rozier was reported by the Associated Press in March, but I'll bet you never heard about it. The news was even printed in the *New York Times,* but no one I've spoken to remembers seeing it. People tend not to notice little two-paragraph news items which appear just once on page 126, tucked in among the ads for hemorrhoid relief and telephone sex. You still can dig it up from the *New York Times* site on the Internet, however, if you're interested.

The point is that the way in which the news is reported makes all the difference. Most people in this feminized age simply don't relate to bare facts. They relate only to other people. They aren't able to assimilate evidence that doesn't appear in a personal context. It just doesn't mean anything to them unless Tom Brokaw or Bill Clinton or someone else they can relate to explains it to them and tells them how they should respond to it. They really do need to be told whether or not a news item is interesting and what attitude they should have toward it. I'm sorry, but that is the level to which the television-viewing American public has sunk.

And that's why the news about the ritual murder of Attilio Cicala outside the so-called Black Hebrew Israelite temple in Newark has made virtually no impression on the consciousness of the public. And that's too bad, because it's really an interesting story: much more interesting than the story of Benjamin Smith's shooting of a Black and a Korean last weekend. The Jewish media bosses hoped that you wouldn't pay any attention to the news about the murder of Attilio Cicala, but I'm going to tell you about it now, because I think it's something you ought to know.

The story goes back 25 years to a horrendous series of racial murders in California, many of them in the San Francisco area. Over a period of six months in 1973 and 1974 members of an offshoot of the Black Muslims called "Death Angels" murdered several hundred White men, women, and children. The exact number will never be known, because many of the victims were so-called "street people": runaway teenaged girls on drugs, hippies, and the like -- people who weren't missed. There were many of these pitiful lost souls on the streets of San Francisco in the 1960s and 1970s. Their corpses often were hacked up and dumped in the ocean or buried. But the San Francisco police who tracked the Death Angels counted 15 very tangible victims from all walks of life, not just street people: 15 murdered White people, and eight others who were seriously injured during attempts to murder them. While they were looking for the killers the police referred to the series of murders as the "Zebra" killings: all Black on White.

Eventually the Death Angels were broken up when San Francisco police arrested eight of them. Four of them were put on trial, and after the longest trial in California history -- a year and six days -- were convicted on all counts. The transcript for the trial filled nearly 14 thousand pages and was bound in 141 volumes.

You say you never heard of any of this? Could that be because the Jewish media bosses -- the ones who have been making such a circus of Benjamin Smith's killing of one Black and one Korean -- didn't want you to hear about it? Could it be that the news of the Zebra murders didn't fit the pattern of White aggressors and non-White victims that the media bosses wanted to imprint on the consciousness of the White public?

During the trial of the four Death Angels between March 3, 1975, and March 9, 1976, a great deal of interesting information came out that the White public should have been told about. One of the Death Angels who had been involved in many of the murders, Anthony Harris, obtained immunity from prosecution by testifying against the other Death Angels. Harris was on the witness stand for 12 days, and the chilling details of his testimony make very interesting reading. He told the court that the Nation of Islam -- the so-called "Black Muslims" -- taught that the murder of a White person -- a "blue-eyed devil" -- was pleasing to Allah. There was an elite organization in the Nation of Islam whose members had especially pleased Allah. That was the Death Angels. To become a Death Angel one had to murder nine White men or five White women or four White children. In 1974 the San Francisco chapter of the Death Angels had fifteen accredited members.

Harris related the horrifying details of some of the murders. There were the young White couple, Richard and Quita Hague, who were grabbed off a San Francisco street at gunpoint, taken to a rail yard, and butchered with a machete. Richard, a mining engineer, was 30 years old. His wife Quita, a reporter, was 28. They were out for an after-dinner stroll when three Black Muslims forced them into a van. Two of the Muslims were in the process of raping Quita when the third grabbed her by the hair, dragged her over to the railroad tracks, and slashed her throat.

Some of the White victims were taken to a loft used by the Death Angels, where they were tied to chairs and tortured to death. Harris testified that he was given the butchered remnants of one of these kidnapped torture victims, all trussed up in a plastic sheet like a turkey, and told to drive the package to a bluff overlooking San Francisco Bay and throw it into the water. Other victims, more fortunate, were simply gunned down on the street. And the killing wasn't confined to San Francisco or even to California. Other groups of Death Angels murdered Whites in other states: in New York, in Georgia, in Florida. The word spread among Black Muslims everywhere. The only people who didn't hear about what was happening were ordinary White citizens, like Richard and Quita Hague. They didn't hear about it because the Jewish media bosses didn't want the White population to become alarmed. They didn't want Whites to take measures to protect themselves. They didn't want Whites to stop feeling guilty about how badly they had treated minorities.

One Black Muslim in Atlanta who learned that the murder of blue-eyed devils was pleasing to Allah was Hulon Mitchell, known at the time as Hulon X. Hulon was given control of a Muslim mosque in Atlanta, but his career in the Nation of Islam was cut short when he was caught dipping into the collection plate and having sex with underage Muslim girls. Hulon moved to Florida. In 1978 he founded his own Black church in Miami. He called it the Nation of Yahweh, called its members Black Hebrew Israelites, and took for himself the name of Yahweh ben Yahweh. Hulon's new church flourished, and he soon formed an elite group in it, which he called the Circle of Ten. He also branched out to several other cities, including Newark.

He taught his followers that the killing of blue-eyed devils was pleasing to Yahweh, rather than to Allah. Soon one of the members of his church, NFL player Robert Rozier, brought him the ear of a White man he had just murdered: his first victim. A number of other victims followed during the next few years. One of these victims was Attilio Cicala, the 52-year-old Italian man murdered in Newark.

As with the Death Angels in California, many of the ritual murder victims chosen by Yahweh's followers were the easiest White victims: people who wouldn't be missed -- young runaways, street people, Whites who lived in Black neighborhoods or who associated with Blacks. It wasn't until November 1990 that the police finally wound up Yahweh's murder spree, charging him and sixteen of his followers with a number of felonies, including 14 murders. Actually, the murder of Attilio Cicala was not one of the 14 murders the Black Hebrew Israelites were charged with. That murder remained unsolved until last year, when Black Israelite John Armstrong, also known as Yokonon Israel, was charged. And finally Rozier also was charged in the murder of Cicala this March. He will be tried later this year.

Well, Blacks will be Blacks, and they, at least, understand that we're engaged in a race war. But that's our fault, really. We shouldn't have brought them here. As soon as we rectify that mistake a big part of the war will be over. Meanwhile, there's not much point in our being angry at Blacks or shooting one or two of them here and there, a la Benjamin Smith. That's just foolishness. What we need to win this war is self-discipline: iron self-discipline, and Benjamin Smith didn't have it.

We also need knowledge of the sort I try to disseminate with these broadcasts. If we are to make intelligent decisions about the world around us and about our future, we need to know that hundreds of White Americans have been ritually murdered by members of Black religious groups during the past 25 years. Even more do we need to know that news of these murders has been suppressed by the Jewish news media, and we need to understand why this news has been suppressed. We need to know what the Jews and their political, ideological, and religious allies are aiming for when they deliberately suppress the news of the mass murders of Whites by the Death Angels of the Nation of Islam and the Black Hebrew Israelite followers of Yahweh ben Yahweh, while filling our television screens day after day with the details of Benjamin Smith's killing of one Black and one Asian. We need to know these things if we are not simply to be led like lambs to the slaughter.

Knowledge and discipline, those are the keys to our survival as a people: knowledge of what is really happening in the world and why, and the self-discipline to deal collectively and effectively with the very real threats to the future of our people, rather than expressing our frustration in foolish and undisciplined acts of premature violence. And if our knowledge leads us to anger, to rage of the sort that I felt while living in Washington and of the sort that Benjamin Smith presumably felt while attending the very Politically Correct University of Indiana, let us direct that rage not at the random Black or Asian on the street, but rather at the evil creatures who planned the government policies which are putting more and more Blacks and Asians on our streets, policies which are leading America into becoming a non-White country in the next few decades. Let us direct our rage at the evil creatures who conspire to keep our people ignorant of

the real dangers around them by suppressing the news of the Zebra murders and the Black Hebrew Israelite murders.

And if we sometimes feel ourselves frustrated by the willful ignorance of the lemmings and by the malice of those among our people who have cast their lot with our people's enemies, let us remember that it is we who are becoming stronger, not they; let us remember that more and more of our people are understanding what is happening and are drawing the correct conclusions. Let us remember that with growing knowledge and growing self-discipline among our people, we -- not they -- will prevail.

The Division of America

An interesting thing is happening in America: the country is moving in two directions at the same time.

On the one hand there's the Clinton coalition, moving ever more boldly into the feel-good realm of greater and greater permissiveness, of homosexuality, of feminine values and attitudes, of multiculturalism and "diversity." This is the part of America which cheered the bombing of Serbia and which supports the concept of a New World Order telling everyone everywhere how to run his life. This is the part of America which is looking forward happily to the continued darkening of America, the part that believes things will be much better when there no longer is a White majority. This is the part of America which believes in equality and democracy and brotherhood; it is the trendy, fashionable, materialistic, consumption-oriented part of America, the narcissistic and individualist part, the "me generation" of all ages.

And on the other hand there's the rest of White America. It's the part of White America that not only didn't vote for Clinton and doesn't approve of the way he's running the country, but which is appalled -- which is horrified -- that such a person could have become their President. It's the part of White America which has not accepted that America should be a policeman for the world, waging war on countries whose internal policies the New World Order trendies don't like. It's the part of White America which has not accepted the notion that homosexuality is okay, that same-sex marriages are okay, that homosexuals should be able to adopt children and raise them in accord with their own perversity. It's the part of White America which does not believe in sending women into combat or in keeping our borders open to the Third World. It's the part of White America which does not believe that it's more important to have more diversity and multiculturalism in our schools than it is to maintain rigorous performance standards. It's the part of White America which has resisted the notion that everything White, male, and heterosexual is suspect; the part which is beginning to become a little cynical about the use of the word "hate" by the controlled media to label everything which is not Politically Correct.

Now, this part of America isn't moving as a whole anywhere. Most of the people in this part of America are in a state of culture shock; they're still trying to figure out what happened to the America they used to know and love. To the extent that this part of America is going anywhere, it is supplying a growing trickle of recruits to a resistance movement which is in part an underground army and in part a forum for dissidents.

This growing separation of two parts of America may not look the same from everyone's point of view, and to some it may not be apparent at all. What I see, however, is two simultaneous movements away from the center, away from the old status quo. I see on the one hand the part which for the sake of simplicity I'll just call the "Clinton coalition" -- and please understand that I'm using the terms "Clinton coalition" and "Clintonistas" in a generic sense now, not just to refer to the current gang but also to their predecessors of the same ilk -- I see the Clinton coalition becoming ever more outrageous, ever more arrogant and audacious, ever more self-confident and unrestrained; and on the other hand I see the accelerating growth of the organization I head, the National Alliance, and I see a growing response to these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts.

Now, the way I've described this phenomenon, in a sense I've cast myself and the part of America to which I belong in the role of reactionaries: the Clinton coalition has been pushing policies we don't like, and we have reacted to them. I guess I'd rather be able to think of myself as a revolutionary than as a reactionary, but the truth of the matter is that if the Clinton gang hadn't been pushing policies 30 years ago which I saw as policies which would destroy my race and the civilization we built, I would have remained a physics professor. I became a dissident, I became an activist, in reaction to these destructive policies which were being promoted by the Clinton gang back in the 1960s. They were the revolutionaries; I was the reactionary.

Having become a dissident, however, I eventually went quite far beyond merely resisting the policies of the Clinton gang. I thought about the underlying flaws in our society and in our system of government and in our prevailing ideology and lifestyle which had allowed the Clinton gang to get into a position where it could do us so much damage. Instead of defending the center, I became a revolutionary myself, determined that we must not only defeat the Clintonistas and take power away from them, but that we must restructure our society, restructure our government, restructure our way of thinking and of living so that the enemies of our people could not gain power over us again. So while the Clinton gang continued to move away from the center in one direction, I began moving away from the center in another direction -- and now many more people than in previous years also have stopped trying merely to defend the center and are moving away from it with me. Many more people have stopped being reactionaries and are becoming revolutionaries instead. This is the phenomenon which I want to talk about today, this accelerating moving away from the center, this accelerating separation of two parts of America.

There are many different viewpoints from which one can look at this phenomenon. Let me describe for you a film I saw last week which casts light on it from one viewpoint. The film was made in 1995, but it took me four years to get around to seeing it. It's called *Pure Race*, and it's a more or less standard hate-propaganda film of the sort Hollywood has been churning out for the past 15 years or so in an effort to persuade the couch potatoes that anyone who doesn't have Politically Correct ideas on racial matters is a dangerous psychopath. It steals a number of ideas from other propaganda films in the same genre, such as *Betrayal* and *Into the Heartland*, both of which came out a few years ago. In fact, *Pure Race* is chock full of the standard liberal clichés. The film looks at America from the Clintonista viewpoint, and what it says, essentially, is that you can't trust anyone who isn't a Politically Correct urban liberal. White people in small towns and rural areas are likely to be dangerous, racist thugs.

The two co-protagonists in the film, a White university student and a Black university student, are driving together through the Pacific Northwest, heading back to school, and they have a flat tire in rural Idaho, where Blacks are not welcome. The two are kidnapped by a neo-Nazi gang, the leader of which is the mayor of the nearest town, and a prominent member of which is a local sheriff's deputy, and they are turned loose in the woods to be hunted down and killed by the heavily armed neo-Nazis for sport.

Well, that's part of what the film *Pure Race* says. It also tells viewers that Blacks really are superior to Whites in every way, especially in their attractiveness to pretty White girls, and that we certainly shouldn't be resentful about that. One young White man who objects to the Black

co-protagonist making a pass at his girlfriend gets a well-deserved beating from the Black. The White co-protagonist, of the liberal-wimp variety, slavishly admires the Black both for his successful pass at the White girl and for beating up her White boyfriend.

Now, the Jews and their allies make films like *Pure Race* because the films serve their purpose. They do make Politically Correct urban liberal viewers suspicious of White people who live in small towns in places like Idaho or West Virginia. They do convince White university students of the liberal-wimp variety that it's okay for Blacks to date White girls, and that anyone who objects ought to get beaten up. If the films didn't serve this purpose the Jews wouldn't keep making them.

My reaction to the film was that one of the first things to be done when America is restored to health is to hunt down everyone who ever has had anything to do with making one of these anti-White hate propaganda films and deal with him appropriately. And I know that a great many other White Americans would at the very least be angered by this film. The portrayals in these Jewish hate propaganda films aimed at the urban couch potatoes are starker than they used to be a few years ago. The propaganda is more blatant. The films are less subtle. And that's because the gap between the two Americas is widening. The films don't have to be as subtle as they used to be in order to be effective with their intended audience.

Well, that's one viewpoint. Last night I saw another hate propaganda film: a much, much more subtle propaganda film than *Pure Race.* The film I saw last night was a fairly new one. The name was *American History X.* When this film first appeared a few months ago there was quite a bit of soul-searching and hand-wringing among the Jews and their allies. Many of them thought that it was too subtle, that it might send the wrong message to many viewers. They were afraid that by pretending to be objective, by pretending to be evenhanded in its portrayal of Whites and Blacks, it might confirm some Whites in their prejudices.

Well, in case you haven't seen the film yet, I'll describe it for you. The protagonist in *American History X* is a skinhead in a working-class family in California: a bright and articulate skinhead named Derek, who is a natural leader. Derek's father is a fireman who is murdered by Blacks while trying to put out a fire in a crack house in a Black neighborhood. And I must say for this film, that it does a better job than any other film I have seen recently of portraying the grim realities of life for young people growing up in the multicultural cesspool that the Clintonistas have made of California.

Anyway, the Black gangs and the intimidation of White kids by Blacks in the schools are portrayed with stark realism in *American History X.* Watching the film helps one understand why many White kids from working-class families who are forced to attend the multiculturalized schools in our cities become skinheads. They do it in order to survive. The White kids have been abandoned by the adult establishment, which in order to be Politically Correct must pretend that going to school with Blacks is a wonderful, culturally enriching experience. So the White kids join skinhead gangs so that they can protect themselves from the Blacks.

Early in the film a gang of armed Blacks come by Derek's house at night to steal his truck from his driveway. Derek surprises them and engages in a shootout with them which leaves two of the

Blacks dead. Derek is sent off to prison for three years under the theory that he used excessive force in preventing the theft of his truck. While in prison he finds protection from the Black prison gangs by hanging out with a White gang. But when Derek criticizes the White gang's drug dealing, he is savagely brutalized and raped by them to teach him a lesson. After that, without the protection of his fellow Whites he is afraid that the Black gangs will kill him, but a Black prisoner he has been assigned to work with in the prison laundry saves his life by putting out the word to the other Blacks that Derek is not to be hurt.

To make a long story short, when Derek finishes his three years in prison he is a changed man. He has learned from his experience in prison that not all of his fellow Whites are good, and not all Blacks are bad: not all of them are against him. He is determined to get his younger brother, whom he loves dearly, out of the skinhead scene. But it's too late. His younger brother has made the mistake earlier of standing up to a Black thug who was stomping a smaller White boy in the school bathroom, and at the end of the film the Black thug comes back to school with a pistol and murders Derek's brother.

So the message of *American History X* is not that Blacks are superior and Politically Incorrect Whites are psychopathic thugs, which is the message of *Pure Race.* The message of *American History X* is that some Whites are bad and some Blacks are good: that it's not simply a matter of good Whites and bad Blacks. We see the effect of this message on Derek. It confuses him to the point that he decides to opt out of the very real war going on between Blacks and Whites. He fought in the war and it cost him dearly. He won't fight any longer. He just wants his own family to be safe. He wouldn't have gone to prison, and his brother would still be alive if they hadn't resisted. The message of *American History X* is that we should not resist.

And undoubtedly in this feminized society in which we live today that message will be effective with some people. What the hate propagandists are telling us with *American History X* is, yes, it's a rough, dangerous world out there, but you mustn't try to resist it on the basis of race. Because, you see, there are some very bad White people, and there are some decent Black people. So don't resist. It won't do any good. You'll just get hurt. Just let the process of multiculturalization continue. Just go with the flow and try to make the best of it. Don't resist.

Well, well, well! As if we needed Hollywood to tell us that some White people are bad, and some Blacks are not! Now, for those who are not hopelessly confused by this revelation like Derek was and therefore are not inclined to throw up your hands and surrender, let me carry the message of *American History X* a step further than its producers intended. Yes, it's a war zone out there, and perhaps you will be more likely to be hurt if you don't surrender. But you know, America wasn't always such a multicultural cesspool. The schools in our cities weren't always infested with Black gangs. Even places like Los Angeles used to be decent, safe, wholesome communities for White families to live. It used to be that White kids didn't get stomped by Black thugs in the school bathrooms. It used to be that one didn't have to worry about Blacks stealing one's truck from the driveway at night -- not even in Los Angeles. In fact there didn't even used to be White drug gangs like the one in the prison Derek was sent to -- there didn't use to be such gangs before our whole society became the cesspool that it is today. I mean, there was a time when not even the Mafia would deal in drugs, because drug dealing was considered a "dirty" business.

And the situation is getting worse. The non-Whites are continuing to flood in. California is becoming darker and darker, a less and less tenable place for young Whites to grow up. All of America is becoming darker. White people are losing ground everywhere: in our cities, in our suburbs, in our schools, in our armed forces. Non-White immigrants are continuing to pour into the country. The handouts and the favoritism toward non-Whites continues. The governments in Washington and in every statehouse in the country and in the larger city halls are becoming more and more corrupt.

Throughout our history our ancestors responded to situations like this by fighting, the way Derek and his brother did in the beginning of the film *American History X*. We fought our way up from barbarism. We built a civilization. We established a system of justice for our people. We brought order out of chaos. And we fought every step of the way. We fought the Huns and the Moors and the Mongols and the Turks. We built a civilization in Europe in which we knew how to deal with White thugs like those who brutalized Derek in prison. We didn't pamper them or send a social worker out to talk to them. We hanged them. We got rid of them.

We came to America and we fought the Indians. The White settlers here did not submit to the Indians' atrocities against our women and children. And we did not throw up our hands and surrender when we realized that some of the Indians were friendly -- that not every Indian was in the habit of kidnapping White settlers and torturing them to death in horrible ways. We didn't quit when it dawned on us that we would have a hard fight ahead of us to civilize North America. We fought! We civilized the continent. We built a country where we could live and work, where we could go to school and raise our families in a decent and safe environment: no Black gangs, no Asian gangs, no Hispanic gangs, no drugs, no drive-by shootings, no flood of non-Whites pouring into the country, no Bill Clintons in the White House. It was our America. We fought for it, and we built it.

And then perhaps we let down our guard. We relaxed too much. And so here we are in 1999, with our civilization under attack and losing ground on all fronts. The interesting thing about *American History X* is that the skinhead hero, Derek, understood and enunciated all of these things at the beginning of the film. He fought, in the only way he knew how to fight in his environment and with his background, and that was right and good. Of course, we can't win this war with an army of drunken, undisciplined, carousing skinheads. But at least, the message of the film -- its moral -- was good up to this point. But then the film revealed its true nature as a hate-propaganda film when it had the hero discover that there are bad Whites and good Blacks and decide, therefore, that he no longer could fight for White civilization, that it was bad to resist those who are destroying America.

And I guess that propaganda message will be effective with some people -- but not as many, I believe, as the producers hoped. I believe that many viewers will go the next step, without my having to explain it to them, and will say to themselves, yes, life is not so simple, but the fact is that we are in a war, and we are losing; conditions are becoming worse. And it is not in our nature to surrender. The only way that we can have a better future for our people is to fight, not give up like Derek did.

And that's the division of America that I see now. I see more people than before understanding that we must fight, even as others are persuaded to surrender. And I do hope that most of you in my audience today will understand that we must fight and will choose to fight with me for a better future.

Enemies of Liberty

It has been said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. That makes sense to me. I believe it's true. But it certainly isn't good news for America. It's not good news because eternal vigilance is simply too high a price for most Americans today. They're not willing to pay that much for liberty.

I mean, think about it. Vigilance means paying attention to what's happening in the world. It means trying to understand what's happening. One might even have to get up off the couch, turn off the TV for a few minutes, and think. It might even mean missing the Sunday game! Really, that's asking too much of the average American voter. I mean, why should he trouble himself to be vigilant when he's got his buddy Bill up there in Washington to keep an eye on things for him? Surely, if anything important comes up, someone he can trust, like Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather or Peter Jennings will warn him about it and tell him exactly what opinion he should have on it. The fact is, he has put off his own responsibility for vigilance onto the mass media. He expects them to be vigilant for him.

You may detect a hint of sarcasm in my voice, but indeed, I am not exaggerating the situation. The average White American hasn't an idea in his head that didn't come from his television receiver. The notion of the average American being vigilant is simply ridiculous. But you know, that really doesn't worry him a bit. He's not interested in liberty, so why should he care about being vigilant? What he's interested in is, when does the next ball game come on? Is there any more beer in the refrigerator? When's supper?

And in America we let these people vote! We put our liberty in their hands. So perhaps we have no right to complain when someone else takes our liberty from the uncaring hands of America's White majority. But if you don't mind, I'll complain a bit anyway. Perhaps some members of the minority of White Americans who are vigilant and who do care about liberty will find some interest in what I have to say.

For a long time there has been a very close relationship between the mass news media and various specifically Jewish propaganda organizations. I've spoken about the dominant Jewish role in America's mass media many times in my broadcasts, and I won't bore you with a repetition of that again today: the names of the people who own the major Hollywood film studios, the *New York Times*, and so on. But you know, it goes beyond Jewish ownership of much of the mass media. There are, for example, still many newspapers in America which are not owned by Jews. There are independent radio and television stations. But the special relationship between the Jews and the media applies to most of these nominally "independent" media as well as to the media actually owned by Jews. Let me give you a very specific and very current example of the way this Jewish relationship works. What have you been seeing on television and reading in the newspapers about Serbia since the NATO invasion of that country about six weeks ago? You've been seeing NATO soldiers giving candy bars to smiling Albanian children. You've seen NATO soldiers presiding over the reopening of the Pristina city hall. You've seen NATO soldiers bringing law and order -- bringing peace -- to Serbia's Kosovo province, now that those nasty Serb soldiers and policemen who had been terrorizing everyone

and committing all sorts of atrocities have been chased out of the province. That, in fact, is what virtually all of the news media have been telling Americans. There were a few shootings and burnings after NATO first moved in, but NATO pretty quickly got things under control and has kept the KLA from making trouble.

Now I will read you a news release put out by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency a couple of weeks ago. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency, identified by the abbreviation JTA, is a news agency which operates much like the Associated Press or Reuters or other news agencies, except that it is an all-Jewish agency and it gathers news of special interest to Jews. The news gathered and reported by the JTA is not secret. Other news agencies or newspapers or news magazines can subscribe to JTA's news and publish it. And many of them do. But they do so selectively. They use only the news which fits, and I'm sure that you understand what I mean by that. Anyway, here's a JTA report written by Ruth Gruber and datelined Rome, July 5. It's headlined: "Albanian Leader Promises to Prevent Revenge Attacks on Jews." It reads:

The leader of Kosovar Albanians issued a written promise to safeguard Kosovo's Jews and their property. Hashim Thaci met twice in recent days with a special envoy of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Eli Eliezri, to whom he issued a letter ordering "the entire Kosovo Liberation Army under my control to respect and protect all the Jews of Kosovo." The KLA, the letter said, "will also protect and preserve the property of the Jews of Kosovo whether they are present at the moment in Kosovo or are absent and intend to return." It also guaranteed safety to representatives of the [Jewish] Joint Distribution Committee. Despite the assurances, members of Kosovo's tiny Jewish community, commonly identified as Serbs, remain under threat of revenge attacks from Kosovar Albanians. Speaking to JTA from Tel Aviv, Eliezri said that the situation in Kosovo remained chaotic and dangerous for anyone not of Albanian ethnicity and not speaking Albanian. Heavily armed paramilitary vigilantes target and threaten such people, including Jews, as Serbs or Serb sympathizers.... The average Kosovar Albanian, Eliezri said, identifies Kosovar Jews, who do not speak Albanian, as Serbs.... "The government wants to control people, but they haven't succeeded yet," he said, adding that Kosovo's Jews are being threatened and ordered to leave their homes "all the time."

Well, this JTA report goes on to describe a few specific instances of Jews in Kosovo being threatened and ordered to leave their homes by gangs of armed Albanians. And of course, you haven't heard a word of the news in this JTA report. You haven't seen any of it in the mainstream news media. One of the reasons is that it doesn't fit. It doesn't fit the picture of smiling Albanian children accepting candy bars from NATO soldiers. It informs us that while everything in Kosovo may be all smiles for Albanians and NATO troops on camera, off camera life is hell for the Serbs, with gangs of armed Albanians threatening them and ordering them out of their homes as the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo proceeds under NATO jurisdiction.

Beyond that, let's just think for a moment about what this JTA report tells us. Let's think about what it reveals to us about the Jews. In the first place, note that the Jews are complaining that the Albanians mistake them for Serbs because, like the Serbs among whom they live, most of the Jews don't speak Albanian -- which, incidentally, is a language quite distinct from any other spoken in Europe; the only people who speak it are the Albanians themselves. Many of these Jews have lived in Serbia for generations; they speak the language of the Serbs; they are

mistaken for Serbs; but they are not Serbs; they are Jews. And this is not a religious distinction. Most of these Jews have no religion. Under Tito they were virtually all communists and were riding relatively high.

There's nothing startling about any of this. It is a fact that the Jews live for generations among another people -- the Serbs, for example -- speak the language of the other people, are mistaken for the other people, but remain entirely distinct. They are Jews, period. They feel absolutely no sense of loyalty or belonging to the country in which they were born or to the people among whom they live. They aren't concerned with the fact that the Albanians are terrorizing their Serb neighbors. The Jews of the Joint Distribution Committee in the United States and in Israel aren't concerned about the Serbs either. They are concerned only about protecting Jews and their property. And reminding the head KLA thug of the Jews' worldwide connections and of their control over the media in the United States is enough to convince him that the Jews in Kosovo should get favored treatment, that the Jews should be respected and protected while their Serb neighbors are raped, looted, and killed.

So one can imagine how things go now in Serbia's NATO-occupied Kosovo province. A gang of armed thugs kicks in your apartment door at four o'clock in the morning and begins ripping off your wife's nightclothes and grabbing the silverware. You inform them that you are a Jew, not a Serb and perhaps show them some unspecified proof of that fact, and they turn your wife loose, give your silverware back to you, and apologize for their mistake. You point out to them that the family living next door are genuine Serbs, and so they kick in your neighbor's door while you tidy up your apartment and smile at the screams coming from the next apartment. And some people still wonder why the Jews are so hated!

Why is this significant? Because in America we are taught that the only difference between us and the Jews is that the Jews have a different religion. We are taught that, aside from this religious difference, they are just like us, just as American, just as loyal, just as patriotic. So draw your own conclusions. It's clear enough that one of the reasons the mass media in America didn't print the JTA report I read to you is that the media bosses are afraid that you might draw some conclusions from it.

And remember, that is true of virtually all of the mainstream media bosses in America, including those who are not Jews. This special deal between the Jews and the KLA reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency is relevant news, it was available to all of the mainstream media, but none of them would touch it because it tells people things about the Jews that the Jews prefer they not know. That in itself ought to be enough to worry a vigilant American. But before we try to decide what this means, let's consider some more evidence. Let's look at the special relationship which exists between various Jewish organizations in this country and virtually all of the mainstream media.

The Jewish organizations I'm referring to now are those which serve primarily as openly recognized Jewish propaganda and lobbying organizations: organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center. All of the mainstream media routinely refer to these groups as "respected human rights organizations" and take an uncritical -- almost a worshipful -- attitude toward them. Any press

release issued by one of these outfits is regarded as gospel and is quoted without question or reservation.

Shortly after the Oklahoma City bombing the Southern Poverty Law Center sent out a fund-raising letter to its supporters and a press release to the media claiming that it was keeping an eye on "over 200" armed and dangerous militia groups in the United States and implied that these militias were somehow responsible for the bombing. The media all quoted this figure of "over 200" militia groups without question and suggested that the Southern Poverty Law Center and its chairman, Morris Dees, were doing America a favor by warning peace-loving Americans of the militia danger. As a matter of fact there have never been more than a dozen genuine militia groups operating in the United States at any one time -- if one specifies that a genuine militia is one with at least 10 active members and some sort of military organizational structure which actually holds meetings and engages in military practice of some sort. Not one of these groups poses any conceivable threat to the public, although occasionally a militia member who likes to collect weapons may get himself in trouble by being caught with an unregistered machine gun or the like. Militias don't even pose a real threat to crooks like Morris Dees, but the media nevertheless collaborate enthusiastically with the Southern Poverty Law Center and other Jewish propaganda groups in raising money from a befuddled public by helping these groups portray militias as a public menace.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith -- ADL for short -- is a group similar to the Southern Poverty Law Center, and it also makes its money by peddling hate and fear to the public with the eager and uncritical assistance of the mainstream news media. Like the Southern Poverty Law Center, the ADL fabricates bogeymen, concocts phoney "hate crimes," and distorts facts to suit its fundraising needs. It has repeatedly fed information to the news media it knew to be false: information which the media easily could have checked and found to be false, but instead has published without question. Whenever something happens which can be useful to the hatemongering and fearmongering of these Jewish propaganda groups -- the drive-by shooting of a Black and a Korean by a young White man in Chicago earlier this month, arson committed against three synagogues in California last month -- all of these groups are ready with self-serving statements to the media, and the media always are ready to be of service to them.

It would be bad enough if these Jewish groups the media so eagerly front for were merely in the direct-mail fundraising business, but many of them also are involved in far more sinister activity. Police agencies are familiar with the ADL's ties to organized crime, for example, but the American public isn't, because the mainstream media carefully avoid mentioning these ties. In 1985 the ADL gave its annual "Torch of Liberty" award to Jewish organized-crime boss Moe Dalitz at a banquet honoring him for the millions of dollars in gang loot he has poured into the ADL. Moe Dalitz was at that time the gang boss of Las Vegas and made his money in gambling, loansharking, prostitution, and contract murder. Later the ADL was involved in the corruption of police departments and the theft of thousands of confidential police files on people the ADL was interested in. Search warrants were obtained, and the ADL's offices in Los Angeles and San Francisco were raided by police to recover the stolen files, but the average American never had a chance to learn about these criminal activities, because most of the media suppressed the news and continued referring to the ADL as a "respected human rights organization." I mean really, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is engaged in large-scale criminal activities,

including the corruption of police agencies around the country, it gives awards to notorious organized-crime bosses in return for donations of criminal loot, and the mainstream media continue to tell the public that the ADL is a "respected human rights" organization and continue to parrot whatever the ADL has to say about someone like the Chicago shooter Benjamin Smith and the church to which he belonged. It's surreal.

And the gangsterism of the ADL is by no means exceptional in the ranks of these "respected human rights" organizations. Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center is hardly better. With the adoring support of the mass media, Dees has combined barratry with fraudulent fundraising to build up a fortune estimated at $100 million. Despite his media support, it hasn't been an entirely smooth ride for Dees, however. He orchestrated a courtroom circus when he was defending a Black female communist who had stabbed a White jailer to death in North Carolina, and he was charged by the judge with attempting to suborn the perjury of a key witness in the case.

Some of his former associates are especially strong in their condemnation of Morris Dees. One lawyer, Courtney Mullin, who has worked with Dees says that Dees is not just immoral, he's amoral. He says that the Southern Poverty Law Center under Dees is an "evil" institution. Another former Dees associate, Atlanta lawyer Millard Farmer, calls Dees and his Southern Poverty Law Center "a Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker operation." The problem is that while Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker got caught and sent to prison, Dees is still being quoted by the mass media as a "respected human rights activist." Really.

Dees is perhaps best characterized by the depositions filed in the Alabama Court of Appeals in connection with his divorce from his second wife, Maureen Bass. These sworn depositions describe Dees's bisexual activity and his sexual molesting of his young stepdaughter and leave the reader convinced that his associate Courtney Mullin's description of him as "amoral" is right on target. Despite all of this, statements put out by Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center in connection with the drive-by shootings in Chicago have been quoted by virtually all of the major news media in recent weeks, of course giving Dees's self-serving spin to the news.

So now I've just discussed two aspects of the way the mass media in America inform the American people about what's going on in the world. I quoted a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report containing news with very interesting implications about the Jewish role in our affairs -- a report which was avoided by all of the mass media because of those implications. And I've described the slavish dependence of the media on the biased and falsified reports issued by Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Southern Poverty Law Center. These are just two illustrations. Next week I'll provide more illustrations.

But today's illustrations are enough, I believe, to persuade most thoughtful people that we have a serious problem with our mass media. And as I indicated earlier, that problem goes beyond the mere fact of Jewish ownership or control of a vastly disproportionate share of the mass media. What we have is a lockstep ideological orthodoxy which has permeated all of the media. They all follow the Jewish party line, whether they are owned by Jews or not. They all suppress Politically Incorrect news, and they all willingly propagate the lies of Jewish propaganda organizations, such as the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center.

In a free society the most important single function of the mass media is not to bring ball games to the masses, and it should not be simply to make money for the media bosses: the essential function of the mass media is to be diligent and responsible bearers of the vigilance which the masses themselves are incapable of bearing. In America the mass media not only do not serve that function, they consciously and deliberately misinform the people. By so doing they all have become enemies of liberty.

Kennedy, Barak, and Revolution

As much as possible I try to base my commentary on current events -- on things which people presumably are thinking about because they have been covered recently by the mainstream news media. Last week, unfortunately, there was hardly anything on the television screens besides scenes of the public lamentation, breast-beating, and garment-rending associated with the latest death in America's rottenest family -- well, second rottenest. I am sure that something newsworthy must have happened during the week, but it was crowded out by the Kennedy circus.

I was amazed at the extent of the spectacle: the expressions of grief from all the major politicians and media celebrities, the sidewalk interviews with the lemmings and couch potatoes of various hues who had come out to gawk at the empty Kennedy apartment in New York. It was as if the emperor had died, when in fact it was only an arrogant, puffed-up rich boy who published a slick, shallow, yuppie magazine as a hobby. It reminded me a bit of the public and media reaction to the death of Princess Di last year. She also was a bird-brained non-entity, but she was rich and glamorous, and the rabble identified with her -- as apparently also with John Kennedy, and so the media and the politicians played along. Or maybe it was the other way around. Some media spokesmen even gushed that the Kennedys are "America's royal family." This reaction to Kennedy's death is an interesting phenomenon which may merit some commentary later.

All I could think about at the time, however, was that taking a ride with a Kennedy has been bad luck for a number of young women. I guess some people still remember Mary Jo Kopechne and Chappaquiddick, but one never hears about the 17-year-old girl whose back was broken when a car driven by another drunken Kennedy overturned. Well, having enough money to pay off the families of drowned and crippled girls has been important to the Kennedys, I guess. At least, this time the responsible party didn't survive to kill or cripple again.

The big news immediately before the Kennedy circus was the triumphal visit of Ehud Barak to the United States. All of the politicians in Washington were scrambling to do homage. There was one state dinner or diplomatic banquet after another for the visiting potentate from Israel. Bill Clinton followed him around like an obedient puppy. This toad-like little Hebrew with his barely intelligible English was being presented by the media as the great hope for peace in the Middle East: a wonderful improvement, we were told, over the previous top Hebrew, Benyamin Netanyahu. How many times before have we heard this line?

Well, there's no need for me to go into the details of Barak's grand tour over here. I'm sure that all of you saw that on television until you were sick of it. The Barak visit does serve to remind us of the absolute and total corruption of the gang running our country, however. On July 18 Barak was interviewed on NBC's program "Meet the Press." During that interview he announced that none of the Palestinian refugees who had fled from their homes during Israeli ethnic cleansing programs would be permitted to return. That announcement received nothing but smiles from the interviewers, and later it received nothing but smiles from Bill Clinton, Madeleine Albright, and other members of the Clinton gang, who still were patting themselves on the back for having

bombed Serbia into submission, ostensibly so that Albanian refugees could return to their homes in Serbia's Kosovo province.

The Clinton gang would like for everyone to believe that its war against Serbia was based on its opposition to ethnic cleansing and its determination not to let the Serbs get away with chasing Albanians back to Albania. But when the Jews in Israel do exactly what the Serbs are accused of doing -- only more so, because whereas the Serbs chased Albanians out of Serbia and back to Albania, the Jews had chased Palestinians out of Palestine in order to seize Palestinian land -- when the Jews engage in ethnic cleansing the Clinton gang has not even a reprimand for them. Instead Mr. Clinton told Barak during his visit that he would give him $1.2 billion from the U.S. Treasury to compensate Israel for the expenses involved in administering conquered Palestinian territory. Mr. Clinton didn't announce this to the American taxpayers who'll get the bill for this latest handout to Israel. Instead he whispered it to Barak, who told the Israeli media, which trumpeted the news triumphantly to the Jews of Israel in the Hebrew-language press over there. The $1.2 billion from the American taxpayers will be used to build roads linking illegal Jewish settlements in Palestinian territory and to provide additional military security for those illegal settlements, according to the Israeli newspaper *Yediot Ahronot.* Finally the news appeared in a few newspapers in this country, quoting *Yediot Ahronot.*

There's other news relative to the Clinton-Barak relationship which never has appeared in the controlled media over here. For example, there's the growing status in Israel of the tomb of mass-murderer Baruch Goldstein. It has become an Israeli national shrine, a sort of second Wailing Wall, with thousands of religious Jews flocking there to worship and pay their respects. Baruch Goldstein, remember, is the Jew from Brooklyn who went to Israel so obsessed with Jewish racial hatred against the Palestinians that he slaughtered 29 of them in February 1994 while they were praying at the Ibrahimi mosque in Hebron. Goldstein sneaked up behind the Palestinians while they were kneeling in prayer and opened fire with an assault rifle, killing 29 of them and wounding another 60. The armed Jewish guards outside the mosque did not try to stop him nor did they think it odd for a Jew to carry an assault rifle into a mosque. In Israel many Jews carry assault rifles in public; it is only in America that the Jews want to ban assault rifles. Goldstein was killed by the surviving, unarmed Palestinians in the mosque while he was attempting to reload his rifle.

Goldstein became an instant national hero to the Jews, and many Jewish tourists from America make a pilgrimage to his tomb near Hebron. The tomb bears an inscription in Hebrew which in English reads: "He gave his life for the people of Israel, its Torah, and its land." The growing number of tourists and religious Jews attracted to Goldstein's tomb has caused a public debate in Israel: on the one hand there are the Israelis who are worried that the public worship of a mass-murderer might not be good for Israel's image in the United States if the *goyim* -- the Gentiles -- who are financing Israel through their foreign aid payments ever find out what's going on, and on the other hand there are those Israelis who want to see the Goldstein cult continue to grow because they are certain that the *goyim* are too stupid ever to find out what's going on.

This debate has been reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency from time to time during the past five years, but the controlled mass media in the United States have carefully avoided the issue. Mr. Clinton, of course, was fully aware of this debate during Barak's visit -- he is briefed

daily on such matters by the National Security Agency and the CIA -- but he certainly did not raise the issue with Barak during the latter's visit. Instead Clinton was very busy urging the Congress to enact an expanded "hate crimes" law that every Jewish group in the United States has been demanding. I suppose that it would have been insensitive of Clinton to raise the Baruch Goldstein issue at a time when the Jews were all beating the drums for more severe punishments for Gentiles who commit so-called "hate crimes." Anyway, he didn't.

Another Israeli issue which has been kept out of the mass media in America and out of the public consciousness here is what the Israelis are doing in Lebanon these days. Israel, of course, still maintains an occupation army inside southern Lebanon which has been there since Israel's murderous invasion of that country in 1982. The Israelis also finance, arm, and give orders to a gang of Christian Lebanese cut-throats called the Southern Lebanese Army, or SLA. The SLA does much of Israel's dirty work of terror and assassination in southern Lebanon. One of the regular tasks the Jews have assigned to the SLA is the kidnapping of hostages, who are held in a concentration camp in southern Lebanon until such time as the Jews may want to engage in a prisoner exchange with one or another group of Palestinian or Islamic freedom fighters. The Jews refer to these kidnap victims as "bargaining chips." The camp where the SLA keeps the hostages for the Israelis is notorious in Lebanon for the torture which takes place there. Occasionally hostages escape or are exchanged for Mossad agents who have been caught in any Middle Eastern country, and these former hostages have told their stories to journalists in other countries. They also have told their stories to American journalists, but these stories are never permitted to appear in print in America. Most Americans don't even realize that the Israelis still have an occupation army on Lebanese territory. But we all heard Ehud Barak congratulate Bill Clinton for his role in stamping out what Barak referred to as "Serb aggression." That "aggression," of course, was the Serb effort to restore order inside their own country after an insurrection by the so-called "Kosovo Liberation Army." It's nice to see that Mr. Barak has plenty of what the Jews proudly call *"chutzpah."*

None of these things I've just mentioned in relation to Ehud Barak's visit to the United States are ancient history. They are all things which are happening now: Barak's statement that the Palestinian refugees the Jews ethnically cleansed when they seized Palestinian land will not be permitted to return to their homes is a statement about current Israeli policy; the statement was made just a few days ago, while Mr. Clinton was fawning over Mr. Barak and throwing a state banquet for him on the White House lawn. The debate in Israel about whether the growing cult associated with the tomb of mass-murderer Baruch Goldstein is a good thing or not is going on right now and was going on while Barak was making his triumphal tour of the United States. And Palestinian hostages kidnapped by the Southern Lebanon Army at the behest of Israel are being tortured now, today, and Ehud Barak is the man in charge of the kidnapping and torture.

So perhaps you believe I'm reminding you of these things because I like to beat up on Israel. Really, that isn't my principal reason. I don't especially need to beat up on Israel because Israel already is despised by decent and knowledgeable people almost everywhere. Of course, that doesn't include the people in the media and the government in this country, or America's couch potatoes, who don't listen to *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts anyway.

The reason these things I've mentioned today are interesting to us is not because of what they tell us about Israel or Ehud Barak, but because of what they tell us about the mass media and the government here. With the exception of the question about Palestinian refugees which was asked Barak in his July 18 interview on *Meet the Press*, the controlled news media in the United States have kept quiet about all these things. And even Barak's breathtakingly arrogant statement on *Meet the Press* that Palestinian refugees who had been ethnically cleansed by the Israelis would not be permitted to return to their homes -- even this really didn't hurt the Jews appreciably.

To get even the simplest message into the consciousness of the average American voter, it has to be repeated at least 14 times. He needs to have Tom Brokaw explain to him, every night for at least two weeks, that Ehud Barak has the same policy toward refugees that Slobodan Milosevic had, ostensibly the policy for which we bombed Serb schools and Serb hospitals mercilessly before invading Serbia so that we could force the Serbs to permit the return of refugees to their homes. He has to see the disapproving expression on Brokaw's face and hear the disapproving tone in Brokaw's voice to understand that Ehud Barak's policy of ethnic cleansing in Palestine makes Barak a bad man, like it made Milosevic a bad man. He has to see a TV reporter interviewing passersby on the sidewalk and hearing their disapproving opinions before he feels it safe to have a disapproving opinion of Barak's policy himself. And after all of this preparation he then needs to be led by the hand to the conclusion that the sauce which is good for the goose is also good for the gander. He needs to be told explicitly that his government should not be giving billions of dollars every year to Israel for doing the same thing we bombed and invaded Serbia for; that the Clinton administration should not be hosting White House banquets for Ehud Barak while pursuing Slobodan Milosevic as a war criminal. If he's not told these things explicitly and repeatedly the average American voter won't get it.

But Mr. Clinton certainly gets it. Everyone in a policymaking position in the Clinton government gets it. Everyone in an editorial position in the news media gets it. These people are crooked, but they're not stupid. They are criminals, but they do understand what they're doing. And it's important for us to understand that they understand what they're doing.

I don't want to insult your intelligence by telling you this 14 times, but I'll tell you just one more time now, because it is important. The government we have in Washington now -- this monstrous thing which has mutated and devolved from the government set up by the Founding Fathers of this country -- cannot and should not be reformed or repaired or salvaged. It should be pulled down and have a stake driven through its heart. Everyone who is a part of it should be dealt with in the same way. You don't reason with people like Bill Clinton and Madeleine Albright. You don't explain to a Senator Kennedy or an Al Gore or to a judge of the Supreme Court or to any other Washington politician or bureaucrat that his policies are harmful to America. He will simply think that you are crazy. I mean, who cares about what's harmful to America? That's completely irrelevant to the people in Washington. If you want to make an impression on anyone in Washington today, you must convince him that you are willing and able either to hurt him or to help him.

That's the way the government works now. Lobbyists attempt to persuade politicians and bureaucrats that it will be to their advantage to adopt the policy favored by the lobbyist -- or to their disadvantage not to adopt it. Politicians bargain with their fellow politicians: you vote for

this, and I'll vote for that. And looming above everything else is the power of the controlled mass media to make or break any career.

Even patriots have played this game, with letter-writing campaigns to the Congress, with donations to lobbying organizations, with rallies for one candidate or another. But to play the game is simply to feed the beast, when what we need to do is kill the beast. And you know, this is not a theoretical discussion. The beast -- the government in Washington -- kills people. It kills our people every day. It starts wars to enforce its will. It fires cruise missiles at those who defy it. And it makes policies which kill us and our kinsmen as surely as one of their bombs or missiles does. The 14 Serb farmers who were slaughtered in their field while trying to bring in their wheat last week were just as surely murdered by the government in Washington which chased the Serb police and the Serb army out of Kosovo province and left the Serbs there at the mercy of KLA gangsters as were the Serb women and children in Belgrade on whom our warplanes dropped cluster bombs a few weeks earlier. The women who are raped by non-Whites in our cities every day, the people who are murdered by non-White criminals every day, are just as much the victims of the Washington government as are the murdered wife and child of Randy Weaver or the murdered church members in Waco. They are victims of the immigration policies and the "diversity" policies and the so-called "civil rights" policies of the government.

The government kills people. And when we play the government's game we become accomplices. We become accessories to murder -- just as surely as the members of the Clinton administration and the members of both parties in the Congress become accessories to the murders committed by Baruch Goldstein when they support the policies of the government of Israel or vote to give money to Israel.

Everybody is familiar with the cliche about politics being a dirty business. Everyone expects politicians to lie and bureaucrats to be hypocrites. And people believe that we just have to put up with this, that this is just something inherent in all government, that there's nothing we can do about it. But that attitude is dangerously wrong. The situation in Washington has gone far beyond the point where we merely get our hands a little dirty when we collaborate with the government. This government is pushing us to the brink. This government is not just corrupt; it is terminally rotten. It is pathological. It is like a mad dog that must be put down -- and soon.

And perhaps it seems that I simply accentuate our impotence as citizens when I say things like that, because none of us individually has the power, the means, to put down this sick and destructive beast in Washington. And I know that some people believe that there's nothing we can do about the government, so we shouldn't waste time talking about it.

Well, even though no one of us can single-handedly drive the stake through its heart, we still can fight the beast, and by fighting it we can bring closer the day when many of us working together finally will be able to drive the stake home. It is useful even now to speak out strongly against the Washington government, to force people to recognize its crookedness and its destructiveness by holding up examples of the sort I have held up today.

Too many people are afraid of the government, afraid that the FBI will get their names on some sort of "enemies list," afraid that the government will retaliate against them the way it did against

Randy Weaver's family. But that is a coward's excuse. We should not be thinking about the ways the government may hurt us; we should be thinking about the ways we can hurt the government and those who collaborate with it. We should make the government fear us. And if enough of us speak out, if enough of us talk just about the things I have touched on today, the government and its collaborators will fear us.

Authoritarianism and Oz

Three weeks ago we talked about the fact that America is divided into two camps that are moving in opposite directions ideologically. I pointed out that on one side is the Clinton coalition, which believes in democracy and equality and "diversity" at any cost and is stampeding happily and mindlessly toward the precipice of a non-White majority in America, and on the other side are the folks who are saying, "Whoa! Going over that precipice is not a good idea!"

All of us can see where the Clinton coalition is headed. Just turn on your television set. The Jewish propaganda is becoming more and more extreme. What the Jews are presenting as the norm today is much, much closer to the precipice than the norm they were presenting 10 years ago, or even five years ago. There is no doubt that they are moving, that they are stampeding the lemmings.

The movement of the people on the other side -- on our side -- away from the center is not as visible to most Americans, because we don't control television. But I see the unmistakable movement, as people who five years ago thought I was too extreme are today joining my organization, the National Alliance. I certainly haven't compromised or softened my position, but more and more perceptive and responsible Americans are realizing that the government in Washington is indeed out of control and is pushing us toward racial annihilation, and they realize that they must take a stand, that they no longer can ignore what's happening. And as I said, I am in a position where I can see this movement in my direction, as more and more of the most perceptive members of our society respond positively to my message.

The Jews, of course, also see this movement in my direction. That's why they make such a media circus out of a trifle like the case of the University of Indiana student Benjamin Smith shooting a Black and a Korean a few weeks ago, while their media ignore much more atrocious crimes which happen every day. That's why they're pushing so hard for firearms confiscation and for laws against what they call "hate speech." If the whole herd were stampeding in the direction the Jews want them to go, the Jews wouldn't get so excited about such matters. But the Jews understand that not everyone is going their way. They understand that more and more people are dropping out of their herd and coming my way, and it worries them; it worries them even though there still are far more people moving their way than my way.

Well, today let's not talk about people who're moving in our direction. Let's talk instead about the people who're the problem. Let's take a closer look at the people who're moving the way the Jews want them to go. And I don't mean the Blacks or the swarms of wetbacks coming across our southern border. I don't mean the growing portion of the population which consists of raceless mongrels, the consequence of the Jews' propaganda for miscegenation during the past generation. I don't even want to consider the portion of the White population which is on the dole and whose only real concern is the size of the checks or the other perks they receive from the government. Let's just look at the able-bodied White men and women who are earning their own keep but who have turned against their own people, their own race, and are going with the Jews.

Some of us have an opportunity to come in contact with such folks on a regular basis at work or in school; we have an opportunity to talk with them and to listen to them talking among themselves, and so we may be able to gain some insight into the way they think, into their values. We may be able to understand what's wrong with them. All of us can watch television, and from that we can see which direction the Jews are pushing these people. And of course, what we see when we watch television is not some big-nosed Hollywood studio boss preaching to us and telling us that we ought to behave in a certain way and think in a certain way. What we see are actors and actresses that the viewers can identify with behaving in the prescribed way and saying the prescribed things.

My own situation does not bring me into close personal contact with many people who follow the Jews, and most of the television that I watch, other than the news, is something that a friend or a listener has recorded and sent to me because he believes that it contains something significant that I should see. But I do have a special window into the enemy camp. I receive a great deal of mail from listeners of every persuasion. Perhaps as much as a quarter of this mail is hostile, and I find it very interesting to read this mail and to try to understand what motivates the writers. Today I'll share with you a few of the tentative conclusions I've reached in this regard. And I stress the word "tentative," because this subject of human motivation is tricky and complex, and I'm not at all sure that what I'll tell you today will be the final word on the matter. And I should caution you that with all complex subjects my approach is to attempt to simplify the subject as much as I can, to try to get my mind around one or two key ideas before I start adding the refinements and complications.

Roughly half of all the hate mail I receive is explicitly Christian in some way. And if we look only at the mail from White haters, and don't even consider the letters from Jews, the Christian hate mail may run as high as 60 per cent. So what does that mean? Does that mean that there is something inherent in Christian doctrine which is responsible?

I don't think so, because 50 or 60 years ago most people who considered themselves Christians were not advocates of the policies the Jews are pushing today. One of my tentative conclusions, after studying a large number of these hate letters with Biblical references or some other Christian slant to them, is that what the writers have in common is a compulsion to think, speak, and behave in an approved manner. Most of these Christian hate letters come from people who are not very sophisticated and not well educated, judging from the ways in which they use the English language.

Of course, that doesn't mean that the people who hate us are all uneducated and unsophisticated. I also receive some hate letters from people who at least think that they are quite sophisticated. Whereas the Christians will tell me that I am going to hell because God hates people who criticize the Jews and then will cite some Bible verse to prove it, the sophisticates -- really, pseudo-sophisticates -- will sneer at me and tell me how stupid I am because I can't get it through my thick skull that all people are equal, that the color of a person's skin has nothing to do with his intelligence or creativity or anything else. And they also will cite some authority to prove their point -- not the Bible, but something they have seen on television or learned in class.

And of course, there are other sorts of hate letters. There are hate letters from the Birch Society types, who tell me that I am a communist because I am a racist and racism is a form of collectivism, just like communism. And these folks also will quote some authority to prove their point.

When I back away from all of these individual hate letters, when I don't think about their individual differences but instead look for common elements, what I see is authoritarianism. I see haters who are angry at me because I'm not marching in lockstep with them toward the precipice. Perhaps I'm misusing the word "authoritarianism." Perhaps other people have a different meaning in mind for the word than I do. I remember that back during the 1960s and 1970s the Jews used the term "authoritarian" as a pejorative. They used it to refer to people who stood in the way of their remaking of America.

The Jews called the people who objected to their pro-Viet Cong demonstrations "authoritarians." They called people who were not in sympathy with their so-called "civil rights" revolution "authoritarians." They called people who refused to adjust their moral standards to the new standards the Jews were pushing "authoritarians." In the 1960s and 1970s an authoritarian was an old-fashioned, not-very-bright person who frowned on the use of LSD and marijuana by high school kids. An authoritarian was a flag-waving Bible-thumper who deplored the changes in sexual mores the Jews were pushing and thought people who burned their draft cards ought to be sent to jail. An authoritarian was an inflexible, humorless, narrow-minded person: a bigot, a hater, a racist, an anti-Semite. He was an Archie Bunker. He was the sort of person who told a hippie to get a haircut and find a job. The Jews made hundreds of Hollywood films during that period in which the villain was an authoritarian.

Now, back during the 1960s I was trying to figure out what was going on. I didn't pay much attention to the psychology of it at that time, but I did notice the type of people the Jews were complaining about and denouncing as "authoritarians," the Archie Bunker type. I certainly wasn't on the Jews' side of what was happening then, but I can't say that I was on the authoritarian side either. I thought that the authoritarians were a little too uptight in their sexual attitudes, for example. I didn't have much sympathy with their Biblical arguments or their Constitutional arguments for opposing the changes the Jews were pushing. My impression was that their resistance to the Jews wasn't guided by much in the way of reason.

The Jews don't complain much about authoritarians these days. They don't bother to ridicule them the way they used to. Archie Bunker did his job and is now in retirement. But as I have been trying to understand the motivations of the people who send me hate letters today, I keep having flashbacks to the 1960s and 1970s, when I saw White Americans standing on street corners and yelling at college students of the Bill Clinton stripe who were marching down the street carrying Viet Cong flags. They would shout things like, "Go to Hanoi, you commie bastard!" The idea that keeps coming to my mind is that the people who were shouting that in the 1960s are the same sort of people who are sending me hate mail today.

I was a lot closer to agreeing with the 1960s-style authoritarians than I am to agreeing with those of the 1990s style. The 1960s authoritarians may not have been very bright, and they were wrong about some things. For example, most of the American college students marching for the Viet

Cong in the 1960s weren't really communists; they were just shallow, spoiled, irresponsible, trendy brats doing what had been made fashionable on their campuses by the Jews. But those 1960s-style authoritarians were not basically destructive. They were not dangerous to our civilization or to our race. They were just pretty much thoughtless defenders of the status quo, defenders of what they had been taught was right and proper.

Today's authoritarians are a different matter. Their psychology may be the same as that of the 1960s authoritarians -- and like the authoritarians of 30 years ago they also aren't very bright -- but their cause is deadly. The 1990s authoritarians are out to destroy our civilization and our race, because they have been taught that that's the right and proper thing to do.

What's really interesting to me about all of this is what it tells us about the nature of our struggle, about what will work for us and what won't work. What won't work is trying to change the ideas or the ideology of most of the White men and women who are dancing to the Jews' tune and heading for the precipice now. We can't change their ideology because they really don't have an ideology. We can't reason with them because their behavior isn't based on reason. They are not defenders of equality and democracy and diversity because they really believe in those things. What they believe in is defending the status quo, defending what they have been persuaded all right-thinking people support and believe in, defending the Great God of the Tube. And of course, they believe in hating anyone who speaks against the Great God of the Tube, anyone who ridicules what the Great God of the Tube teaches, anyone who criticizes those authority figures who speak to them so convincingly from the tube every day.

One cannot change the allegiance of an authoritarian with any sort of reasoned argument. One can, of course, change the authority that he worships. One can change an authoritarian's direction by changing the status quo. Christians write me today and damn me to hell because I refuse to accept the fact that Jesus wants all the races to be mixed together. Christians with the same sort of mentality were writing hate letters 50 or 60 years ago to interracial couples and explaining to them that racial mixing is contrary to God's plan. The Bible hasn't changed. Christianity hasn't changed. But the sold-out preachers and sect leaders -- the authority figures for these Christians -- have changed the way in which they interpret Christianity for their flocks.

Authoritarians are not bad people just because they are authoritarians. In the Middle Ages they burned witches, but in the 1960s they would happily have burned communists. Today they would like to burn White racists. Authoritarians always are defenders of the status quo; they always are worshippers of authority. Whether their role in society is constructive or destructive depends on who the authority figures are. In trying to change authoritarians, one does not argue ideas with them; one changes their authority figures, if one can.

We should note that there also are White people moving in the Jews' direction today who are not authoritarians. There are people who are motivated by what they perceive as their self-interest. There are some businessmen, for example, who believe that non-White immigration and so-called "free" trade bring them more profit. There are some people -- White men -- who can justify anything which brings them a profit or helps their careers. There's not much point in arguing ideas with these people either. The only argument that they will understand is one which

is to the effect that they will lose a lot more than profit or a career if they persist in their present ways. And one should not try to make that argument until it can be made convincingly.

And there are many White people who are neither amoral businessmen nor authoritarians -- at least, not authoritarians in the religious sense, not in the sense of worshipping authority -- but who do tend to go with the flow, who do tend to do whatever is fashionable or trendy at the moment. We don't get many hate letters from these people, because they don't have strong convictions, one way or the other. But there are lots of them, and it may be worthwhile to argue with some of them.

A conclusion we might draw from what I've said today is that we won't win many of our benighted White brethren away from the Clinton coalition with ideas or reasoned argument: some, but not many. They certainly can be won over, but we don't have the means to do that at this time. Most of what we can hope to accomplish at this time is to help decent and reasonable men and women of good will -- men and women who never have been part of the Clinton coalition -- understand better the situation we all are in and the process which is carrying all of us to disaster; and then to motivate those with understanding to quit being spectators and to join us in an organized effort to take back our world. It is only through organization that we can acquire the means to begin making an impression on the trendies and the authoritarians and the careerists.

One final thought today, just in case some of you believe that I have exaggerated in talking about the urgency of our situation or the animalistic and mechanical nature of many of our fellow citizens. There's a television series called *Oz* which you ought to watch. It's on Home Box Office, HBO, which is a subsidiary of Time-Warner, headed by that nice Jewish boy Gerald Levin. The executive producer of the *Oz* series itself is another nice Jewish boy, Barry Levinson. I don't have access to HBO myself, but a friend recorded a few episodes and sent them to me. Like much of Jewish television, *Oz* is not very realistic, but it does provide a stark and graphic picture of where the Jews are pushing America, where they are pushing the lemmings. It is not at all subtle in telling us that homosexuals are sensitive and caring people; that Blacks are strong and intelligent; that Jews are noble, inoffensive, and long-suffering; that interracial sex is good and natural; and that racially conscious Whites are despicable and beastly.

This is a Jewish message aimed at the lemmings. It speaks to the lemmings directly from Mr. Levinson's black heart. And there is no doubt that the message has the desired effect on its White-trash viewers. If it didn't have good ratings, Gerald Levin wouldn't bother to poison the airwaves with it. The Jews, of course, always have been pushing in the same direction. But *Oz* shows us how far they have moved in that direction. Such a television series would have been inconceivable 10 years ago -- even five years ago. But today, with millions of mindless, trendy White kids in their backward baseball caps, singing the rap ditties they have been taught by other Jewish media bosses, trading basketball cards with their favorite Black sports heroes on them, Mr. Levin and Mr. Levinson have figured that they can get away with pushing a little further. And they are getting away with it.

So tune in to *Oz*. View a segment of it. Don't let yourself be offended by the language or the gutter-level imagery. Study it. Think about its message. Think about what is in the Jewish minds

of the people producing this filth. Think about what these Jews are aiming for. And remember, this is not some obscure, underground production viewed by only a few warped fans. This is mainstream America. This is Home Box Office. This is Time-Warner. The people who produce this filth are the biggest financial contributors to the Democratic Party. They are the Jews who got Bill Clinton elected twice. And the people who watch it and like it are the people who kept Bill Clinton's popularity polls up during his impeachment. This is not some bad dream. This is real. This is what is happening today.

So now, what are you going to do about it? Why don't you write to me? Why don't you join the National Alliance and work together with me?

Killing Little Children

The shooting at the Jewish community center in Los Angeles happened a couple of days before I prepared my broadcast last week, and I thought that I would just skip it, that I would not comment on it, either in that broadcast or in the future. But I have had many calls from reporters asking for comments on the shooting, and I have watched some of the news coverage of the shooting, and I have changed my mind. I believe that the thing which prompted me most strongly to make a comment was listening to a televised statement by Janet Reno on the shooting. What a woman! A fitting colleague for Madeleine Albright! The only thing wrong with Janet Reno is that she's not a Jewess. That's a shame, because she certainly would qualify on the grounds of mendacity and overall crookedness.

Several things our Attorney General said brought me to the boiling point, but probably the statement which made the strongest impression on me was to the effect that we must learn how to resolve our disputes without violence, that we all must respect each other as fellow human beings and learn to live together in peace. She said that with a straight face, without even cracking a smile or suppressing a giggle. She said it as if she really meant it, this business about resolving our disputes without violence and about learning to live together in peace. I mean this was coming from a member of the inner circle of the Clinton administration. This was coming from a high official of the government which a few short weeks ago was dropping cluster bombs on Serb schools and hospitals in order to force the Serb government to conduct Serbia's internal affairs in accord with the demands of the New World Order gang.

And you don't have to remind me of the Clinton government's excuse that the bombing of Serb schools and hospitals was a "mistake." That was the same excuse the Los Angeles shooter, Buford Furrow, used. He said that he didn't intend to shoot Jewish children; he merely wanted to shoot up the community center, and the children just happened to get in the way. Every time the Clinton gang killed a bunch of Serb civilians they said they hadn't done it on purpose, but that the civilians just got in the way and were hit accidentally.

Now, I am sure that often the pilots accidentally hit the wrong target with their bombs and missiles, but the fact is that when the planes were loaded with cluster bombs and then sent over Belgrade, somebody in the Clinton administration was planning to kill Serb civilians. If you drop cluster bombs on any populated area, the result will be maimed and killed children. The cluster bombs were not a "mistake." They were deliberately chosen as a part of the munitions used against the Serbs to destroy their will to defend themselves against the Clinton administration's aggression: violent, armed aggression, on a far bigger scale than anything Buford Furrow could even dream of doing.

One other thing to remember now is that the war against Serbia was essentially a Jewish war. Every major Jewish organization in America -- the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Congress, you name it -- they all advocated the war; nearly every high official of the Clinton government engaged in the conduct of the war -- Madeleine Albright, William Cohen, Sandy Berger, General Wesley Kanne Clark -- is a Jew; and the Jewish mass media did their damnedest to build public support for the war and hatred against the Serbs. But I do not

remember any apologies or expressions of regret from the Jews when American cluster bombs killed Serb children. The attitude was, "Well, that's too bad, we didn't deliberately target Serb children, but that's what you get when you don't do what we tell you to do. If you don't like it, just surrender to us now."

That was Janet Reno's attitude a few weeks ago. And if we want to remember a little further back, Janet Reno was the Clinton administration's chief thug in charge of the murderous attack on the Branch Davidian church in Waco, Texas, in 1993 which resulted in burning to death nearly 100 church members, including 17 children and led to the Oklahoma City bombing two years later, in which another 15 or so children were killed. Janet Reno thought her burning of the Branch Davidian church was OK. Her murder of all those people, including 17 children, was OK, because, first, they were oddballs, social outcasts, people who weren't in favor with the media, just a nutty little cult which wanted to be left alone; and second, they refused to obey the Clinton government's orders. So there were no apologies. There was no admission of wrongdoing for her leading role in that violent and murderous assault on the Branch Davidian church.

But when some nutcase Christian Identity kook shoots up a Jewish community center without even killing anyone -- hey, that's suddenly an opportunity for this cold-blooded "butch" of an excuse for a woman to begin preaching about how we all must learn to live together without violence. That sort of hypocrisy really irritates me.

Do you remember what Timothy McVeigh, the convicted Oklahoma City bomber, said when the Clinton government sentenced him to die? He said, in essence, that the government sets the example for the people. The government teaches the people by its actions. When the government is lawless and shows its contempt for life, then this will provoke lawless behavior and contempt for life on the part of the citizens.

And you know, that's true. We have a violent, aggressive, murderous government. The government taught everyone by its example in Waco and at Ruby Ridge and in Serbia and in a hundred other places. And so we should not be surprised when some citizens react in a violent and lawless way to the government's example rather than taking Janet Reno's hypocritically pious mouthings to heart.

Janet Reno, of course, wasn't the only hypocrite interviewed by the media in connection with the Los Angeles shooting. They trotted out all of their familiar "experts" -- most of them Jews -- to discuss the question of why we're experiencing so much more violent behavior these days. Why are so many heterosexual White males acting up, causing trouble, and doing violent things? Why can't these awful heterosexual White males be nice, like everyone else in the wonderful multicultural salad the Clintonistas are blending?

And we heard every explanation except the correct one, and that is that as alienation grows, so does violent, antisocial behavior. As more and more heterosexual White males feel that they're being dispossessed, being edged out, being marginalized so that homosexuals, feminists, and other minorities can have a bigger slice of the pie, some of them react violently.

How do you reduce the amount of antisocial behavior? You reduce the degree of alienation. You try to rebuild the spirit of community, of solidarity, of belonging that we used to have in American society 50 years ago: the spirit of community and solidarity and belonging which has been destroyed by the policies of these same "experts." Every one of these Jewish "experts" on violence is in favor of continued non-White immigration, more "diversity," more racial mixing, more multiculturalism, and all the other policies which have broken down the ordered, homogeneous White society we used to have in America, a society in which most White people felt they had a place, whether it was at the top of the social ladder or at the bottom or somewhere in between. They had roots in the society. They felt a part of it. But that is much less the case today than it was 50 years ago, because of the government policies which Janet Reno as attorney general is enforcing, and the consequences are showing up.

One other thing about the Janet Reno statement which irked me was her use of the Los Angeles shooting as one more reason why we need to scrap the Second Amendment. Too many people have guns, she said. We have to stop the proliferation of guns, et cetera. This is the woman who presides over the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is the government's strong arm of compulsion. Janet Reno sics the FBI on landlords who show reluctance to rent apartments to homosexual couples. She sends the FBI around to put the handcuffs on employers who have failed to hire enough Haitians or mestizos. The FBI, which 50 years ago used to spend its time chasing bank robbers, solving kidnappings, and catching foreign espionage agents, is used these days to spy on people who have been overheard expressing Politically Incorrect thoughts. It is the agency which will be used to haul these people off to jail after the Jews succeed in having a Federal "hate speech" law enacted.

And the FBI has been growing rapidly recently. Janet Reno lobbies the Congress for bigger and bigger appropriations for the FBI, and each year she has more hired guns on the government payroll for use against the citizenry. It is not surprising that the citizenry is stocking up on guns in response: at least, that part of the citizenry which has the same feeling about firearms the Founding Fathers did, namely, that one of their principal functions is to keep the government from getting out of hand.

Of course, astute observers understand that the government has been out of hand for a long time and that it'll take much more than a few thousand citizens with assault rifles to get it back in hand again. But the word hasn't yet trickled down to a lot of patriots, and so they keep on stocking up on assault rifles and ammunition, and Janet Reno keeps putting more armed thugs on the government payroll, while the Jews in the Congress and the media work on getting guns away from the citizens so that Janet's thugs will have a monopoly on firepower. Meanwhile, all of this talk about making America a safer and more peaceful place by disarming everyone is the sheerest hypocrisy. Janet's thugs certainly have no intention of handing in their guns and halting their efforts to intimidate White citizens.

Perhaps this is a good time for me to mention that people who are angry at Janet Reno or Bill Clinton or the Jewish media bosses or at the growing hordes of non-Whites in America ought to think of a more constructive outlet for their anger than simply shooting at targets of opportunity, a la Benjamin Smith or Buford Furrow. I will go so far as to say that there are even more useful things for an angry patriot to do than building a truck bomb and blowing up the nearest Federal

office building. At this particular moment in the breakdown of our society, these occasional, random acts of violence are not especially helpful. They are not part of a sound strategy. In fact, they are not part of any strategy: they are simply individual acts of indiscipline, and they do not serve the purposes of our people.

You know, I can understand the anger that results in these acts. When my office was in Washington, DC, I was ready to explode and do something violent every day. I wanted to blow up government buildings and kill the politicians and bureaucrats who were destroying America; I wanted to use a machine gun and sweep the streets clean of all the non-Whites; I wanted to walk into the offices of the *Washington Post* with a semiautomatic shotgun and lots of ammunition and begin cleaning house. I was filled with rage at the things I saw going on around me. I wanted to strike back at the liberals and the Jews and at their creatures.

And I know -- I am quite certain -- that the rage I felt every day when I was in Washington is in many, many other heterosexual White males as well. Rage is, I believe, a natural and healthy reaction, a normal reaction in a healthy man to what is being done to America and to our people. I can understand that women don't feel this rage and perhaps homosexuals don't feel it and certainly all the people who're on the other side, all the people who believe things are going their way, don't feel it, but I'm much more concerned about any White man who isn't enraged today than about those who are. I can only assume that any White man who isn't angry today, either doesn't understand the situation, or he needs to take hormone supplements.

Anyway, the conditions in every major city in America are conducive to the rage I felt in Washington. And the rage is growing, and it will continue to grow as a consequence of the policies of America's internal enemies. Those who feel, as I do, that random acts of violence are not especially helpful at this time, should not be thinking of ways to keep men from being angry, but rather should think of ways to help men control and direct their anger: to master their anger rather than being mastered by it. We all should be angry, but we should not express our anger in temper tantrums, which is essentially what these random acts of violence are.

Can you imagine our enemies acting in such an immature and undisciplined way? When the Jews want to hurt a country -- Iraq, for example -- they don't express their hatred for Iraqis by setting off a truck bomb in front of the Iraqi embassy. They very carefully make a long-range plan to get one of their creatures elected President, and then they use the powers controlled by the President to inflict really serious damage on Iraq. If the Clinton administration became angry at China, say, the government would not send a squad of U.S. Marines to shoot up a Chinese restaurant in Washington. And Janet Reno wouldn't show her opposition to letting Americans purchase firearms by ordering FBI agents to throw bricks through the windows of gun stores or to spray-paint hateful graffiti on the headquarters of the National Rifle Association.

The reason America's internal enemies are winning now is because they not only use their heads to make plans, but they also exercise self-discipline. They keep their feelings under control. When Madeleine Albright began her murderous bombing of Serbia this spring, every Jewish organization in America came out with strong statements of support for the bombing. It obviously was something the Jews had been thinking about for a while. But they did not act prematurely and foolishly by doing something like shooting up the Serb community center in

Chicago. They understood that such an action would not cripple the Serbs or even weaken them; it would only put them on the alert, make them angry, and generate public sympathy for them.

I'll recap what I just said. Random acts of violence don't make sense now. Temper tantrums are not helpful. What we need now is self-discipline, not self-indulgence. It's good for us to remember now the old, old rule for people who want to get rid of a king. The rule is: kill the king with your first stroke; don't merely wound the king, because if you do he surely will kill you.

Again, if you are angry at America's internal enemies, do not indulge yourself with a foolish, premature, and ineffective act of violence. Control yourself. Don't break laws. Don't even talk about breaking laws. In America today many people are serving long prison terms for simply talking about committing illegal acts without having actually done anything. They are prosecuted under the government's conspiracy laws.

So if you don't like what Janet Reno and Bill Clinton and the Jewish media bosses are doing to America, think in terms of a long-range, effective plan, not some foolish act of self-gratification. And if you want to talk about long-range, effective plans, contact my organization, the National Alliance.

You know, some people who are angry at the government actually applaud acts such as Buford Furrow's shooting up the Jewish community center in Los Angeles. They believe that other people will do similar things, independently, and the government won't know how to deal with it. I mean, if many angry men, who don't even know one another, all do their shootings and bombings independently and unpredictably, what can the government do to stop them?

Listen, don't kid yourself! The government is perfectly capable of countering illegal violence with illegal violence, and if there's one thing the government is good at it's violence. People who advocate this sort of independent violence against America's internal enemies seem to believe that the government won't be able to counter it because the government is bound by laws: we still have a Constitution, et cetera. Believe me, the government will do whatever it thinks it can get away with, legal or illegal. Look what the government did at Ruby Ridge and at Waco. Look what it did to Serbia. We have a monster in Washington, and the mere fact that the monster has respected some laws so far is no guarantee that it will continue to do so in the future.

Both the Jews and the government, in fact, are using the recent Los Angeles shooting now as ammunition to chip away at the Constitution. Janet Reno is using it as an argument for a national gun registration law. The Jews are using it as an argument not only for more restrictive firearms laws but also for laws against what they call "hate speech." Jews want to abolish both the First and the Second Amendment. Since the shooting there have been polls of the couch potatoes, and the media already have persuaded nearly half of the American public that so-called "hate speech" is primarily responsible for so-called "hate crimes," such as the Los Angeles shooting. How much longer do you think it will take the Jews to persuade a majority of the couch potatoes that they will be safer and we all will have a more peaceful and loving society if the government is allowed to lock up anyone who says unkind things about Jews? If you believe that can't happen in America, then you have a lot more faith in the couch potatoes and their representatives in Washington than I do.

A final word: I'm not trying to say that we must be careful not to provoke the monster, that if we don't provoke it maybe it won't eat us. The monster fully intends to eat us as soon as it can: as soon as it has proceeded a bit further in its program of persuading the couch potatoes that if they will just give up the First and Second Amendments -- and perhaps one or two others -- they all will be safer and happier. Ultimately the only way we can prevent that is by killing the monster. The monster is at war against America, against our people, against our freedom, against our traditions, against our children's future, and it is a war to the death. So far the monster is winning that war. If we want to change that, if we want to begin winning instead of losing, then we must fight the monster with intelligence and self-discipline, not with childish daydreams of victory through drive-by shootings.

Bosch/Bin Laden

I was looking last night at some paintings by the 15th-century Flemish painter, Hieronymous Bosch. Interesting, but pretty weird stuff. Bosch was sort of a godfather to the Surrealist school of painters, who came along 450 years later: Salvador Dali and his limp clocks, for example.

I don't know much about Bosch's life, but he was a moralist, and his paintings, with their nightmare quality, reflected his concern for the moral condition of Dutch society in his time. I thought to myself as I studied his paintings, "My God, what would Bosch be painting if he were alive today in America?" I shuddered when I thought about it. This is indeed an age which lends itself to surrealist treatment. Public life today lacks some important elements of reality.

I was looking at Bosch's paintings right after having seen Bill Clinton on television preaching about his opposition to a tax-cut bill which the Republican Congress had just passed, and that's what made me think about what Bosch might have painted in the Clinton era. I mean, there was this unspeakable piece of filth up there at his lectern, this reprobate, this criminal, wagging his finger and moralizing about doing what's good for the American people, and no one was hooting him down or even laughing at him. All of the media people were taking him seriously and showing him respect: not even an expression of distaste on the news commentator's face or a hint of contempt in his voice. I could imagine millions of other television viewers around the country soberly watching this same newscast and seeing nothing amiss. I believe that Howdy Doody or Fred Flintstone could have been up there on the speaker's podium with the Presidential seal, saying the same things Clinton said, and as long as the media people treated it seriously the viewers would see nothing amiss.

I don't know what the moral condition of Dutch society was like in the 15th century, but it certainly couldn't have been worse than that of American society today. Actually, I guess it's not really the moral condition of the American public I'm complaining about. It's the surreal nature of public life in America today.

I'll give you an example of what I mean when I say that there's something which isn't real about our society. When Israel's new prime minister, Ehud Barak, was visiting the United States recently, he was treated with great respect by the media people. He was described as an Israeli "war hero" and as the man who might be able to bring peace to the Middle East. Now, to the Jews the term "hero" has a different meaning than it does to us. Let me tell you about one of Ehud Barak's "heroic" exploits. In 1973 Barak headed an Israeli assassination squad which was landed on a Lebanese beach near Beirut late at night by an Israeli submarine -- supplied, of course, by the United States. Israel and Lebanon were at peace at the time, but Israel always has had a policy of assassinating troublesome Gentiles, whether they are Islamic religious leaders or Egyptian rocket scientists or Palestinians who write patriotic poetry or anyone else the Jews don't like. The excuse usually is that the victim was a threat to Israel. The threats which Barak's murder squad dealt with that night in 1973 when they landed on the beach near Beirut were two Palestinian political writers and a poet, living in exile in Lebanon after having been "ethnically cleansed" by the Israelis.

Barak and two other members of his squad quietly picked the lock and let themselves into the house of Palestinian writer Kamal Edwan and his family in the Beirut suburb of Verdun at one o'clock in the morning. Using silenced submachine guns they slaughtered Edwan, his wife, and his daughter while they slept in their beds. Other members of Barak's murder squad killed the other two victims and their families. Escaping from Lebanon and returning to Israel as a "hero," Barak explained to journalists that it had been necessary to shoot all three members of the Edwan family because the women attempted to shield Kamal from the Jews' bullets. Well, the facts are that although the bullet-riddled body of Kamal's wife was found on the bed beside him, his daughter's bullet-riddled body was found alone in her own bedroom.

Now, all of the major media in the United States knew about this at the time of Barak's visit to the United States last month. These 1973 murders made headlines around the world at the time, and, as I said, Barak was treated as a hero when he returned to Israel from this murder mission. This sort of information is kept on file at the *New York Times*, the Associated Press, the *Washington Post*, and every major news agency. You can dig it up yourself from any major library. But there wasn't a word about any of this in the U.S. news media last month. Why not? Was it irrelevant after 26 years?

Imagine that it had been a senior statesman from Germany who was being entertained at the White House last month instead of the prime minister of Israel. Imagine that during the Second World War, in 1943, say -- that's 56 years ago instead of 26 -- the German statesman had been the head of an SS team which killed Jews, and the news media here knew it. Do you believe that they would have remained silent about the events of 56 years ago in order to avoid embarrassing our visitor or Mr. Clinton, or because they believed that the events of 56 years ago had become irrelevant after the passage of so much time? I mean, really, what do you think?

Let me help you: the Jews always get special treatment. They own the media, they control the Clinton government, they believe they're entitled to special treatment, and they get it. You know as well as I that it is inconceivable that any foreign official who had killed Jews, and the media knew about it, could be entertained at the White House while the media kept quiet about the official's past. But a Jewish official who has murdered Gentiles -- hey, that's different: no need to remind the public about that.

And of course, the murders of Palestinian families that Ehud Barak carried out under the cover of darkness in 1973 were not the end of his career as a cold-blooded murderer of women and children. The 1973 murders were among the few that made headlines around the world, but he kept on doing the same sort of thing. Nowadays, of course, he doesn't actually go out and shoot people himself; he just gives the orders to have people shot.

This year, the day after Barak took office as prime minister of Israel, his Mossad agents murdered a 27-year-old Lebanese nuclear physicist in his Paris apartment. The Jews believe that people who are likely to sympathize with their enemies, with people from whom they have stolen land -- with the Palestinians, for example -- should not be permitted to become nuclear physicists, because their enemies may benefit from the knowledge, from the expertise. And so the Jews arrange to have these people murdered whenever they can. They count on the media under the control of their kinsmen to cover for them and on crooked politicians who are in their

pocket not to make a fuss. And the politicians who run France these days are approximately as corrupt as those who run the United States -- which means totally corrupt. So the Jews get away with this sort of behavior.

Well, that's Jews for you. And I really wouldn't waste much time worrying about the type of people they are or what they do if they were doing all of their dirty work over in the Middle East somewhere among their fellow Semites. But they're doing their dirty work over here, among us, and it concerns all of us. At least, it ought to be a matter of concern to all of us, because it certainly affects all of us.

I'll just recap what I've said so far: the mass media in the United States -- all of them, the TV network news programs, the national newspapers and news magazines such as the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News and World Report* -- all of them knew about Barak's background when he was in this country recently, and they all covered for him. They all concealed his bloody past from the American people -- deliberately and knowingly concealed it and portrayed Barak as a "man of peace" -- so that Bill Clinton and the other politicians could suck up to him and promise him billions of dollars more from the U.S. Treasury -- our money -- without any protest from us. And the media did that because Barak is a Jew, because he is the head of the Jewish state, and they -- the media bosses -- also are Jews or are completely tied up in collaboration with the Jews.

Now that's a serious business, and it ought to concern all of us. It's not just that ordinary Americans, who depend on the mass media for everything they know -- or think they know -- about what's happening in the world are being deceived. One could argue that that's not important, because most ordinary Americans never understand anything anyway, whether they're being deliberately deceived or not, so what difference does it make whether it's the Jews or someone else who's deceiving them; they're just sheep; they don't count.

Now, that's not my position. I believe that we must have honest, accurate, and responsible mass media in the hands of our own people. I believe that ordinary Americans at least ought to have the information needed to understand what's happening in the world, whether they have the desire or the intelligence to take advantage of that information or not. But as I just said the problem is bigger than the fact that the public is being deceived. You know, there are a great many Americans who are not sheep and who are not so easily deceived: smart, wide-awake Americans who have the same access to information that I do, Americans who understand that their personal success and welfare depend on their knowing about what's happening in the world.

People like Bill Gates don't simply take at face value everything they see on their television screens. But Bill Gates doesn't speak out. He does nothing to counter the deception and plundering of his own people. Instead he knowingly collaborates with the Jews in the deception. His Microsoft Corporation is involved in a joint media venture with NBC.

And of course it's not just Bill Gates. No one who understands what's happening and who also has the resources to oppose it effectively is willing to do so. Everyone is looking out only for himself. Everyone is willing to collaborate with the Jews or with Bill Clinton or with any other evil and destructive group or person or policy so long as there's some personal advantage to

doing so. No one is willing to stand up for what is true and right if there is no personal advantage for himself in doing so. There are not even ten righteous men of wealth and power in America to justify the continued existence of this nation, of this society. That is the nightmare quality of American society today which Hieronymous Bosch would be truly challenged to symbolize in his painting if he were here today.

Before I move on I want to state once more the point I've made here. First, Ehud Barak, the current prime minister of Israel, the man who was entertained in the White House by Bill Clinton last month and was promised billions of dollars more of our money, is a man who used to murder people that the Jews wanted murdered. He used to murder intellectuals whose ideas the Jews considered dangerous -- and their wives and children. He used to murder them personally and close-up, so that he got spattered with their blood and brains as they begged for mercy. He is a cold-blooded murderer. He is a terrorist. The 1973 murders in Beirut I described are a matter of public record, and you can check them out for yourself in any large library. Check using the key words Kamal Edwan.

Second, the mass media here all knew this, but they covered up for Barak. They would not have done that except that he is a Jew and it is in the interest of Jews to conceal his background from the American taxpayers who are supporting Israel. The Jewish media bosses do not want American Gentiles to know that the leading Jew in the world today, the Jew who is looked up to and admired by Jews in America as well as in Israel, is an assassin, a cold-blooded murderer of women and children. The media bosses do not want Americans to understand that that's the sort of man most admired by their Jewish neighbors.

Third, other knowledgeable people in America, knowledgeable Gentiles, rich and influential Gentiles, who should have been providing leadership and guidance to other Americans, also knew about Barak, but they remained silent rather than offend the Jews.

You know, you don't have to agree with me about what we ought to do about the Jews. You may believe that it's possible to live in the same country with Jews. You may even believe in equality or democracy or -- heaven forbid! -- diversity, but you cannot call yourself an honest man or a patriot if you were one of those who knew about Barak and remained silent. And of course, the concealing of Barak's murderous background from the public is only one of hundreds of similar moral failures I could cite, failures to speak out and provide the truth to the public on important issues when the Jewish media are deliberately concealing the truth. I've spoken myself about dozens of these issues on these *American Dissident Voices* programs: about the deliberate effort by the Jewish media to make the White public believe that most so-called "hate crimes" involve Whites attacking non-Whites, for example, by providing enormously inflated news coverage of the tiny minority of interracial crimes in which that is the case and completely suppressing the news of the majority of interracial crimes in which Whites are the victims. The public doesn't know about this deception, but many wealthy and influential White people do -- and yet they remain silent. You cannot call yourself a responsible American if you ignore the deceptions of the mass media, if you fail to speak out about these deceptions for fear of jeopardizing your career or your wealth or some business relationship you have with Jews -- but who is speaking out? I am listening. I hear no political leader, no religious leader, no business leader speaking out.

So what will become of a country in which there no longer are any men of wealth and power and influence who care about the country, who feel responsible for it? What will happen to a society in which the masses care only about their ball games and their welfare "entitlements," as they're called these days, and the rich care only about their personal wealth and power?

Well, let me tell you, it doesn't take a Hieronymous Bosch to look at this society and notice that it is profoundly ill. Ordinary men and women all around the world can see that. And while Hieronymous Bosch isn't here today to chastise us for our lack of morality, other men who care about morality are: men like Osama bin Laden, for example. And the fact that men like Bin Laden can look at America and see that it no longer has a soul, makes them infinitely more dangerous as our moral instructors. Bin Laden knows that the next time he blows something up a great many people will applaud him, both around the world and in America.

The people you see on the television screen won't be applauding, of course. Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton will be looking very grim and will be wagging their fingers and making threats about retaliation. The cameras will focus on the bodies being pulled from the rubble, and the TV commentators will be very serious and will have the couch potatoes everywhere feeling indignant toward Bin Laden and regarding him as a bloodthirsty terrorist who kills people without reason. But there will be tens of thousands of Americans who understand the situation and who will applaud Bin Laden in the privacy of their living rooms, and there will be tens of millions of people around the world who will applaud.

Let me reiterate: people like Bill Clinton and Madeleine Albright would have you believe that a country doesn't need a soul in order to be healthy. Certainly, the couch potatoes, the lemmings, are not concerned about such things as the nation's soul. As long as the bread and circuses continue, as long as the ball games and the "entitlements" keep coming, they will believe that everything is all right. They really don't see anything amiss. They don't have any sort of moral compass inside themselves to tell them that things are very wrong in our national life. They simply believe what the media tell them, without even a twinge of misgiving. That's one of the surreal features of life in America today. The great bulk of the population -- the White population -- is marching happily toward national and racial extinction. That isn't natural. It doesn't seem real -- but it is happening.

And even though the couch potatoes can't understand this, there are people around the world who can and do. There are people who still are able to make moral judgments and who have the will to act on their judgments, in one way or another. Hieronymous Bosch is no longer with us, but Osama bin Laden is. And so are plenty of others who make manifest their moral judgments with weapons of mass destruction instead of with paint and canvas.

And of course, moral chastisement from without isn't the only consequence of our situation that we should anticipate. There will be a lot more craziness of one sort or another as people without moral guidance react in various ways to the stresses imposed by a disintegrating society: mass shootings, cult suicides, scandals and outrages of every sort, from the Oval Office to every corner of American life.

When a society no longer has any righteous men, men for whom righteousness counts more than profit or comfort or personal security -- righteous men who will stand up and make themselves heard in America -- then every member of our society will pay a price. No one will escape the craziness. Some Americans will applaud when they see evildoers struck down; other Americans will become fearful and call for more security from the government. But the craziness will continue, it will become worse as our society descends into chaos, and it will not become better until we once again have a society headed by righteous men.

Bat Guano and "Hate Speech"

Today I want to talk with you about something which gravely concerns me, and that is the corruption of our government and our police by Jewish pressure groups. I've spoken with you about this before two or three times, but the threat to our liberty is becoming more serious by the day, and we all need to be aware of what is happening currently.

In brief, the Jews make up only two and one-half per cent of the U.S. population, but they are smart, they are aggressive, they are extraordinarily well organized and cooperate with each other at all levels in order to advance their own ethnic interests, and by cooperating have acquired a vastly disproportionate share of the power and the wealth in the United States. But that is not enough for them. They want everything, they believe they're entitled to everything -- at least, the religious Jews believe that -- and they're all trying their damnedest to get it. In the present Clinton administration they have for all practical purposes seized control of the Federal government. I can't remember when Clinton made a top-level appointment, in either the executive or judicial branch, that didn't go to a Jew. The latest Clinton appointment to go through was Richard Holbrooke, who even before he became the new U.S. ambassador to the United Nations was part of the Clinton team in the war against Serbia. Just like practically everyone else on that team, Holbrooke is a Jew. Now the Clinton government, which has been using the CIA in an effort to destabilize the Milosevic government, has put forward its candidate to replace Milosevic as the president of Yugoslavia. He is the former head of the central bank there, his name is Abramovic, and he is not a Serb but a Jew! There seems to be no end to it nor any limit to their brazenness.

Despite their control of the Clinton administration, the Jews do have some worries. They understand that they're not home free yet. There may not be many other people who speak out openly about the Jews the way I do, but there are a great many White Americans who nevertheless can see what is happening to America and who don't like it. Not every American is a brainless couch potato, who cares only about ball games on TV and his "entitlement" check. There are many Americans who have both brains and a sense of personal responsibility, even a sense of patriotism, although they haven't found the courage yet to speak out. If anything happened to really upset this "silent majority" -- well, anyway, this fairly large silent minority -- if anything happened to take away their comfort or their sense of security, they could really become a problem for the Jews to worry about. Some of them might begin speaking out themselves -- especially if I am still speaking out to set an example for the others. Things could snowball. The Jews could lose it all, the way they did in Germany in 1933, after they had gotten what they thought was a pretty good grip on that country.

And they understand that -- and they're taking steps to prevent that happening. The Jewish mass media, working in tandem with Jewish pressure groups such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center, have been lobbying intensely for years to disarm Americans and to silence them. This is a concerted effort, a very tightly organized effort. Can you think of a single mass medium -- a single big-city newspaper, a single television network, a single national news magazine -- which isn't in favor of more gun control laws and more so-called "hate crime" laws? Individual Americans are divided

on the issue of firearms. Some are staunch defenders of the Second Amendment, while others have let themselves be persuaded by the media that citizens shouldn't have weapons to defend themselves. But the Jewish mass media are unanimously in favor of more gun control.

The same goes for so-called "hate crime" legislation. Whereas the couch potatoes have mostly been convinced that "haters" ought to be locked up -- many of them, in fact, already believe that "racism" is illegal, that anyone who uses the "n" word, for example, has broken a law and can be locked up -- whereas the couch potatoes and the lemmings have been pretty well brought into line by the Jews, many thoughtful Americans disagree with the Politically Correct sort of law enforcement the Jews are lobbying for, where an offender is punished more for what he was thinking than for what he did. But the Jews, their media, and their pressure groups are 100 per cent in favor of more "hate crime" legislation.

And when it comes to taking the next step -- that is, scrapping the First Amendment altogether and actually enacting "hate speech" legislation of the sort that the Jews already have succeeded in having enacted in Canada, Britain, and many other countries and which many couch potatoes assume already has been enacted in the United States -- again there is a major division among White Americans. The feminists, the homosexuals, the liberals believe that we need such laws in order to maintain domestic tranquility, that it is more important to keep people from having their feelings hurt by "offensive" speech than it is to preserve the freedom to say whatever we believe. But that's still a minority opinion. A majority of White Americans have not yet been convinced that they ought to give up their First Amendment rights for the sake of tranquility -- but that's not for a lack of the Jews' trying to convince them.

On this issue the Jews are still being cautious. Whereas most major Jewish organizations still are proclaiming their support for the First Amendment, they are in fact solidly in favor of abolishing it. The Jewish media are using the same deceptions: they tell us that they are for freedom of the press, freedom of speech, but what they really are for is freedom of their press, freedom of their speech, not ours. They are for their freedom to continue promoting gangsta' rap music and producing films which propagandize racial mixing, but they are against our freedom to speak out against this propaganda and especially against our freedom to identify the producers of this propaganda and to talk about their motives.

Read carefully the way in which the controlled press deals with specific instances of what they like to call "hate speech." My organization, the National Alliance, publishes leaflets and pamphlets and stickers for mass distribution. Some of our members distribute these materials to the public. None of these materials would have been considered "hateful" just a few years ago. They do not use pejoratives or insulting language, and they do not urge violence or illegality of any sort. They provide facts and express opinions about matters of importance to White Americans. They have information about gun-control efforts and the people behind these efforts, for example. They have information about AIDS and its much greater incidence among non-Whites than among Whites, with the consequently greater danger of contracting the disease if one has sex with a non-White. They have information about the immigration crisis in the United States. One of the pamphlets we have distributed most widely is a documentary report on the control of the news and entertainment media in America. It's a report with the names and holdings of the top media bosses.

We write, publish, and distribute these materials because we believe that the information and ideas in them are vitally important and need to be seen and thought about by all White Americans. But the controlled mass media routinely refer to these publications as "hate" literature: not just sometimes, but always. You cannot read a news story in any mainstream newspaper about our publications without seeing the word "hate" at least a dozen times.

Another item we distribute widely is the catalog of books offered by National Vanguard Books, the sponsor of this program. This 80-page catalog offers some 700 books and tapes, ranging from *Aesop's Fables* and Virgil's *Aeneid* to Friedrich Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra.* It also offers a number of very hard-to-find books, such as the *Protocols of Zion,* which is certainly of historical interest, regardless of what one's personal opinion is of its contents. And yet this entire book catalog also is routinely denounced by the Jewish media and by Jewish organizations as "hate" literature.

And the controlled media always use the word "hate" in referring to our publications, not just because they don't like or agree with our books and other materials, but because they are trying deliberately to condition the public -- really to brainwash the public -- by forming the association in the public's mind between any officially disapproved or Politically Incorrect publication and the ideas of hate and violence and illegality. They attempt to frighten the public -- deliberately. And with a substantial portion of the public it works. We will, for example, distribute a number of copies of our documentary pamphlet on the ownership and control of the news and entertainment media in the United States; we'll hand them out to shoppers in a mall, or we'll mail a few thousand of them to the residents of a community, or we may even place them on the windshields of parked cars. The controlled media invariably will report such a distribution of our material in the following way:

"Residents of Centerville have been alarmed by finding hate pamphlets in their mail. Mrs. Alvin Jones of 100 Main Street reported to the police that she had received in the mail a hate pamphlet published by the National Alliance which claims that Jews exercise a disproportionate control of the news and entertainment media in the United States. The police are investigating the matter. Because the hate pamphlets were distributed by mail, the FBI also has been notified. An FBI spokesman told this newspaper that, unfortunately, there is nothing the FBI can do to stop such distributions under existing laws."

Often the newspaper will then put a little more spin on the story by printing a statement from one of the Jewish pressure groups I mentioned earlier, and that statement will describe our documentation of Jewish media control as a "myth" and will suggest that pamphlets like ours are responsible for violent and illegal activity. If you read newspapers at all, I'm sure you've read a dozen such stories.

Now probably Mrs. Jones was alarmed, and probably she did call the police. That's what she's been conditioned to do by reading such stories herself. She believes that that's what any good citizen should do when he or she spots a pamphlet which seems to be Politically Incorrect: report it to the police. She probably has a fuzzy notion in her mind that distributing such pamphlets is illegal. The media certainly do nothing to discourage that notion except to suggest that existing laws are inadequate: that if we had adequate laws, then the FBI could arrest anyone who

distributes such pamphlets, and the local police could lock up anyone caught alarming citizens with such material.

I mean, really, think about it. If in the past you haven't noticed the sort of calculated fear-mongering I've just described, then pay close attention to the wording and the tone of the next news report you see about the distribution of National Alliance materials. Analyze the story, and I'm sure you'll understand what the newspaper is trying to do.

Well, that's only part of the threat to our liberty which I mentioned at the beginning of this program. In addition to persuading the couch potatoes that Politically Incorrect speech either is illegal or ought to be illegal, the Jewish media and the Jewish pressure groups also are conditioning police and other local authorities in the same way.

Did you ever see the Stanley Kubrick film *Dr. Strangelove?* If you didn't, you should. It's an old film, a satirical film made in 1964, but it's also the funniest film I've ever seen, and I guess I've watched it a dozen times. Stanley Kubrick really was cut from quite different cloth; he was unlike any other Jewish film director in Hollywood. Anyway, if you've seen *Dr. Strangelove* you'll certainly remember a delightful character in the film named Colonel Bat Guano. Toward the end of the film, when Peter Sellers, in his role as a Canadian Air Force officer, is desperately trying to telephone Washington with the information needed to head off an imminent doomsday nuclear war, Colonel Bat Guano, as a stereotypically pigheaded authoritarian, refuses to let the Canadian officer make his telephone call. To Colonel Guano, the Canadian is not to be trusted, because he wears a funny uniform and has a British accent. Furthermore, the Canadian wants to break a few rules in the emergency situation, such as taking coins from a Coke machine in order to get his call through to the Pentagon war room. Colonel Guano is outraged by such irregularities and never does understand the situation. The Canadian officer finally makes his telephone call, but by then it is too late to avert doomsday.

Anyway, the reason I bring Colonel Guano into the program now is that he is a wonderful embodiment of traits all too often found in military and police officials. Cops look up to authority figures and to institutions with an aura of authority. They believe what they see on television. They don't question it. They are likely to be indignant and hostile toward anyone who does question it. They don't like people who rock the boat or have a different view of things. They are strong on conformity and a bit weak on basic principles and on logical consistency. Certainly, this isn't true of all cops or all military officers, but the tendency is definitely there. The subliminal propaganda messages in the media find a receptive audience among cops.

And then Jewish organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith -- the ADL -- come along and offer to help the cops decide who are the good guys and who are the bad guys in this dangerous and confusing new age of multiculturalism and terrorism we are entering. Most local cops are a bit confused about this whole new category of so-called "hate crimes" the Jews have pushed through various legislative bodies in this country. Twenty years ago the whole concept of "hate crime" was unknown. The Jews invented it, and they are the self-appointed "experts" on it. Domestic terrorism also was virtually unknown in America 20 years ago, and the Jews also have appointed themselves experts on that.

The Anti-Defamation League -- the ADL -- and similar Jewish organizations always are described by the mainstream media as "respected human rights organizations," and so they have an air of authority when they approach the police with offers of "help." What this means is that when an ADL official shows up at the local police chief's office in an expensive suit, accompanied by the Gentile mayor and a couple of other local politicians who are in the Jews' pocket, and offers to provide training seminars for the local cops on dealing with "hate crimes" and domestic terrorism, the Colonel Bat Guano element in the chief's personality kicks in. He doesn't question the ADL's motives. He just learns to despise the people the ADL tells him to despise, the people who aren't marching in lockstep with the lemmings. He learns to turn to the ADL for advice whenever any question comes up about dealing with dissidents. A sort of quasi-official relationship between the police and the ADL develops.

And this is really horrifying when you think about what the ADL is. It is an organization which has been involved in large-scale criminal activity of a sort which ought to put everyone concerned about our freedom on red alert. The ADL has been caught red-handed in the theft of confidential police files on a huge scale: files on more than 12,000 persons in California alone. The ADL has had its offices raided in California by police teams armed with search warrants to recover these stolen files. The ADL has bribed police and other public officials to gain illegal access to confidential information -- driver's license information, credit card information, and so on -- on tens of thousands of American citizens. It has passed on some of this information to foreign governments, and this has resulted in Americans being arrested and imprisoned by foreign governments when they travel abroad.

The ADL also has close ties to other Jewish criminal organizations. In 1985 the ADL gave its annual so-called "Torch of Liberty" award to the notorious Jewish organized crime boss Moe Dalitz, who at that time was the underworld "godfather" of Las Vegas. The ADL gave its award to Moe Dalitz at a black-tie banquet because he had funneled millions of dollars in criminal loot into the ADL's treasury. And it's not that the ADL didn't know what Dalitz did for a living or where the money came from that he gave to the ADL. Before Dalitz moved to Las Vegas he was the boss of the notorious "Purple Gang" in Detroit, an all-Jewish gang involved in smuggling, White slavery, and contract murder.

Although Moe Dalitz was killed in a gang shootout with rivals in 1989, the ADL has cozy relations with plenty of other Jewish gangsters. The fastest-growing organized-crime operation in the United States today is the *Organizatsiya*, which consists entirely of Jews from the former Soviet Union. The Jewish media, of course, never mention that it is a Jewish organization -- they call it the "Russian Mafia" -- but it is, in fact, the biggest, the best-organized, the most ruthless and violent criminal organization in operation today. And it is the most dangerous criminal organization to ordinary Americans. It steals such huge sums of money that it could even pose a threat to the American economy. It has ties to the Clinton administration, and to the Democratic Party, and now it is trying to gain ties, through the ADL, to the American law-enforcement agencies which are charged with fighting against it. The *Organizatsiya* is positioning itself to be the criminal organization of the New World Order. It intends to suck the blood out of the U.S. economy the same way it has sucked the blood out of Russia.

Police agencies everywhere should understand what and who the real threats to law and order are. But they are being conditioned now not to understand these things. They are being conditioned to regard anyone who publicizes the Jewishness of Jewish organized crime -- me, for example -- as the threat, rather than Jewish organized crime itself. It was bad enough having the ADL, the media, and the Washington politicians in cahoots. When police agencies and Jewish organized crime enter the coalition, we're in real trouble -- all of us. And that's what's happening now under the guise of fighting so-called "hate crime."

Jewish Democracy

Well, there's been another dragging, this one just last week in Martin, South Dakota. Three Indians from a reservation there severely beat a White man, 21-year-old Brad Young, tied a rope around his neck and to the back of their truck, and dragged the White man until they thought he was dead. Then they cut the rope loose from their truck and drove off, leaving their unconscious and badly injured victim lying in a field, where he was later found. His ears had been torn off, and his face and neck were so badly lacerated that his family couldn't recognize him. The sheriff, noting the viciousness of the attack and that the victim was White and his attackers were Indians, told reporters that it was clearly a "hate crime."

The fascinating thing about this particular incident is that it is practically a mirror image of the dragging of a Black by three White men in Jasper, Texas, last year: three White men and a Black victim in the first case; three Indians and a White victim in the second case. In both cases the victims had known and been drinking with their assailants. Both draggings were unplanned and simply grew out of drunken fights. In both cases a beating preceded the dragging. The really interesting difference between the Jasper, Texas, case and the Martin, South Dakota, case is the way in which the controlled news media have responded to them. The Jasper, Texas, case was immediately on television screens around the world and remained on the screens for months. It periodically comes back on the TV screens as the deliberately spaced trials of the three perpetrators come up. Bill Clinton addressed the nation about it. Every Jewish propaganda organization and every Politically Correct columnist and commentator had something to say about it. But unless you're an Internet news junkie or a very careful newspaper reader you haven't even heard about the Martin, South Dakota, case. You certainly will never see it on television or hear Bill Clinton comment on it.

In the South Dakota case the media people have been trying to pressure the sheriff into backing down from his initial assertion that the dragging was a "hate crime." Since the victim knew his assailants and was voluntarily drinking with them before they beat and dragged him, it wasn't really a "hate crime," the media people have been saying; it was simply a bit of drunken hooliganism that got out of hand. You know, they could have said exactly the same thing about the Texas case, but they didn't, did they? In Texas their motivation was to exaggerate the atrociousness and malice involved, not to minimize it as they have done in the South Dakota case.

And for real media minimalization, consider the dragging murder of Patricia Stansfield by a Black near Streator, Illinois, on August 1 last year. I first reported this dragging to you nearly three months ago, in my broadcast of June 12. The 46-year-old White woman, a registered nurse, was deliberately dragged three miles to her death along a country road. Police found blood spots, body tissue, and bits of her clothing along the road. Sounds a bit like the dragging of James Byrd in Jasper, doesn't it, with all of those little painted circles on the road which we saw a hundred times on television? Patricia Stansfield's Black murderer was 26-year-old Christopher Coleman. But you haven't heard even the slightest peep from the Jewish media about the Stansfield dragging, have you?

You might ask, why couldn't the media simply have presented the facts in each case, giving them approximately equal coverage and let the public make up their own minds and form their own opinions about them?

Well, we all know the answer to that question, don't we? The controlled media are not interested in presenting facts; they are interested in shaping public opinion, so they present the facts which serve their purpose, but not those facts which don't. We have three atrocious interracial draggings in the past 15 months, one with a Black victim and two with White victims. Even if you didn't already know, you wouldn't have to puzzle very long trying to figure out which one the controlled media would choose to report.

You know, even when the facts don't fit, the Jews sometimes will try to use them anyway. The media liars still refer to the two killers at Columbine High School this summer as "neo-Nazis" and "racists." They know that one of the killers, Dylan Klebold, was a Jew, and that both were not racists, but rather were anti-racists. They know that Eric Harris had an Internet web site in which he talked about how much he hated White racists. Now, those facts don't fit the image the Jews have been forging in the public mind of people who go on shooting sprees as being White racists or neo-Nazis. But they couldn't really suppress the story of the Columbine High murders, like they did the story of the dragging murder of Patricia Stansfield. The Columbine High story was too big to kill, so they just twisted it a bit. They repeated over and over the rumor that the two killers had targeted Blacks, even though only one of the 13 people they killed was a Black. They parlayed this false rumor about targeting Blacks into the characterization of the two killers as "neo-Nazis." And the general public, never too difficult to fool, has swallowed it.

At least, much of the general public has swallowed it. And most of the rest are such lemmings that even if they don't literally believe the Jewish party line on racial matters they pretend that they do. They are afraid of being out of step with everyone else. They are the ones who understand the danger and the unpleasantness of living with non-Whites, but who won't admit that they understand. They flee to White suburbs or to Whiter parts of the country to get away from non-Whites, but they'll never give you a straight answer about why they fled. Maybe it's a good thing that we're running out of places to flee to and soon will be obliged to stand and fight. At least, some of us will stand and fight. Many will just grovel and beg for mercy. That's the kind of White people we've been raising in America for the past 50 years.

I have a story on my desk about a murder in Salt Lake City last month. I suspect that this is a story you haven't heard before, because like so many others it doesn't fit. Early on the morning of August 3 a Black male slipped into a condominium where three young White women were sleeping. He stabbed one of the young women, 22-year-old Amy Quinton, to death, and tried to kill 19-year-old Erin Warren by stabbing her in the stomach. Erin was taken to a hospital in critical condition. The third woman, in a separate bedroom, was able to telephone police and escaped injury. You know, this sort of thing happens all the time; you just don't hear about it.

What I found especially poignant about this story was the reaction of one of the girls' neighbors. Bill McDade lives in the apartment just above the one in which the girls were attacked. He's 41 years old, and he moved from southern California to Salt Lake City with his elderly father several years ago to escape the non-White crime in California. He told reporters: "We moved up

here from L.A. to escape this kind of thing. When I moved here it was very peaceful, very quiet, and very serene, but now it has gotten worse." He sighed and said that maybe now he would have to move again.

Well, here we are, the descendants of the pioneers who fought the Indians, conquered America, and built a White civilization on this continent -- here we are at the end of the millennium, just running, running, running, afraid to fight, afraid even to name our enemies. It certainly looks as if both the moral and physical quality of White Americans has declined during the last couple of hundred years. We really need to think seriously about the ways in which we can improve the breed when we move into the next millennium. But of course, our plight today is the consequence of more than bad breeding. It is to a very large degree the consequence of psychological manipulation.

I've said this to you 100 times, but I'll say it again now, because it is the single most salient fact of our present situation: Whoever controls the mass media of news and entertainment is able to control most of the public's perception of what is fashionable -- in ideas, in policy, in behavior. And for most of the public, their perception of what is fashionable determines what they say and do -- and to a large extent what they think. And in a democracy, where people who are easily manipulated by the media are permitted to vote, whoever controls the mass media also controls the government, for all practical purposes.

I'll give you a very specific example of the way in which this works: Every listener certainly remembers Buford Furrow's shooting spree in Los Angeles on August 10. The way the controlled media have harped on his non-lethal foray into the Jewish community center there, it'll be a long time before anyone forgets Buford Furrow. Well, of course, all of the publicity attracted politicians, the way a candle attracts other types of insects. They smelled votes. And one of these vote-sniffing politicians was California's governor, Gray Davis. He noted the publicity. He noted the hysterical reaction of various minority groups and women's groups and lemming groups. He saw an opportunity to win votes and a pat on the head from the media masters at the same time. He focused on the fact that Buford Furrow was characterized by the media as a "hater," that Furrow had belonged to a Politically Incorrect church in Idaho which the Jews have labeled a "hate group." Last week Governor Davis called a press conference and announced that California needs new laws "to fight hate groups." He said that he was appointing a panel to study ways in which California's laws might be used to impose civil or criminal penalties on so-called "hate groups," their leaders, and their members. He wants, he said, to "curtail the unlawful acts of these dangerous bigots."

That's worrisome talk. I believe that the police, the courts, and everyone else concerned already have figured out how to impose civil or criminal penalties on people who shoot other people, whether the shooters have been labeled by the media as "dangerous bigots" or not. Laws covering that sort of thing have been on the books for a long time. What Governor Davis's talk suggests to me is that he would like to punish people not so much for committing a crime as for having the wrong beliefs, going to the wrong church, having the wrong friends -- that is, for falling into the "dangerous bigot" category. His comments suggest that he believes that the laws should be applied differently to so-called "dangerous bigots" than they are to Politically Correct people. He wants his panel to study ways of getting around the First Amendment guarantees of

freedom of religion, freedom of association, and freedom of speech. He sniffs a willingness of the lemmings to give up these freedoms in response to the media-generated hysteria, and he's eager to show that he's willing too.

I suppose that the most worrisome thing of all about this talk by Governor Davis of finding ways to impose penalties on "dangerous bigots" is the question of who decides who's a "dangerous bigot" and who's not. And I suspect that most of you already know who it is that makes decisions of that sort. Governor Davis doesn't make those decisions. The police don't make them. The courts don't make them. Jewish so-called "human rights" organizations, such as the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the Southern Poverty Law Center, and the mob-affiliated Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, working together with the Jewish media bosses, decide who's a "dangerous bigot." And whatever the Jews decide, that is A-OK with Governor Davis, who understands which side his bread is buttered on.

But you know, this is not what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they made a revolution against King George's government and fought the Redcoats in order to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity. Our ancestors did not fight in the American Revolution and give us a Constitution so that Bill Clinton wannabees like Gray Davis can trash it in order to garner the votes of lemmings and please their Jewish paymasters.

I know that there are lots of ordinary folks out there who don't really want to abolish the Constitution, but they have let themselves be stampeded by the media into the belief that we really do need to accept some new limitations on our liberty in order to protect little children from crazed haters like Buford Furrow. These folks are not deep thinkers, and they're easily distracted by media sleight-of-hand. They are convinced now that people like Buford Furrow are the principal threat to little children and others, because that's all they hear about. They're also convinced that all of the outrage about Furrow they're hearing from media spokesmen is genuine. They don't have a clue as to what the true agenda of the media bosses is. But let me tell you: it isn't to protect little children from crazed killers.

Consider this: On May 3, three months before Buford Furrow shot up the Jewish community center, killing no one, a man named Steven Abrams deliberately rammed his Cadillac into a crowd of children on the playground of a preschool in Costa Mesa, California, just a few miles from the Jewish community center visited by Buford Furrow. Abrams spotted the children on the playground of the Southcoast Early Childhood Learning Center as he drove past in his Cadillac. He made a U-turn, aimed his Cadillac at the children, and accelerated toward them. He jumped the curb, tore through a chain-link fence, knocked a jungle gym aside, and plowed into the kids. Two of the children, a four-year-old girl and a three-year-old boy, were mangled to death under Abrams' car when it roared onto the playground. Five others were hurt, two of them with serious head injuries.

When the police arrived Abrams told them: "I was going to execute these children because they were innocent." I'll repeat Abrams' statement to the police: "I was going to execute these children because they were innocent." Does that sound like Abrams is dangerous or not? You know, Abrams' murderous assault on the Southcoast Early Childhood Learning Center did make the newspapers -- for about a day, and then it was quietly dropped. No breathless coverage on

national television; no interviews with spokesmen from the Anti-Defamation League; no televised comments from Mr. Clinton. I'll bet you don't even remember reading about it. The Jewish media bosses weren't really interested in it. Governor Davis didn't interrupt his golf to comment on it. I mean, the school wasn't a Jewish school or a Black school, and a firearm wasn't used, so what's the point in making a big fuss about it? How's that going to help us get rid of the First and Second Amendments? And besides, when the murderer has a name like Abrams, the less said about it the better.

I'm sure that you get my point here. All of the outrage we're hearing from the media and the politicians about Buford Furrow isn't genuine. These people aren't really interested in protecting little children from dangerous nuts. The media bosses don't care about little children. They do care about disarming and silencing the public. They don't want dissent, and they don't want firearms in the hands of dissidents. And they are able to keep the couch potatoes and the lemmings hypnotized. Which is why the politicians, like Governor Gray Davis, dance to their tune.

What all of this amounts to is a disgusting caricature of civilized government. It's a preview of democracy in the 21st century, as the Jews would like it to be: at the top a Jewish elite of string-pullers and media bosses and money men; at the bottom a degraded and easily manipulated electorate of sports fans and hereditary lemmings; and in between a class of thoroughly corrupt and amoral politicians and bureaucrats to front for the Jewish elite and help keep the electorate in line.

One of the most interesting aspects of our situation is that a number of White Americans who don't fall into any of these classes more or less understand these things, but they don't do anything about them. They keep up with what's happening, even when it doesn't appear on network television. They think about these things, but only in a personal context. They don't worry about what these things are doing to the country or to the race, but only about how they themselves are affected. They try to adapt to this Jewish democracy in a way that will be beneficial to themselves. They are not corrupt in the same sense, or at least not to the same degree, as the politicians and the bureaucrats, but they have abdicated their responsibilities as White Americans. And they are dangerously short-sighted if they believe that they can separate their own fate, their own destiny, their own well-being, from that of their people.

My reason for saying that this abdication of responsibility is short-sighted is this: It's not just that here in America we have a disgusting caricature of a civilized society. America's sickness is spreading out and affecting much of the rest of the world. And much of the rest of the world is quite concerned and quite unhappy about that. In the remaining time today I'll mention only the example of Serbia's Kosovo province. Unfortunately, exactly what I predicted back during Madeleine Albright's bombing of Serbia has come true. The ethnic cleansing of Serb civilians in Kosovo began as soon as the Clinton gang forced the Serb military and police to leave the province. The NATO occupation forces are not keeping the peace in Kosovo at all. They are simply providing cover for the KLA to run the remaining Serbs out of the province and to murder those who don't run fast enough.

The one atrocity committed by the KLA against Serb civilians which received enough publicity over here to gain the notice of the couch potatoes was the massacre of 14 Serb farmers six weeks ago, on July 23. That sort of thing or worse has been happening every week. Mass graves of Serbs murdered by the KLA since the bombing stopped in mid-June are uncovered every few days. More than 90 per cent of the Serbs who lived in Kosovo in June have now been driven out in terror or have been murdered: more than 90 per cent. Most of the American electorate -- most of the lemmings -- don't know that; most of them believe the fairy tales the Clinton administration tells them about "peacekeeping" in Kosovo.

The world, however, doesn't believe those fairy tales. The world can see what is happening. The world understands what America has become. America is seen not only as sick and irrational, but as dangerously sick and irrational. It is not a question of if but only of when patriots elsewhere will strike in order to safeguard their own nations. Responsible patriots here really shouldn't just sit around and wait for that to happen.

Hardheaded Altruism

Yesterday I received a letter from a National Alliance member who works in a hospital in Phoenix, Arizona. Most of his patients come to him through the emergency room, and he was lamenting to me the fact that the majority of them are non-White and most of them don't pay for their treatment. Furthermore, a large percentage of the non-Whites are illegal aliens. He kept score for a week and reported that approximately 45 per cent of his patients were Hispanic mestizos, 9 per cent were Blacks, 11 per cent were American Indians, 5 per cent were Asians, and only 30 per cent were Whites.

He wrote to me:

"The Hispanics, Blacks, Indians, and welfare Whites get everything free, through ACCESS and other socialist programs. The Hispanics flood the emergency room and take valuable resources away from patients who really need them. They bring their whole families to the hospital and have to be chased away by the security guards. They fill the waiting rooms at night and sleep anywhere they can. They ignore the trash cans and leave their trash on the floor. They try to invade the staff lounges for `free' coffee and whatever else they can pilfer. They think nothing of grabbing fresh sheets, pillows, and blankets from the linen stacks and making themselves beds on the floor. They smoke in the elevators and are generally a filthy, ungrateful lot. Even the Blacks resent them."

My correspondent describes a number of other details of his hospital work and winds up his description with the remark that the major complaint he hears from his freeloading patients is that the hospital needs to hire more Spanish-speaking staff members, the better to take care of their unpaid needs. Well, anyway, all of this helps to explain why hospital bills have become astronomical for that portion of the population which does pay for the services it receives. Each working White person who goes to a hospital for treatment is carrying about four drones on his back, three of them non-White. And the letter also led me to think about a number of related problems in our society.

You know, the reason each productive White American is able to carry four drones on his back is that our people, White people, have something that Black and Brown people don't have and never will have because we cannot give it to them, and that is our ability to create, to innovate, to invent. The technological revolution we have wrought during the past 50 years, a revolution based on our advances in science during the past 300 years, is what enables us to carry so much dead weight. But of course, the fact that we are able to carry dead weight is no excuse for doing so. Imagine the quality of life our people could have for themselves now if we were not carrying dead weight, if all of our productive work went toward the betterment of our own people.

Actually, the economic consequence of having our country flooded with non-Whites is the least of the evils this non-White horde has brought to us. My correspondent in Phoenix has described for us the way in which the environment has been degraded for White medical staff and hospital patients in Phoenix. Hospital conditions have become so bad there -- so much like conditions in the Third World -- that my correspondent finds himself hating an occupation that he used to love.

But as a matter of fact, the living and working environment for our people nearly everywhere has been degraded in one way or another. Some American cities have not been hit as hard as Phoenix, while conditions in other cities have become even worse.

And it's not just our hospitals, of course. It's our public schools, our neighborhoods, our suburban shopping malls and the centers of our cities, our factories and stores and offices and recreational facilities, our colleges and universities. I'm really sick about the multicultural environment in our universities today, which used to be civilized enclaves of European culture. Before the stifling regime of Political Correctness took hold -- a regime which everywhere is a concomitant of multiculturalism -- before that, our universities were places where new ideas could be developed and freely expressed and where excellence was the goal and the standard for every endeavor. Today it's hard even to imagine the sort of stimulating and intellectually exciting environment we used to have at our universities -- and in addition to that the feeling of tradition and community and of being a part of something with very deep roots.

Well, that's all gone now. Of course, there still are many White Americans -- especially those living in smaller towns and away from the most heavily impacted areas on the east and west coasts, who have not felt the degradation of our living environment as much as my National Alliance correspondent in Phoenix has. Many White people have fled to less affected parts of the country. For others the decline has been so gradual that they have hardly noticed. But things are speeding up now. It is becoming more and more difficult not to notice what is happening. There are fewer and fewer places for White Americans to flee to. Within the next year or two many, many more White people will be reacting with the same degree of exasperation expressed by our medical worker in Phoenix.

And that is a good and necessary development. It is necessary for this degradation of our country to be speeded up, so that our people have a harder time ignoring it. If it proceeds too slowly most people will manage to ignore it, and that will be the death of everything. If this continued invasion of our living area by the Third World continues we will be completely swamped. We already have the Clintonistas counting down in eager anticipation of the day sometime around the middle of the next century when we will be a minority in our own land and a non-White majority will be lording it over us. And of course, it will be not only the drowning of America in a non-White tide, it will be the destruction of the last of the rain forests and the last of the wild animals everywhere, as the Brown and Black population explosions continue in their own parts of the world. It will be terminal pollution everywhere on our overcrowded planet.

How did this happen? What were we thinking of when we took our medical science to Africa and Asia and the jungles of Central and South America and reduced the death rates in those places so that their non-White populations could explode?

If we had just left them swinging through the trees and sacrificing each other wholesale to their various gods, instead of trying to get them to wear clothes and learn English or Spanish or French and wash their hands after going to the bathroom, they still would be happily making mud pies with their own filth and dying like flies, and their population density still would be what it was ten thousand years ago; the tropical rain forests still would be thriving, and the lions still would be eating as many of them as vice versa. Most important, we wouldn't be carrying

them on our backs now whenever we go to a hospital; we wouldn't be subjecting our kids to them in our schools; we wouldn't have them shoved in our faces whenever we turn on a television receiver; we wouldn't be looking for parts of the country to which we can flee where there are fewer of them; we wouldn't be watching our whole civilization being pulled back down into barbarism by their dead weight. We could be masters in our own world, a cleaner and greener and healthier world.

So why did we do it? Well, there are historical reasons, and there are current reasons. Historically, we always have had a surfeit of shortsightedness -- or at least, the farsighted people among us were not in the policy-making positions. To a large extent, of course, we didn't have any policy when we settled the New World. We just let entrepreneurs do their own thing, and that thing nearly always was based on individual profit rather than on the general welfare of the race. We let a bunch of greedy businessmen plan things for their own benefit: cheaper labor, bigger markets, more profits -- those were their considerations.

And among the greediest of these businessmen seeking a bigger market for their wares were the Christian priests, hell bent on converting savages and saving Black or Brown souls. Christian universalism certainly played a major role in the destruction of our world. We should have lynched every missionary who had the crazy notion that Blacks needed Jesus instead of their own voodoo gods or that Mexicans needed the Catholic Church instead of their jungle temples, where they liked to cut the hearts out of their prisoners and eat them.

Completely aside from Christianity, we let the altruism which seems to be unique to our people run wild. It is wonderful that we care about one another, that more than in any other race there are among us individuals who really do feel the pain of others. It is wonderful that many of us want to preserve the rain forests of South America and the great wild beasts of Africa for their own sake. Whenever one of these United Nations commissions is organized to protect some part of our natural environment on this planet, I have a strong suspicion that all of the non-White members on the commission are there strictly for window dressing and for the stipend they receive for lending their non-White faces to the commission. Certainly, were it not for specifically White sensibilities, there would be no one combating the fur trade or trying to save the whales or the redwoods or anything else.

All of that is wonderful, but it is not wonderful that so many of us who are able to feel the pain of others do not seem to have the farsighted understanding which should go along with that empathy. We seem to have achieved that understanding when it comes to things such as forest and wildlife management. We understand that it often is good to permit Nature to take its course in the case of forest fires, or in maintaining the natural balance between predator and prey, and so on. But we need to apply the same considerations to the non-White races. We never should have permitted medical intervention in the non-White world. We should not be trying now to halt the spread of AIDS in Africa. We should not even consider famine relief for Ethiopia. We should not interfere in the mutual genocide between Hutus and Tutsis. Unless we temper our altruism with intelligence -- and especially, unless we limit it to our own race -- it will destroy us rather than help us achieve a higher civilization and a higher grade of humanity on this planet.

What rules us now is a soft-headed, mushy, egalitarian, feminine sort of altruism, where we are more inclined to feed the starving picaninnies of Africa than to take account of the fact that every picaninny who doesn't starve to death now will grow up to breed more picaninnies. We feel sorry for the disease-ridden Blacks and Browns of the world, and instead of keeping them and their diseases strictly confined to their part of the world, we bring them into our part of the world so that we can share their diseases -- as in the case of New York's current outbreak of West Nile encephalitis imported from Africa.

What we need is a hard-headed, masculine sort of altruism, which makes us as concerned for the preservation of our own racial quality as for the stamping out of the fur trade, the sort of altruism which leads us to sterilize our own defectives rather than permitting them to breed a White welfare class, just as it leads us to thin out the two-legged population of Africa rather than permitting it to continue encroaching on the four-legged populations.

And you know, whenever I say something like that I can hear the screams of protest in the background. I can hear the softheaded altruists screaming that I am advocating genocide, and oh, isn't that awful. But as a matter of fact, it is their policies which are leading to a far more terrible genocide, with our race as the victim.

When one has a world overcrowded with races competing for a limited living area and limited resources, there will be genocide. The feminine altruists cannot face that hard fact, and their activities simply guarantee a bloodier and more destructive genocide in the end. The masculine altruists, on the other hand, should be capable of imposing a necessary discipline in order to preserve the health of a beleaguered planet and permit its most valuable life forms to continue developing, instead of being dragged down by the least valuable.

Of course, this whole discussion is academic at this point. The masculine altruists are outgunned now by those who, for one reason or another, oppose the imposition of any discipline. Certainly, many more White people, and not just in New York, will die from West Nile encephalitis, from drug-resistant strains of tuberculosis, and from a hundred other exotic diseases which the shortsighted, feminine altruists have inflicted on us. Instead of banning the carriers of these diseases from our continent, we will continue wringing our hands over the fact that so many Africans are dying from AIDS, and we'll continue trying to find a cure. And many, many more of our people, like the National Alliance medical worker in Phoenix will come to hate their jobs, hate the neighborhoods in which they live, hate the schools they attend.

I have mentioned some of the historical causes of our problem: causes for which we ourselves are largely to blame. But there also are more recent causes. Within ourselves we have both regressive and progressive tendencies -- both softheaded, feminine tendencies and hardheaded, masculine tendencies. Sometimes the softheaded tendencies prevail, and sometimes the hardheaded tendencies. And as I indicated earlier, sometimes we simply drift without guidance or policy.

During the past century our situation has been complicated greatly by the fact that we have had an alien element in our midst which has strenuously opposed our hardheaded tendencies and kept them from coming to the fore, and at the same time has encouraged our regressive tendencies or

tried to prevent us from having any policy. We have seen this especially during the past 50 years, with softheaded policies on immigration, on education, on welfare, on law enforcement, on the relations between the sexes, on race relations, on the citizen's right to self-defense, and on a number of other issues vital to our survival and progress. This alien element, of course, is the Jewish element, and it has gained virtually a monopoly control over the opinion-forming media in America.

Just this week we have had another striking example of the way in which the Jewish media are able to manipulate public opinion and public policy. The former president of Chile, ailing 83-year-old Augusto Pinochet, went to England last year for medical treatment. In response to a complaint by a group of Marxists in Spain, last October the British government arrested Pinochet, and since then the lawyers have wrangled over whether or not he should be extradited to Spain to be tried on a charge of so-called "crimes against humanity." Specifically, the Marxists claim that when Pinochet was president of Chile between 1973 and 1990, his government tortured a number of communist prisoners during interrogation. Marxists everywhere have had a special hatred for Pinochet because he successfully crushed communism in Chile, and the Jews have had a special hatred for him because a strikingly high percentage of the communists he crushed were Jews.

No one really denies that in Pinochet's Chile some communist prisoners were dealt with roughly. That was the only effective way to deal with communist subversives, who were attempting to undermine Chilean society and take over the country. Whatever was done to the communists by Pinochet's police, however, was quite mild compared to what the communists did to prisoners whenever they got the upper hand. So today the leftists and the Jews are demonstrating noisily in London for Pinochet to be extradited to Spain so that he can be tried and punished because his government tortured communist prisoners during the time Pinochet was the president of Chile. The Jews are arguing that the normal immunity from arrest held by heads of state and former heads of state doesn't apply in Pinochet's case, because of the special nature of his crimes: namely, "crimes against humanity."

The fascinating thing about this affair is that all the while the Left and the Right have been arguing the pros and cons of Pinochet's case, another political leader whose government has routinely tortured prisoners since 1948 comes and goes freely wherever he pleases, including Britain, and there's never a yap about him in the controlled media, never a suggestion that he should be arrested and tried for "crimes against humanity." That political leader is Israel's Prime Minister Ehud Barak. At the same time that there has been a big stir almost every day in the media in Britain about the legal wrangling over Pinochet's pending extradition, there has a been a debate in the Hebrew press in Israel over whether or not the Israeli secret police should continue to torture their Palestinian prisoners during interrogation. Which is to say, there is a general recognition in Israel that the government there has had a policy of torturing non-Jewish prisoners.

Does this worry Ehud Barak? Is he concerned that he might be arrested and held for "crimes against humanity" if he travels to Britain or any other country? Is he worried that the arrest and extradition of Augusto Pinochet may set a precedent which could be used against him and other Israelis?

No, of course not. He is not worried, because he knows that the controlled media will never raise the issue. He knows that if some group somewhere demands his arrest for "crimes against humanity," the media will simply ignore the demand, and nothing will come of it.

The average citizen hasn't a clue. He sees and hears the television reporters talking about what a cruel and violent government Pinochet headed in Chile, and so it seems to him reasonable that Pinochet should be arrested and turned over to a gang of Reds for a legal lynching. And the same citizen sees and hears Barak being greeted with a smile and hugged by heads of state wherever he goes, and so it never occurs to him that Barak should be punished for anything. Public attitudes toward either Pinochet or Barak could be turned instantly by the media if they chose to do so. But of course, they won't, because the controlled media take their positions on every issue on the basis of Jewish policy.

So this problem of Jewish control of the mass media is something that we must overcome before we can even begin to do anything about our Phoenix medical worker's problems -- or any other problem.

The Jews and the Senators

Sometimes the most important things occur virtually unnoticed, while people's attention is focused on things of no consequence. Last week, while everyone was glued to his television screen, oohing and ahing over Hurricane Floyd and watching the huge traffic jams of lemmings fleeing the southeastern coastal areas lest they be obliged to do a little wading, much more dangerous and sinister doings than wind, rain, and high tides were afoot, but hardly anyone noticed. The Senate Judiciary Committee in Washington was holding a public hearing and listening to suggestions from various pressure groups on ways to eliminate free speech on the Internet.

That's not what they called it, of course; they said they were trying to devise ways of keeping "hate" off the Internet. They want to protect children from being exposed to "hate," they say. They want to reduce the amount of violence in the country, they say; many people learn from the Internet to hate, and then having learned to hate, they run out and commit acts of violence. Keep "hate" off the Internet, and then there will be less violence. That's what they claim to believe.

Well, whether their theory about the Internet provoking people to violence is correct or not, it sounds as if the Senate Judiciary Committee really means well, doesn't it? I mean, who could be against reducing the amount of "hate" in America? That's really a Mom and apple pie issue, isn't it?

Of course, if you're a skeptical sort of person, as I am, you might want to know exactly what this "hate" consists of that the senators and the witnesses testifying for them are so eager to keep off the Internet. "Hate," it seems to me, could be a tricky thing to define. Would you call any expression of dislike or contempt "hate"? Maybe only a strong expression of dislike? How strong? Maybe whether an expression of dislike or contempt is "hate" depends on who is making the expression and who is the target of the dislike. I mean, really, how do you decide what is "hate" and what isn't?

Well, listen, you will be pleased and relieved to learn that we don't have to bother our little heads about that at all. We don't have to decide what is "hate" and what isn't. We have some very public-spirited people who have volunteered to do that for us. Lucky us! These are the very same public-spirited people who persuaded the senators to hold the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing in the first place and then appeared as witnesses before the committee. They are Howard P. Berkowitz, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center; and several other like-minded citizens of the Jewish persuasion. Morris Dees's Southern Poverty Law Center sent a witness to testify, for example.

These public-spirited citizens are referred to uniformly by the controlled media as "civil rights experts" or "human rights advocates." Isn't that reassuring to know that these people who want to protect us from "hate" on the Internet also are concerned about our civil rights?

Reading the testimony of these Jewish witnesses and the comments of the eager-to-please politicians on the committee is a surreal experience. Their language is Orwellian. Nothing really

means what it sounds like it means. Rabbi Abraham Cooper referred to the Internet as a "terrorism tutor" and implied that a substantial part of the violence in American life is the consequence of permitting "hate" on the Internet. The truth, of course, is that most of the violent criminals in America never have had their hands on a computer keyboard. There is no evidence that even one act of real terrorism in the United States had anything at all to do with the Internet.

If, in fact, terrorists learn their trade from the media or are provoked to commit violent acts by the media, I would suspect Hollywood long before I would suspect the Internet. But I guess that Rabbi Cooper and Mr. Berkowitz and Mr. Dees would want to change the subject in a hurry if you began talking to them about violence inspired by television or by Hollywood films, however. After all, it's their tribe which is in control of the television and film business.

The witnesses at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing spoke of Internet sites where one can learn to make a bomb. Perhaps there are such sites, although I've never seen one. But I cannot think of a single terrorist bombing in the United States in which the bomber could have learned from the Internet how to build his bomb. Neither Timothy McVeigh nor the people accused of bombing the World Trade Center in New York were ever on the Internet, so far as I am aware. Certainly, no evidence was presented by the government at their trials to indicate they were.

Really, the whole notion that people commit violent crimes or terrorist acts as a consequence of "hate" on the Internet is simply ridiculous. Do you know what these anti-hate crusaders presented as evidence of terrorism inspired or facilitated by the Internet? I'll quote directly from the transcript of the hearing. The committee chairman, Utah's Republican Senator Orrin Hatch, said that he was pleased to have as a witness the assistant U.S. attorney from Los Angeles, Michael Gennaco, who had gained "the first conviction against a hate-crime assailant for acts taken on the Internet." Assistant U.S. Attorney Gennaco then related his achievement to the committee:

"On the morning of March 5, 1998, 42 Latino faculty members turned on their computers at Cal State Los Angeles to read their e-mails. They read a mean-spirited derogatory statement against Latinos. Using the most demeaning racial slurs, the sender told the faculty members that he hated their race, that he wanted them to die, that the only reason the professors were hired was because of Affirmative Action, that their race was stupid, greedy, and ugly, and that the sender was going to personally come down and kill each of them."

The student who sent this message to the Latino faculty members was tracked down, arrested, tried, and convicted. Of course, the name of the offending student wasn't mentioned in the hearing -- just for your information, his name is Kwon -- and it also wasn't mentioned in the hearing that Kwon is Chinese, because that inconvenient fact doesn't fit the general theme the committee wanted to develop. Before we get into that theme, however, let us remember that what this Chinese student did -- essentially sending a death threat by wire -- certainly was nothing new, and it required no new laws for its prosecution.

The fact that this was the best example the committee could come up with of a genuine Internet-related "hate crime" ought to tell us that this whole pretense of being concerned about the connection between "hate" on the Internet and violence is phony. These Jewish "human rights

advocates" like Berkowitz and Cooper understand that there simply are no convincing cases of violence or terrorism stemming from the Internet, so after giving us the pitiful example of Kwon and his derogatory e-mail to the Mexican faculty members -- and giving it to us in such a way that many of us would assume that Kwon was a heterosexual White male, their stereotypical "hater" -- after this they try to bolster their case with all sorts of innuendo and misdirection.

For example, much was made in the hearing of the facts that Benjamin Smith, the University of Indiana student who shot a Korean and a Black this summer, belonged to the World Church of the Creator, and the World Church of the Creator has an Internet web site. The not so subtle implication was that if the World Church of the Creator had been kept off the Internet in some way, then the Black and the Korean shot by Benjamin Smith still would be alive. But that's really a false implication. Benjamin Smith wasn't incited by the Internet to shoot anyone. He knew personally the man who heads the World Church of the Creator; he was his close associate and helper. That man is an attorney; he has a law degree and wants to practice law in Illinois. And when that man was denied a law license by the Politically Correct Illinois bar committee because they didn't like his religious beliefs, Smith went on a rampage. There is absolutely no evidence to indicate that the Internet had anything to do with it.

And there was a lot of other deliberate misdirection too by the politicians and the Jewish witnesses. The shootings at Columbine High School in Colorado were invoked by several witnesses. Rabbi Cooper claimed "In 1999 the Internet can serve as a terrorism tutor; it did for Eric Harris at Columbine." Rabbi Cooper seems to have forgotten that Eric Harris had a Jewish accomplice, Dylan Klebold.

The Southern Poverty Law Center's Joseph Roy, who was also a witness, testified:

"In Littleton, Colorado, the two youths who opened fire on their classmates at Columbine High School may well have been inspired, in some part, by neo-Nazi propaganda they encountered on the Net. It seems clear that they found plans for building pipe bombs and other weapons there."

Now, that is really deceptive, and I'm sure that Mr. Roy intended it to be. He knows that Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold were not "neo-Nazis"; he knows that one was a Jew and that both were anti-racist. He knows that Eric Harris had an Internet web site in which he said that he wanted to torture and kill White racists. If Harris and Klebold were inspired by anything they encountered on the Net, it certainly wasn't "neo-Nazi propaganda"; on the contrary, the evidence suggests that they were inspired by the sort of multicultural "love" and diversity-mongering with which the Southern Poverty Law Center, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith poison the Net. As to whether or not Harris and Klebold found plans on the Net for making pipe bombs, that's really beside the point, since they did all of their killing and wounding with shotguns and pistols. They neither killed nor injured anyone with a pipe bomb.

So without the least bit of evidence that Politically Incorrect web sites on the Internet have any connection to terrorism, why did the Jews and the politicians bother to have this hearing? Why try to persuade anyone that the Internet is a "terrorism tutor" when it plainly isn't? What's the point?

The point is that the Jews aren't concerned about the Internet as a so-called "terrorism tutor"; that is just a smoke-screen. What they are concerned about is keeping inconvenient facts and ideas off the Internet. They don't want to stop terrorism; they want to stop the spread of truth. Until the Internet came along the Jews had a virtual monopoly on the dissemination of ideas and information to the general public. If they wanted to persuade the public that in most interracial crime White males are the aggressors, there was no one to contradict them with the facts. They could report -- over and over and over again, with non-stop coverage -- any interracial crime in which Whites actually were the aggressors and ignore all Black-on-White crimes, which is essentially what they're still doing -- but with the Internet people like me are embarrassing them with the facts.

Five or six years ago they could talk about "Russian" organized crime on television or in the *New York Times,* and there was no one to tell the public that it wasn't "Russian" organized crime at all: that it was 100 per cent Jewish organized crime. They could whine about how they were "persecuted" by the Swiss and the Germans and the Swedes and the Poles and the Ukrainians and the Russians and the Lithuanians and the Latvians and everyone else during the Second World War, and how everyone owed them hundreds of billions of dollars in "reparations" now, and there was no one to tell the world about the persecution of other peoples and nations by the Jews. There was no one to point out to the world that for every dollar taken from the Jews during the war, the Jews stole 100 dollars from those countries which fell victim to their communist racket. They could moan to the world about how the cold and cruel Gentiles just stood by and let six million Jews be led into the gas chambers, and so now the very least the world could do for the Jews was to give them a free ride. Anyone who questioned their story was immediately shrieked down as a "Holocaust denier," and the questioner had no way of presenting the historical facts to the public. People like me could print a few pamphlets and distribute them on street corners, but for all practical purposes we had no effective way of exposing the lies of the Jews.

The Jews liked it that way. They liked having a monopoly on the dissemination of ideas and information to the public. The Internet robs them of that monopoly, and they don't like that a bit. They don't like having me and others exposing their lies and telling the public things they prefer to keep quiet.

Of course, even with the Internet available to us, we can't challenge the hold the Jews have on America's political system -- at least, not yet. The great mass of the voters, the couch potatoes, the ball game fans, don't use the Internet and never will -- except perhaps to access porno sites and check their horoscopes. But the perceptive and intelligent minority of White men and women capable of independent thought now have a new information medium, a new medium for the exchange of ideas, and the Jews aren't able to control it. That's what they don't like. That's what they're afraid of, certainly not terrorism.

They're afraid of the fact that as the sickness of American society becomes more and more evident to the perceptive few, that as the craziness and destructiveness going on in Washington and Hollywood take a greater and greater toll, more and more of the people who really count, the intelligent and productive White men and women in the universities and in the professions and in industry who somehow keep this civilization staggering along under its growing burden -- these people are looking for answers, and Rabbi Cooper and his fellow tribesmen are afraid they may

find the answers. They are desperately afraid of that. And that's why they told the politicians to hold the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing last week. They are desperate to control the Internet the same way they control television and the *New York Times;* they are desperate to censor the Internet, to choke off the free flow of information. But of course, they won't tell us that. What they tell us is that they want to protect us from violence and terrorism caused by "hate" on the Internet.

So what do you think? Are the American people too smart to fall for that sort of deception? Are we so fond of our freedom that we won't give it up just because the Jews have cleverly labeled it as "hate"? Can we relax because Senator Hatch and the other senators on the committee all swore to uphold and defend the Constitution and therefore won't let these Jews get away with their scheme?

Listen, you know as well as I do that Senator Hatch and every other politician in the Congress would fall all over themselves to abolish the whole Bill of Rights in order to please Rabbi Cooper and Mr. Berkowitz and the rest -- if they thought the American people would let them get away with it. They know that the couch potatoes won't object, but they're still concerned about that minority of perceptive and responsible White Americans who aren't quite ready yet to give up their freedom without a fight.

So the hearing last week was well larded with assurances that new laws can be devised to keep "hate" off the Internet without infringing on anyone's freedom of speech. If that leaves you a little uncertain as to exactly what these Jews have in mind, let me tell you about something which happened this month in the Fort Lauderdale, Florida, suburb of Oakland Park. Lloyd Shank is a 73-year-old retired carpenter who lives in Oakland Park, which is in Broward County. Mr. Shank doesn't much like the Clinton government, and he also doesn't like Jews. On August 23 he hand-delivered copies of a one-page letter he had written to members of the Broward County Commission. All but one of the members of the county commission are Jews, and the one who is not is a woman married to a Jew. After the Second World War New York Jews migrated in large numbers to Florida and virtually took over the southeastern part of the state.

In his letter Mr. Shank said some unkind things about the Clinton government, including the charge that the government is responsible for the deaths of more than 80 members of a church in Waco, Texas, that the FBI and other secret police agencies laid siege to and then burned to the ground on April 19, 1993, with most of the church members, including women and children, inside. Mr. Shank also said some unkind things about Jews in his letter, calling them "perverts" and accusing them of liking to be hated. He wound up his letter with the statement:

"When your holocaust reprisals come, hide in the New York subways for security from nuclear bombs. Don't forget your money."

No threats, just an expression of dislike.

Now, I don't know about you, but I don't see the point in sending letters to Jews telling them that they're bad people and that you don't like them. To me that seems like foolishness and a waste of time. But we have a right to be foolish and waste our time if we want to. We have a right to send

letters to people and call them perverts and tell them that we don't like them, whether they are Jews or not. The Jews should not be exempted from criticism, and no one should be punished for criticizing them. We do still have a Constitution and freedom of speech -- except in Broward County, Florida, apparently.

The Jews ran immediately to the police with Shank's letter and demanded that he be arrested. Broward County Sheriff Ken Jenne jumped to obey. With an eagerness to please that put Senator Orrin Hatch in the shade, Jenne arrested Shank and began making statements to the press: "We will not allow extremists to terrorize any member of our community." That sounds suspiciously like the sheriff of Broward County and his Jewish constituents believe that extremists -- which is to say, people who criticize Jews -- should have fewer rights than the rest of the citizenry.

A news story in the September 10 issue of the Miami *Herald* about Mr. Shank's arrest stated:

"In the wake of a shooting spree at a Jewish community center in Los Angeles last month, authorities are taking anti-Semitic rhetoric like Shank's seriously."

Yes, but apparently they no longer take the Constitution of the United States seriously in Broward County. And believe me, that's exactly what Rabbi Abraham Cooper and Mr. Howard Berkowitz and Mr. Morris Dees and their pals have in mind for the rest of the country, despite all of their deceptive claims that they're not out to abolish the First Amendment.

Seeing the Forest

I really do appreciate the responses to my broadcasts which listeners send to me. Even though I and my staff can't answer every letter we receive, we do read them all, and I learn from them.

Every week I receive a number of letters from listeners who believe that I blame the Jews too much for the destruction of our society. I'm not referring now to the letters from crazed Christian fundamentalists who rave at me about the Jews being "God's chosen people" and therefore entitled to do whatever they want without criticism. These pitiful souls tell me, "God'll get you if you say anything bad about the Jews. Don't you know that Jesus was a Jew?"

And I also am not referring to the letters from lemmings, who simply parrot back the Politically Correct party line they've learned from watching television, to the effect that Jews are just like everybody else, except better, and that the only reason I speak critically of them in my broadcasts is that I'm jealous of their success. They tell me that I'm an embittered loser who lives in a trailer, has bad teeth, and never got an education, and that I spend most of my time getting drunk and doing intimate things with my female relatives, because the media have taught them that all people who live in West Virginia are like that.

Anyway, I never waste time arguing with people about their religion, whether it is Christian fundamentalism or Political Correctness. Unless people have a reasoned basis for their beliefs, a reasoned argument with them is pointless. The believers I want to argue with today are those who believe that I am incorrect in imputing bad motives to the Jews as a whole. Some of them tell me, it's not the Jews per se who're destroying our race and our civilization; it's the rich people, Jewish and non-Jewish. It's the greedy billionaires, who keep our borders open to the Third World because they want a steady supply of cheap labor. It's the crooked lawyers, Jewish and non-Jewish, who run our legislatures and our courts to enrich themselves rather than to give us good laws and justice.

And of course, the people who tell me this are correct -- up to a point. It is true that Gentile billionaires do tend to put their further enrichment at the top of their list, and they do tend to go along with the Jewish billionaires in many things. They seldom see any profit to themselves in opposing the Jews, even when they don't agree ideologically with them. Billionaires are more inclined to go with existing trends and try to profit from them than to buck those trends and risk losing money. It has been truly said that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to... do anything which might diminish his fortune. And it also is true that most lawyers chose their profession not with the aim of serving their people or because they are interested in law, but rather because they see it as a way to personal wealth and power. And it also is true that we have a lawyer-ridden society. We should have people other than lawyers setting policy.

More generally, it is true that if one looks into every destructive institution in our society, if one looks behind every destructive policy, one finds non-Jews as well as Jews. The ruinous immigration policy we have now in the United States is favored by some Gentiles as well as by virtually all Jews. The 1965 immigration law which shifted the flow of immigrants into this

country from mostly European to mostly non-European was pushed primarily by Jews, but Senator Ted Kennedy was a co-sponsor of the law. The Jews may be taking over organized crime in America, but there still are some Italians involved in it. The most active legislators in the Congress pushing for the curtailment of our right to keep and bear arms are Jews, but many Gentiles also are involved. If we look into the destructive exploitation of our natural environment, the cutting down of our forests and the strip-mining of our land and the polluting of our rivers, we probably will find greedy and short-sighted Gentile profiteers more often than we will find Jews. And even in the mass media, one can still find some non-Jewish media bosses who promote essentially the same party line as the Jewish media bosses: Rupert Murdoch is an example.

All of that is true. So, then, why don't I just complain about the plutocrats or the lawyers or the businessmen? Why do I single out the Jews? The answer to that is that if we don't look at the Jews specifically, if we don't try to understand them as Jews, then we can never really understand what is happening to our race and our civilization. And if we don't understand what's happening, we're much less likely to be able to change things for the better. We need to understand the process, and in order to understand the process we need to understand the Jewish role in it -- because it is the key role.

Let's back off a bit and just ask ourselves, what is the single most powerful and influential institution in American life today? What institution, more than any other, is promoting the worst and most destructive trends in American life? Is it professional basketball? That's certainly a noxious influence -- but it's not the most noxious. Is it the Internal Revenue Service? No. It isn't even the Clinton government of which the Internal Revenue Service is a part, because the Clinton government itself is only a creature of the most powerful institution, and that most powerful institution is made up of the mass media of news and entertainment which together shape public opinion and control public policy. And these media in turn are dominated by Jews.

I won't go into all of the names and organizational relationships today, because I've done that a number of times in past broadcasts, and the details are all in a pamphlet I publish and update regularly, it's called *Who Rules America?,* and if you send $2 to the sponsors of this broadcast they'll send you a copy. But just a quick summary: the three giants in the electronic media are Disney-ABC, headed by Michael Eisner; Time Warner-CNN, headed by Gerald Levin; and the new Viacom-CBS conglomerate, headed by Sumner Redstone. Eisner, Levin, and Redstone are all Jews, but it's not just the men at the top who're Jews; these media giants are staffed by Jews from top to bottom.

In the print media the country's three most influential newspapers are the *New York Times,* the *Wall Street Journal,* and the *Washington Post.* All three of them are owned or controlled by Jews. The only three widely read weekly news magazines in the United States are *Time,* which is owned by Gerald Levin's Time Warner-CNN; *Newsweek,* which is owned by Katharine Meyer Graham's Washington Post Company; and *U.S. News & World Report,* which is owned by Jewish real-estate developer Mort Zuckerman. The story is the same in the Hollywood film industry and throughout the rest of the mass media of news and entertainment.

Now, there are people who will tell you with a straight face that this almost total domination of the most powerful institution in our society by the Jewish minority, which makes up only 2.5 per cent of the U.S. population, is just a coincidence, that it has no sinister significance. It just as well could have been Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses who happened to rule the media. What difference does it make?

When grown men say something like that, you can safely bet that there's something other than reason at work. Usually it's fear: not so much a conscious fear as a conditioned avoidance reflex, the product of a long-term program of media conditioning of the public never to say or even think anything negative about Jews, lest one be labelled an "anti-Semite" or a "Nazi." Really, the proper name for this sort of conditioning is "brainwashing." Think about it for a minute. Imagine yourself in a group of yuppies, at a restaurant, say, or a cocktail party: a fairly sophisticated and irreverent sort of crowd. You can make a joke about the Pope, and even the Catholics in the crowd will laugh. You can say something smutty about Mother Teresa or Martin Luther King without objection. You can express your dislike for homosexuals or feminists. Some of those present may argue against you, but they are not likely to get uptight about it. But if you want to stop the conversation cold and give everyone present a bad case of heartburn, just say something unfriendly about the Jews: either about a specific Jew or the Jews as a whole. Say, for example, something like, "Well, now that that Jew Sumner Redstone has grabbed CBS, there's hardly any part of the mass media that the Jews don't own. I think that's not good for America." Say that, and then smell the fear in the air as your friends choke on their martinis.

Perhaps I exaggerate a bit, but not much. The Jews do get special treatment, and that is no more a coincidence than their control of the mass media. It has been planned. It is has been engineered. Now, I am sure that, having said that, the minds of many of my listeners have just locked gears as the conditioned reflex forbidding them to think any unfriendly thought about Jews kicks in. But you know, it is possible to overcome this conditioning, this brainwashing -- unless you're a lemming, that is. Lemmings can't overcome it because they don't want to overcome it. They don't want to think any disapproved thought, any thought that everyone else isn't thinking. But if you're a person who wants to think clearly about this matter, all you have to do is begin looking at the facts. Take your time. Study the facts carefully: not just the facts I offer to you, but also everything else you can dig up on the subject. Think about the implications. Reach your own conclusions. You can overcome the conditioned fear -- and as a responsible adult, as a responsible American, as a responsible member of your race, you should.

And when you no longer are afraid and you finally are able to look the truth squarely in the face, you no longer will believe that it is a coincidence that the Jews have elbowed their way into virtually every position of control in the mass media. You no longer will believe that the Jews do not use the power consciously and collectively that this media control gives them. I'll say that again: the Jews use their control over the mass media, not as individual capitalists, the way the few non-Jews in the media do, but they use it collectively and cooperatively to advance Jewish interests. That is why you can see a common propaganda agenda throughout all of the controlled media. They all promote the image of the Jew as a victim, never as a predator or aggressor; they all promote the image of the Jews as sensitive and creative and sympathetic, not as the sort to plan and organize a bloody Bolshevik revolution and butcher tens of millions of innocent Russians and Ukrainians or to run the White-slave business and force thousands of young

European girls into a life of prostitution every year -- or as the sort to elbow their way into the key positions of media control and then to help their fellow Jews do the same thing.

And they also all push interracial sex. They all push the lie that most interracial crime is White on Black. They all suppress any news which contradicts that lie. They all try to persuade us that homosexuality is normal and acceptable, just an alternative life-style. They all propagandize for multiculturalism and for more diversity and for keeping our borders open to the Third World and for scrapping the Second Amendment -- all of them.

Now, let's back up for a moment, because I've just said something extremely important, and I want to be sure that it sinks in: that I have convinced you. I think that most perceptive and responsible people, once they have made up their minds that they want to know the truth, can accept the fact of Jewish media control; that fact is really undeniable. I think that most of them can then take the next step and conclude that this Jewish media control is not just a coincidence: they can conclude that the Jews deliberately and cooperatively set out to achieve this control and then to use it to advance their collective interests.

People can understand that in terms of the sort of group behavior with which they already are familiar. The members of other groups also cooperate in order to achieve group power and then use this power to advance their group interests. And so it should not be surprising that the Jews in the media collaborate to create a favorable image of themselves in the public mind. Most people can persuade themselves that it's not "anti-Semitic" to believe that Jews behave like many other groups do in order to advance their group interests.

It's the next step that is difficult for many people: it is recognizing that the propaganda agenda of the Jewish media bosses goes far beyond promoting a favorable image of themselves; it also promotes everything which is unfavorable to the non-Jewish majority. And this destructive propaganda is not a coincidence either; it is the product of a planned, deliberate, collaborative effort.

Reaching this conclusion is a big step, a difficult step, for many people -- even for people who want to understand, who want to know the truth. It's a big step because it separates the Jews from every other special-interest group. It sets the Jews aside from the rest of humanity and identifies them as a uniquely hostile, destructive, and deceptive group. It identifies them as a group which is uniquely dangerous to our people. And it leaves anyone who takes this step open to the charge of "anti-Semitism." Certainly, if you take this step -- if you reach this conclusion -- and you announce your conclusion publicly, you will be denounced as an "anti-Semite" by the media bosses -- and probably by the lemmings too.

And so I don't want you just to take my word for this very important conclusion about the nature of the Jews as a uniquely hostile and dangerous group. I want you to study the facts. I want you to think about the evidence and reach your own conclusion. But I don't want you to stop short of a conclusion because of fear, because of brainwashing. I want you to overcome your fear and examine the evidence objectively.

I will make a few more observations about this conclusion and its implications now, however. Let me tell you, it really is the key to understanding many other things: the history of the Jews in Europe -- and elsewhere -- for example. Why were the Jews always picked on and persecuted far more than any other group? Why did everyone else always hate them? Why have they been kicked out of virtually every country in Europe during the past thousand years: out of England and Spain and Portugal and France and Sweden and Germany and a dozen other countries and told never to come back, only to sneak back in and then be kicked out again? The Jews will tell you that it was Christian bigotry. But Christian bigotry cannot explain why the Egyptians threw them out of Egypt more than a thousand years before Christ, and it cannot explain why the pagan Greeks and Romans hated them. I used to wonder about these things. And even after I began to suspect that the socially and racially destructive activities of the Jews were planned and deliberate, I didn't know why. It didn't make sense to me that the Jews would deliberately seek to destroy a society in which they were riding high -- that they would deliberately drill holes in the bottom of a boat in which they were passengers. I couldn't figure it out -- until I understood the nature of the Jews.

And that nature really is unique. At some time far back in the prehistoric period, certainly more than 3,000 years ago, the Jews developed a unique mode of survival as predators and parasites. Whereas other races, other tribes, sought either to live alone among their own kind -- or to conquer other tribes militarily and take their land or require them to pay tribute -- the Jews sought to invade the territory of other races by stealth and then to subvert them, to undermine their morale, to break down the order and structure in their societies as a concomitant to controlling them and exploiting them.

In the beginning, thousands of years ago, this may have been only a novel plan for gaining control of a particular neighbor, but eventually it developed into a way of life. It became part of their religion, and eventually it got into their genes. I believe that today they really can't help themselves. And as I said before, you do need to think carefully about this. You need to study the facts. It's difficult for many people to understand the Jews because they really are different from every other ethnic group.

One aspect of the Jewish problem which adds to the difficulty many people have in coming to grips with it is that the Jews are not just a scheming and sinister *kehillah* of adult male media bosses. They are a complete community, with women and children and many members on the fringes: part-Jews, dissidents, and so on -- even a few anti-Jewish Jews. There are approximately six million Jews in the United States, by their own count, and they can't all be film studio owners or newspaper publishers or promoters of "rap" music or Hollywood scriptwriters. Most of them live and work in a way which gives them relatively little personal opportunity for damaging our society. They are simply teachers and businessmen and merchants and lawyers and doctors, earning a living more or less like everyone else -- but not quite.

You must back off a bit in order to see the forest rather than just the trees. The essential thing about the forest is that it is destroying our world. It is a parasitic forest. It is injecting spiritual and cultural poison into our civilization and into the life of our people and sucking up nutrients to enrich itself and grow even more destructive. Perhaps only 10 per cent of the trees in this Jewish forest have roots deep enough to inject their poison into us, and the other 90 per cent play

only supporting roles of one sort or another. It is still the whole forest which is our problem. If the forest were not here we would not have had to endure the curse of Bolshevism. If the forest were not here America would not be growing darker and more degenerate by the year. It is the whole forest, not just a few of the most poisonous trees in it, which must be uprooted and removed from our soil if we are to become healthy again.

The essential point again is this: not every Jew has a leading role in promoting the evils which are destroying us, and not every person is a Jew who is collaborating with the leading Jews who are promoting evil, but it is only because the Jews as a whole are among us that the evils they always promote are overwhelming us. If the Jews were not present we could overcome the evil men of our own race. The evil men of our own race may seek their own profit at the expense of the rest of us, but they do not seek to destroy our race. Only the Jews seek that.

Shuffling Toward the Slaughterhouse

Last week we talked about some specific examples of the way in which the bosses of the controlled media deliberately give most Americans a severely distorted perception of what is happening in the world around them, of what is fashionable, and so on. In particular, I talked about the crooked way in which the media bosses report interracial crime. They heavily overemphasize any attacks on non-Whites by Whites and minimize or ignore attacks on Whites by non-Whites. They do this in order to create the false impression in the public's mind that most interracial crime is White on non-White, whereas in fact exactly the opposite is true. The reason the media bosses deliberately create this false impression in the public mind is to generate a sense of racial guilt in Whites, to keep them on the defensive in all matters relating to race, to keep them off balance and confused as the non-White assault on America continues through immigration and other means. The aim is to persuade White Americans to give up their freedom -- their freedom of speech, their freedom of association, their freedom to keep and bear arms for self-defense -- in order to relieve their sense of White guilt and gain a false sense of security by stamping out dissent on racial matters. In summary, the aim of the media bosses in distorting their coverage of the news is to silence and disarm White Americans and keep them on the defensive.

And that is their aim because they are Jews, and they are reaching for even more control than they already have. This is the historic *modus operandi* of the Jews. They are outsiders everywhere except in Israel, and when they first appear in any Gentile society and begin reaching for power they are resisted. The society treats the Jews as outsiders, as aliens, and attempts to keep them from gaining control. The Jewish method of countering this opposition is to work quietly to accumulate as much wealth as possible. At the same time they work to corrupt the society's leaders with money and to sow dissension among the masses, to set one social class against another, to break up the society's solidarity and its cohesiveness, so that there will be less resistance to their penetration of the society.

During the latter half of the 19th century and the first part of the 20th century fomenting class warfare has been their most successful technique in Europe. In Russia, for example, they would have had difficulty in corrupting the enormously wealthy aristocracy with bribes, but their technique of fomenting class warfare succeeded in destroying Russian society and letting the Jews seize control through their Marxist movement. In the United States, on the other hand, where the political leaders are essentially hucksters and lawyers and the working class is relatively well off compared to Russia, the Jews have had much more success with corruption than with their attempts to foment class warfare.

Many people who have studied the history of communism and have become aware of the enormously disproportionate presence of Jews in that movement have come to the erroneous conclusion that Jews are inherently communists. The truth of the matter is that Jews are no more inherently communist than they are inherently capitalist. Jews are inherently acquisitive, ethnocentric, and cohesive, and they have a parasitic mode of existence. They become communists when that serves their purpose of breaking into a Gentile society and gaining control, and they become capitalists when capitalism serves their purpose better than

communism. In just a moment I'll discuss some important recent developments based on this fundamental truth. First, however, I want to add a bit to our discussion of last week.

The Jews' aim, remember, is to destroy Gentile solidarity, to sow confusion, to generate feelings of guilt, to morally disarm White society so that it will be easy pickings, and in the last half of the 20th century their principal weapon for this purpose, more important than corruption or class warfare, has been their control of the mass media of news and entertainment. For week after week I've cited very specific evidence of the way in which they use their control of the media to confuse and demoralize the White public. Before I get to the new developments I mentioned, I just want to bring you up to date with another example.

On August 13 a 50-year-old White man, Gregory Griffith, was beaten, kicked, and stomped into a coma by a group of young Blacks in Jacksonville, Florida. The Blacks had been standing around on the sidewalk jiving among themselves, and they decided to kill the next White person who came along. Gregory Griffith was it. Griffith died from the stomping on August 26 in Jacksonville's University Medical Center. Have you heard anything about this murder? I'll bet you haven't, unless you live in the immediate vicinity of Jacksonville. Do you think you would have heard anything if Griffith had been Black and a group of White skinheads had decided to kill the next Black who came down the sidewalk? I'll bet you wouldn't have heard anything but that since August 13. It would have been on network television every single night. Bill Clinton and Janet Reno and the head of every major Jewish so-called "human rights" organization would have been on television too, looking grim and waving a stern forefinger at us and lecturing us about "White racism" and "hate crime."

You remember that last week I told you about the three Indians who tied a rope around a White man's neck and dragged him behind their pickup truck in South Dakota until they thought he was dead. There's been very little media coverage of that dragging since then, and what coverage there has been has consisted mainly of arguments as to why it wasn't really a so-called "hate crime." In the Jacksonville case there can be no doubt whatsoever. The arrested Blacks confessed to police that they killed Griffith solely because he was White, that they had agreed among themselves to kill the next White person who came down the sidewalk. So don't expect to see anything about it on television. They certainly wouldn't want to spoil all of the propaganda they're planning for the upcoming trial in Bryan, Texas, of the second defendant in last year's Jasper dragging case. So you tell me, why do the Jewish media bosses do this sort of thing if it's not for the purpose of keeping the White couch potatoes feeling guilty and defensive about being White? Really, confusion and moral disarmament and social breakdown are their purpose.

Television makes it much easier for them, but they were at it long before television came along. Let me read you something which has been a part of their tradition for more than 2,700 years. This was written by one of the Jews' most revered religious leaders, Isaiah. In the 19th chapter of the Book of Isaiah he spelled out the formula the Jews always have used to break up a Gentile society and gain control. Isaiah wrote: "And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians, and they shall fight everyone against his brother and everyone against his neighbor, city against city and kingdom against kingdom. And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst thereof, and I will destroy the counsel thereof, and they shall seek to the idols and to the charmers and to them that have familiar spirits and to the wizards." That was the formula 2,700 years ago.

Now, for some new developments. I've told you on several earlier broadcasts about the growing problem of Jewish organized crime in America. So let me tell you again: it's still growing -- fast. This problem is interesting to us far beyond the interest we might have in, say, a resurgence of the Mafia. A resurgence of the Mafia would simply be a crime story: interesting, but not absolutely critical for our survival. The growth of Soviet-Jewish organized crime -- the *"Organizatsiya,"* they call it -- is interesting to us first, for the same reason the non-reporting by the Jewish media of the racial murder of Gregory Griffith in Jacksonville is interesting. The media bosses simply do not like to talk about the *Organizatsiya,* despite the fact that its operations in the United States already dwarf those of all the other criminal organizations operating here. When they do talk about Jewish organized crime they never refer to it as "Jewish"; they always call it "Russian" organized crime.

And you know, this refusal to talk honestly about Jewish organized crime is more than an attempt to protect their fellow Jews who happen to be gangsters, just like the refusal to talk honestly about interracial crime is more than an attempt to shield Black criminals. The real aim in both cases is to maintain a false image, a false belief, which they have created in the minds of most White Americans. In the case of interracial crime the false belief is that in most interracial crimes heterosexual White males are the offenders and non-Whites are the victims. In the case of Jewish organized crime the false image is that of the Jew as gentle and inoffensive, as more cultured and more moral than his Gentile neighbors, and especially as a victim rather than as an aggressor or predator.

We all read news stories occasionally about rabbis caught smuggling drugs or laundering money, but the way they're reported makes the offenders seem like exceptions to the rule of Jewish rectitude and inoffensiveness. However, when one looks closely at what Jewish organized crime has done and is doing to Russia -- and what it is beginning to do to the United States -- an entirely different image of the Jews and their relationship to their hosts emerges.

Let's look first at Russia. The *Organizatsiya* literally runs the country. It is bleeding Russia of its remaining wealth, pulling hundreds of billions of dollars out of the country and stashing it in other countries. The rule in the Russian government today is total corruption. The police know who the gangsters are. The Russian Army and the Russian police could have every organized criminal in Russia, from billionaire media mogul Boris Abramovich Berezovsky on down, hanging from meat hooks within 48 hours, if they were permitted to act. But Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the other politicians around him will not permit it. Yeltsin protects the *Organizatsiya,* and the *Organizatsiya* supports and enriches him.

Do you remember back in 1996 how the Clinton government was pushing as hard as it could for Yeltsin's re-election? There were promises of financial assistance for Russia if Yeltsin remained as president, and hints that there would be none if he were defeated. And of course, the big television networks in Russia were solidly behind Yeltsin. Today much is made of the rivalry between media moguls Boris Berezovsky, who controls the largest network, ORT, and Vladimir Gussinsky, who controls NTV, the second largest. But in 1996 both ORT and NTV were 100 per cent for Yeltsin -- and of course, both Berezovsky and Gussinsky are Jews. Gussinsky, in fact, is the titular head of Russia's entire Jewish community.

In 1996 the big fear of the media bosses and the Clintonistas here was that a genuine Russian patriot, a Russian nationalist, might win. The Russian people, unfortunately, don't seem to be much more perceptive or farsighted than the American people, and the solid support of Russia's Jew- dominated television plus the promise of more financial aid from America kept Yeltsin in power -- or to be more accurate, Yeltsin remained in office, and the Jewish gangsters around him remained in power. Whenever any Russian official begins to make a move against the gangsters, Yeltsin fires him and brings someone else in. And the gangsters continue bleeding Russia dry at the rate of hundreds of billions of dollars a year.

The Central Intelligence Agency repeatedly warned the Clinton administration that any financial aid money sent to Russia with Yeltsin in office would end up in the hands of the Jewish thieves who are effectively running the country. To the Clintonistas so long as the thieves are Jewish, that's A-OK.

In September 1997 the Global Organized Crime Project at Washington's Center for Strategic and International Studies released a report titled "Russian Organized Crime." The Global Organized Crime Project was headed by Judge William Webster, who formerly had headed both the FBI and the CIA. Both Bill Clinton and Al Gore dismissed Webster's report on organized crime in Russia, and other members of the Clinton administration were ordered to ignore the report and the CIA's warnings. Billions of dollars from the International Monetary Fund kept pouring into Russia and into the hands of the Jewish thieves around Boris Yeltsin. And the Russian people became poorer and hungrier.

The Jewish media in this country would have liked to have kept the situation in Russia covered up, but the lid is beginning to come off a bit now. Such huge sums of money are being taken out of Russia by the Jews -- including most of the emergency aid provided by the IMF -- and being laundered in Israel and America that people are noticing. The scandal involving the laundering by the Bank of New York and BankBoston Corporation of tens of billions of dollars stolen from the Russian people by Jewish crime bosses with the connivance of Boris Yeltsin has made headlines recently, following an FBI sting operation that the Clinton administration inadvertently failed to halt. The stories about the massive money-laundering operation which appeared in the *New York Times* and *USA Today* late last month referred to all of the criminals as "Russians" rather than as "Jews," of course. You have to read the Israeli papers like *Ha'aretz* and *Yediot Ahronot* to see them identified as Jews.

One would think that someone in the Congress would insist on a full-scale Congressional investigation. I mean, here is the Clinton administration solidly tied to massive international corruption, tied to the impoverishment and destabilization of a foreign nuclear power, tied to the bringing of racketeers and racketeering money into the United States on a huge scale, and the Clintonistas cannot claim that they didn't know, that they weren't warned. What a wonderful campaign issue for the Republicans to use! So why are all of the Republican politicians sitting on their hands and pretending not to notice what's going on, just like the Democrats? Are they trying to avoid embarrassing a bunch of crooked "Russians?" Hardly. Are they already on the take from the Jewish crime bosses, like the Democrats are? Probably not -- yet. But they all understand -- all of them -- that this is not a "Russian" issue; it's a Jewish issue. They all understand that, and so they're afraid to touch it.

What does this mean for our future? For one thing it means that the *Organizatsiya* will continue building its presence in America. It's already by far the largest and most dangerous criminal organization in America, and it is now clear that America's government will not move against it, and America's news media will not rouse the people against it. The Jews have softened up America, have broken down American society, have corrupted American institutions, to the point where there will be almost no resistance to their further penetration and takeover. No Republican politician, from George Bush, Jr., on down will stand against them. Instead, the Republicans will have their hands out for their share of the loot, just the way the Democrats do, and just the way Boris Yeltsin does.

One difference between the behavior of the Jewish crime bosses relative to America and their behavior relative to Russia that we will see is that the Jews are pulling money out of Russia and bringing it to the United States. They have bled Russia almost dry, but there's still much blood to be sucked from America. America will be the next center for Jewish organized crime.

And in America we'll be seeing much more of the viciousness and violence with which these Jews operate, as they gain self-confidence here: the same sort of murderous thuggery which characterizes their presence in Russia, in Germany, and in other places where they dominate criminal activity and where they butcher whole families with the same callousness displayed by a slaughterhouse worker butchering a herd of cattle. When they have trouble with some of their White slaves -- with some of the girls they have forced into prostitution -- they think nothing of slitting the throats of a dozen of them in order to terrify the others back into submission. I mean, these girls are only goyim, only *shiksas*, so why not treat them like the cattle they are?

For a while the FBI will carry on its investigations of the *Organizatsiya,* and the CIA will issue its warnings, and there will be stories in the *New York Times* about "Russian" gangsters, but by and large no real move will be made to stop them or to warn the American people. The American political system already has been corrupted beyond the point of no return, and the mass media which are used to control the thinking and the behavior of the American masses already are almost completely in Jewish hands.

Just to be on the safe side, however, the Jews are continuing to wrap up a few loose ends in the area of media control. An example was the takeover this week of CBS by Viacom and its boss Sumner Redstone. Not that CBS wasn't already thoroughly Jewish, but there was always the danger that some very rich Gentile maverick might try to buy it and change its flavor. Now it's safely in the hands of the Jewish media boss who gave us MTV, Sumner Redstone.

To reiterate: the classic Jewish technique for infiltrating and softening up a Gentile society so that it can be taken over is reaching its final stages in America. No mainstream American institution will put up any substantial resistance to the completion of this process -- not the government, not the Christian churches, not the military leadership, and certainly not the mass media. All have been corrupted or taken over. And the American people will continue shuffling meekly toward the slaughterhouse so that the beast can drain the last drop of blood from them. Just as they were afraid to speak out against the massive non-White immigration which has changed the racial complexion of America for fear of being called "racists," so will they also

remain silent and non-resisting as Jewish organized crime spreads its tentacles over America for fear of being called "anti-Semitic." If the beast is to be killed, we'll have to do it ourselves.

Individualism and Alienation

Most of the comments I receive from listeners are very supportive, but I do get some hate mail as well. Most of the hate mail is either nutcase stuff from people who have some personal problem, which they project onto me, or it's from lemmings who are very indignant that I'm not in step with everyone else in the mass media. They just need someone to hate, and I think it makes them feel better if they tell me what a rotten person I am.

But I also receive a somewhat more thoughtful type of hate mail from people who curse me because I can't understand that race really doesn't count. They tell me that I should never judge another person as a member of the race to which he belongs, but only as an individual. They tell me that many Blacks are law-abiding, hardworking people who don't use drugs or throw their trash in their yards and that many White people are criminals, are on welfare, and are generally trashy and worthless. Therefore, these individualists tell me, racism is stupid. I'm stupid, they say, because I embrace all White people, the bad along with the good, and I condemn all Blacks, the good along with the bad.

They tell me that when they're looking at a neighborhood with the thought of renting an apartment or buying a house and moving into the area, they don't judge their prospective neighbors on the basis of whether their names are Chung Lung Fu and Abraham Goldberg or Bill Smith and Earl Turner; they judge instead on how much their neighbors paid for their homes and how well they keep them up. They'd rather live next to an Abe Goldberg or a Rastus Brown with a nicely waxed, new BMW in the driveway than next to a Bill Smith with a ten-year-old Ford.

Individualists also believe that whether a person is homosexual or heterosexual is unimportant. What counts is whether or not he's well groomed, well mannered, and pays his bills on time. Undoubtedly there are individualists who will say that sex doesn't matter, either. No one should be judged by group characteristics, but only by those individual characteristics relevant to the immediate situation: will he or she make a good neighbor, a good employee, a good congressman? That's all that counts, the individualist will say. And I'm sure that many individualists actually believe this. In fact, it is a religion for many of them, judging from the emotional nature of their hate mail to me.

To explore this matter further: some individualists -- a minority of them, I suspect -- have bought into a semi-religious, semi-philosophical world view called "Objectivism" and peddled most notably by a Soviet-trained Jewess named Ayn Rand, who came to America from the Soviet Union in 1926 and began writing books extolling the virtues of selfishness and individualism. Some of her best-known books are *The Fountainhead, Atlas Shrugged,* and *The Virtue of Selfishness.* Another notable individualist in the Ayn Rand mold is Harry Browne, who recently has been the Libertarian Party's candidate for President of the United States and who wrote a book titled *How I Found Freedom in an Unfree World.*

The basic idea of Browne's book is that no one owes anything to anyone except himself, and that the only rational objective for any individual is to look out for himself, get as much for himself as he can, do whatever he wants to do that he can get away with, and to hell with everyone else.

Anyone who doesn't accept this view of things is either a sucker, just waiting to be fleeced by a more objective and rational person -- or is a person with ulterior motives aiming to fleece others.

As I said, some people have made a semi-religion out of this way of looking at things. One finds many of these people in organizations such as the John Birch Society and the Libertarian Party. But for other people -- the majority, I suspect -- individualism is simply an excuse for their selfishness and lack of responsibility. Perhaps for some it's an indicator of cowardice: faced with an intolerable racial situation in America today, they opt for an explanation of things that will not get them kicked out of the country club. They are aware of what non-White immigration is doing to America, for example, but they are afraid to take a position that might be considered "racist." They are afraid of the label. And, at the same time, they can see the catastrophe that is looming for America, so they simply abjure all responsibility.

The views of most individualists have grown out of alienation. When people have been cut loose from their roots, when they have lost all sense of community and belonging, when they have become simply human atoms floating in a cosmopolitan soup, they try to make sense of things. They look for some standard or rule to go by to justify their behavior and their feelings. And some opt for individualism. Individualism doesn't have the social stigma that "racism" does. Individualism has been given the stamp of approval by Jews, and Jews are powerful people who are in good odor with the media and with the government, so it must be OK. They can't get kicked out of the country club for being individualists.

Before I talk further about the connection between alienation and individualism, let's back up a bit and look a little more closely at the individualist mind-set itself. Why do individualists send me hate letters? Because, they say, I stupidly embrace White welfare trash and condemn honest and hardworking non-Whites.

Now, that's really a misleading claim, although in a sense there may be some truth in it. I don't embrace White welfare trash, as such. I embrace my people, my race -- all of it -- recognizing that some White people are trashy and are not the sort I would want as neighbors or would want my sister to marry. It's like embracing my family, while recognizing that some of them are black sheep. And I don't condemn honest and hardworking non-Whites. It's not my business to set standards of honesty or industry for non-Whites. That's their business. I just want them off my people's turf, out of my people's territory -- all of them. When we have settled our external problems, then we will deal with our internal problems -- including our White welfare trash.

You know, this whole debate of individualism versus racism is really tricky. It's easy for people to become confused. I, for example, am more of an individualist than most of the individualists who hate me. What that means depends upon how one understands the term "individualist." I am an individualist in the sense that I don't have a lot of sympathy for people who can't or won't pull their own weight. I don't like to meddle in other people's business, and I like it even less when other people meddle in my business. If one of my fellow Whites doesn't want to take care of himself, that's his business. Just don't ask me to take care of him. I believe in natural selection and the survival of the fittest. I believe that we weaken our race when we help the least fit to survive and reproduce. If we're going to have a welfare system for our people, then we need a compulsory sterilization system to go along with it. I become more upset when I see a 400-pound

White welfare mom surrounded by her brood of runny-nosed kids in the checkout line in front of me paying with food stamps than when I see a Black welfare mother.

I believe in helping my fellow White people in a way that strengthens them as a whole, not in a way that weakens them. I believe in helping the best and brightest and strongest of my people to be more effective, because by strengthening my whole people I strengthen that of which I am a part. That is ***my*** selfishness. That's the sense in which I'm an individualist. I'm an individualist within a certain framework: the framework of my race and my civilization. I'm an individualist with roots, an individualist with a sense of community, a sense of belonging, a sense of responsibility.

And you know, that's the sense in which our people have used the term for a long time. When the Greeks talked about individualism 2,500 years ago, they spoke about it with the same understanding I have today. In the sixth century BC, when individualism characterized Greek poetry, one of the greatest of the Greek poets, Theognis of Megara, expressed his sense of responsibility and his concern for his race when he deplored the careless breeding habits of many of his people and the consequent decline in their racial quality. Theognis wrote:

"The best men . . . wed, for money, runts of poor descent. So too a woman will demean her state And spurn the better for the richer mate. Money's the cry. Good stock to bad is wed, And bad to good, till all the world's cross-bred. No wonder if the country's breed declines. . . ."

And what is the understanding today of the individualists who send me hate letters? To be frank, I think that they understand nothing. They don't see themselves in any framework of race or history or civilization. They think of themselves as pure, disconnected individuals, with responsibilities to no one, existing only for themselves. They do not embrace a race. They embrace only themselves. When they choose neighbors or co-workers or business partners -- or marital partners -- they do so solely on the basis of what pleases them at the moment. A Chinese neighbor is just as good as a White neighbor of the same socioeconomic status. A Jewish co-worker is just as good as an Aryan co-worker. Individualists may form alliances with others they perceive as having similar interests, but their own interests always are strictly personal.

And they really think they're smart. Not only do they avoid the stigma of "racism," but by shedding all responsibility to anyone but themselves they believe they gain an advantage over suckers like me who are burdened with responsibility to my people, to my forefathers, to my descendants, and so on.

Let me tell you: this rootless individualism is not a "smart" way of relating to the world. It is an infantile way. It is based on the same attitude we see in an infant screaming and throwing things because he didn't get what he wanted. In a normal world, in a healthy environment, as an infant grows up he learns that he can't always get exactly what he wants when he wants it. He learns not to expect that or even to make that his goal. He learns that he is a part of something larger and more permanent and more important than himself. He develops roots in his community, in his race. He learns to see himself in a larger context, in a framework of race and history and culture. His concept of "self" expands to include these things of which he is a part.

That the type of development is normal and healthy, the type of development that leads to a sense of community responsibility and racial responsibility. And it leads to a stronger and healthier community and to a stronger and healthier race, in which the members of the community and of the race care about these larger collectives. But if a child grows up in a world where he is deliberately cut off from tradition and history, so that he cannot develop any sense of rootedness, or if his environment is so polluted with "diversity" and multiculturalism that he cannot identify with his racial community, then he does not have a proper framework within which to see himself relative to the world. He feels no sense of belonging and no sense of responsibility. He becomes an individual in the sense of Ayn Rand and Harry Browne.

There's a name for this condition. It's called alienation. It's what happens to many young White people who attend schools where they are in a minority, who attend universities where "Eurocentrism" is Politically Incorrect, who live in cities swarming with Third World immigrants, who see Black and Brown faces and get the Jewish slant on things every time they turn on the TV. Strong and healthy people react to this alienating environment by seeking their roots anyway, by doing whatever it takes to develop a sense of racial identity anyway, but many weak or confused people become individualists.

And you know, this alienating environment in which we live is not an accident. It was imposed on us deliberately by people who want to increase the level of alienation in our society, by people who encourage***our*** people to become rootless individualists, by people who use all of the propaganda media at their disposal to convince everyone that it's "racist" to have roots, that it's "hateful" to have an interest in the history and traditions of one's own people, that it's practically criminal to be concerned about the welfare or even the survival of one's race -- if that race is White, if it's European.

My organization, the National Alliance, attempts to fight alienation among our people in many ways. For example, we distribute a sticker showing the simple message, "Earth's most endangered species: the White race. Help preserve it." That's all. No mention of any other race. Nothing even remotely "hateful." And yet every time these stickers of ours are mentioned by the controlled news media they are called "hate propaganda." Really: "hate propaganda."

Now, that is deliberate. This simple message calling on our people to be concerned about the preservation of our race always elicits a hysterical reaction from the controlled news media. The media bosses are afraid of our racial consciousness. They are terrified that we may feel responsible for our race. They are desperate to stamp out any feeling of rootedness or identity. That's why they always respond to our simple, inoffensive message with their favorite scare-word: hate, hate, hate. And that's a collective response. It's not based on the decision of any single, individual media boss. They have gotten together and formulated a strategy to advance their collective interests. And that is why they're winning their war against us now.

Well, I don't know that anything I've said today will change the attitude of the rootless individualists. They're lacking something in their upbringing that I can't give them in half an hour. They really do think they're being smart by not accepting any responsibility. They believe that they can survive and prosper as individuals, with no community or racial connections.

Listen: the world doesn't work that way. The rootless individualist doesn't realize it, but he really is all alone out there. The other people with whom he is competing -- the Jews, the non-Whites, the feminists, the homosexuals -- think of themselves as members of groups. They think collectively. They collaborate. Their aim is to disarm and destroy us -- collectively. And they're doing it.

I'll give you a very recent and shocking example of how this works. Do you remember the case of Matthew Shepard, the homosexual who went into a bar in Laramie, Wyoming, last year and tried to get a date? Two of the men in the bar gave him a good beating and then left him tied to a fence, where he died of exposure. Of course, there's no way you could forget that case. It has been a *cause celebre* in the national media ever since it happened. It has been on every television screen in America again this week in connection with the trial of Aaron McKinney, one of the men accused of killing Shepard. Janet Reno and Bill Clinton have given solemn commentary on the case and have cited it as a reason for why we need to have an expanded "hate crime" law to protect homosexuals from heterosexual White males. Half the Christian preachers and rabbis in America have publicly deplored the "hate" they say was responsible for Shepard's death.

Now I'll tell you about another case involving murder and homosexuals that I'm certain you haven't heard about, unless you happen to live in northwestern Arkansas and read the newspapers there carefully. Less than three weeks ago, on September 26, two adult homosexuals in the town of Rogers, Arkansas, grabbed a 13-year-old boy off the street, took him to their apartment, drugged him, and tied him up and gagged him so that no one could hear his screams, and then they raped him to death.

The 13-year-old boy was Jesse Dirkhising. The two adult homosexuals are Davis Don Carpenter and Joshua Macave Brown, each charged with capital murder and six counts of forcible rape. I mention these names to help you search for information about this horrible crime on the Internet, so that you can verify for yourself what I'm telling you. Try the Internet site of *The Morning News of Northwestern Arkansas,* the local newspaper there, which has been virtually the only newspaper to carry news of the murder.

As I said, this vicious rape and murder of an innocent child by two adult homosexuals occurred less than three weeks ago, and it's been totally blacked out of the national news. At the same time the beating death of homosexual Matthew Shepard, who made the mistake of looking for a date in the wrong bar, is still receiving national news coverage every day, more than a year after it happened.

Why? I'll tell you. It's because other groups in this country ***want*** it this way. No individual in America has the power to black out the news of the homosexual rape and murder of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising. And no individual has the power to give the enormous, non-stop national coverage to the beating of Matthew Shepard that we are seeing. This is the result of a collective decision -- a racial decision -- by the Jews who control the news media in America. The message the Jews want to send to White Americans is that homosexuals are innocent victims and that heterosexual White males are aggressors who prey on them. And so they give us the news that fits this message, and they black out the news that doesn't.

I mean, really, think about it. Which is the more newsworthy crime: the beating to death of Matthew Shepard by two men he approached for a date or the kidnapping and raping to death of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising by two adult homosexuals? The Jews do this manipulation and distortion of the news for a reason: a collective reason, a racial reason. And it's working. Idiot White women and idiot White Christians are joining the homosexuals around the country in even more candlelight vigils in memory of Matthew Shepard. But there will never be a candlelight vigil for Jesse Dirkhising. No one will ever hear about Jesse Dirkhising -- except those of you listening to me now.

That is the way this world in which we are living works. The suckers are not people like me who feel a sense of racial identity and racial rootedness and racial responsibility. The suckers are the rootless individualists who follow the poisonous teachings of Ayn Rand and Harry Browne.

Hypocrisy and Democracy

During the past week I was very interested in some of the public reactions to Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura's comments in a *Playboy* magazine interview. Governor Ventura, who was a professional wrestler before he became governor, told *Playboy* that "organized religion is a sham and a crutch for weak-minded people"

Pretty hard to argue with that, if he's talking about the mainstream churches in America today. But of course, the Republican politicians jumped at the chance to denounce Ventura and to express their pious outrage at his honesty. The Republicans were indecently eager to garner a few votes from the weak-minded. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott was one of the most outraged. I saw him on television with his jowls quivering and his eyes flashing as he lambasted Jesse Ventura for heresy and sucked up to the television evangelists and the bishops and the reverends . . . and their weak-minded flocks.

Lott's performance reminded me that hypocrisy and mendacity are the distinguishing characteristics of politicians, priests, bureaucrats, media spokesmen, and other public figures in this age of mass democracy. This moral posturing and lying on the part of public figures are more than private moral failings, unfortunately. They are failings of our system of government, of our civilization, and of a growing number of our institutions, and these failings threaten our liberty and even our survival.

I'll give you another very recent example of this basic crookedness, which has permeated our public life. It happened last week in Canada, which is suffering from the same problem we have in the United States. On Monday of last week -- that was September 27 -- the mayor of the city of Fredericton, in the province of New Brunswick, proclaimed a holiday on behalf of European Heritage Week. It was in response to a request from some Canadians who thought it would be nice for Canadians of European ancestry to celebrate their heritage.

Well, the mayor of Fredericton, Walter Brown, had no sooner made the announcement of European Heritage Week than the Jews fell on him like a ton of bricks. The Canadian Jewish Congress told Mayor Brown that they were outraged by his proclamation -- much as Senator Trent Lott was outraged by Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura's comment about the state of organized religion in America. The Canadian Jewish Congress's Tom Kuttner told the news media: "The European Heritage Celebration is just a code-word for White supremacists."

As the intensity and shrillness of complaints from the Jews rose, Mayor Brown wilted. On Wednesday of last week he gave up and withdrew his proclamation. The Jews then bragged that they had succeeded in killing similar proclamations in three other Canadian cities: Victoria, London, and Halifax.

What makes the case of Fredericton especially noteworthy is that last year Mayor Brown initially refused to proclaim a "gay pride weekend" when requested to do so by a homosexual group. The Jews intervened in that case also. They took the mayor to court and obtained a court order requiring him to proclaim the "gay pride weekend." They were denouncing him as a "bigot" for

his initial refusal to make the "gay pride weekend" proclamation requested by the homosexuals. But when the mayor did make the proclamation of a European Heritage Week last week, the Jews were all over him again, denouncing him as a "Nazi" and as a "White supremacist." And so once again the mayor caved in.

Pretty soon the Jews will have him trained, so that he knows without having to be told which celebrations are Politically Correct and which are not. If Mayor Brown had any backbone at all he would proclaim a day for ridding Fredericton of the Jewish pestilence. But of course, we don't have elected officials with backbone these days, either in Canada or the United States.

Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura comes closer to having backbone than any other elected official who has come to my attention recently, but I have a strong suspicion that even Governor Ventura already knows which groups he really cannot afford to offend. Can you imagine the nonstop outrage from all of the politicians and media spokesmen if in his *Playboy* interview he had said something critical of Jews instead of Christians -- if instead of saying that people who are affiliated with Christian churches are weak-minded he had said that Jews are liars and thieves? Well, I'm sure you can imagine how much louder the pretended "outrage" against him would have been.

I'll give you a few more recent examples. One of these examples is from Boulder, Colorado, where I was a graduate student back in the 1960s. I spent five years there at the University of Colorado earning a doctorate. It was a nice university town back then, 35 years ago, a White town, a nice place to live and to study: no gangs, virtually no Asians or Blacks or other non-Whites, almost no crime. Six weeks ago, early on the morning of August 29, a young White woman, a student at the University of Colorado, was walking outside the campus. A van containing six Vietnamese and Chinese immigrants, members of a gang called "Asian Crips," pulled alongside her. The Asian gang members grabbed the White student, forced her into the van, tore off her clothes, and began raping her. She managed to break free and ran naked down the street. One of the Asians ran after her, tackled her, and dragged her back to the van. All of the Asians continued raping and sodomizing the White girl, while screaming racial epithets at her.

The girl lived through the ordeal, and Boulder police later found the van and arrested the Asians. One of them confessed to the police that they had been looking specifically for a White girl to rape. They wanted to have sex with a White woman, he told the police. Well, that was, as I said, six weeks ago. The gang rape and the subsequent arrests and confession were reported in the Boulder newspaper and even in nearby Denver's *Rocky Mountain News.* Unless you live in the immediate vicinity of Boulder and Denver, though, I'll bet this is the first you've heard of it. And that is despite the fact that this abduction and gang rape clearly fall into that new category of crime that was invented by the Jewish media and that Jewish organizations have been pushing so hard to have new laws enacted against: so-called "hate crime."

Whenever a "hate crime" comes along that serves their purpose -- two heterosexual White males beat a homosexual to death after he tries to pick them up in a bar in Laramie, Wyoming; three heterosexual White males drag a Black ex-convict to death behind their truck in Jasper, Texas; a heterosexual White male, Benjamin Smith, kills a Korean and a Black in drive-by shootings near Chicago; a heterosexual White male, Buford Furrow, shoots up a Jewish community center in

Los Angeles -- whenever something like that happens it is publicized without letup for weeks, until everyone has gotten the message: heterosexual White males are hateful and dangerous, and we need laws against them; otherwise they will commit even more "hate crimes." But when a bunch of Asians deliberately hunts down, abducts, and viciously gang-rapes a White university student because she is White, the media bosses don't even report the news outside the immediate area where the crime occurred.

Now, I've commented on this sort of blatantly biased news coverage of so-called "hate crimes" on several previous programs, just to show everyone that the Jewish media bosses do in fact deliberately manipulate public opinion to serve their own anti-American and anti-White agenda. Today I just want to point out that every prominent politician understands this. It's not because they're stupid or ill-informed that they say nothing about it and do nothing about it. It's because they're lying hypocrites who should be hanged alongside the media Jews and their collaborators.

Did you hear any politician expressing outrage over the gang rape of the White student at the University of Colorado? Did even one say anything about this vicious "hate crime"? You certainly heard plenty of them expressing their outrage over the beating death of the homosexual in Laramie. You heard even more of them posturing and fulminating over the dragging of the Black in Jasper and the wounding of Jews at the Jewish community center in Los Angeles.

As I said a minute ago, when I was a graduate student in Boulder, 35 years ago no Asian gangs were there. It was a quiet, safe, peaceful university town. Now the leader of the Asians who gang-raped the White student there brags that his gang, the Asian Crips, has 75 members in Boulder alone, and the girl is terrified about having to testify against them in court. How did that happen to Boulder?

I'll tell you: first the media Jews set the ideological stage, and then the politicians played their role. The Jews promoted the idea that there really is no difference between us and Asian boat people, that we ought to let them into our country, and that anyone who says otherwise is a "racist" and a "bigot." The Jews have promoted this idea of racial equality and their policy of open borders with all of their mass media, and they have made acceptance of these things necessary for Political Correctness.

So what are the politicians to do? Shall our elected leaders actually stand up for us and defy the Jews and say, "No, we won't accept any boat people. Send them back now. We intend to keep our community White and decent."? Shall they say that and be attacked by the Jews as "racists" and "bigots"? Or shall they go along with the Jews, proclaim their belief in racial equality and their agreement with the policy of open borders, and welcome the boat people into our country? Shall they fall all over each other scrambling to see who can give the biggest welcome to the boat people -- and get the biggest media support in the next election? Well, we all know the answer to that, don't we?

Of course, I have oversimplified the issue here, as I usually do. In fact, the process that led Boulder from the peaceful university town I lived in 35 years ago to the gang-ridden slice of multicultural America it has become today is a much more complex process than the one I described. But the essential fact underlying this process is that our elected leaders did not stand

up for us. They did not speak out against policies they knew or should have known would destroy us. Instead they let themselves be trained by the Jewish media bosses, just the way the mayor of Fredericton, in Canada, is being trained.

When I saw this process in its early stages back in the 1960s, I began speaking out. I left my position as a university professor and began spending all of my time trying to alert the public to what I saw coming. But the politicians just kept on posturing and lying. And now Boulder -- and the rest of America -- have become what they are. Yes, the process has been complex, with the churches and many businessmen and the feminists and the homosexuals and others collaborating with the Jews in promoting destructive policies, and with some of the politicians behaving worse than others. But none of them stood up for America or for our people. None of them defied the Jews.

I'll give you another example of what this dereliction of duty -- really, this treason -- on the part of our elected leaders has done to America. This is another university example. Two weeks ago there was news in some of the Nevada newspapers about the trial of a Polynesian immigrant from the South Pacific Tonga Islands who had deliberately hacked a White police sergeant to death with a hatchet on the Reno campus of the University of Nevada because he had an urge to kill a White policeman.

As I said, this news was in a few newspapers in Nevada when the murder trial began two weeks ago, but it was ignored by the media everywhere else. I'll read you a few of the details from the *Reno Gazette-Journal* of September 24, 1999. In the days prior to the killing, the murderer, 29-year-old Siaosi Vanisi, told several of his friends and relatives that he intended to kill a White police officer. He hated White people generally and White policemen especially, he told them. White people had taken many things away from Polynesians, and he intended to start taking things back, he said. He intended to start killing White people.

Then he went with another Tongan to a Reno department store and bought himself a hatchet for $7. Two days later he spotted University of Nevada police sergeant George Sullivan in a parking lot on the Reno campus and attacked the White policeman with his hatchet. He struck Sullivan more than 20 times on the head and face with the hatchet, killing and horribly mutilating him. Then he took Sullivan's service pistol and held up two Reno convenience stores. Then he bragged to his Tongan friends and relatives about what he had done.

Well, if there ever has been any such thing as a "hate crime," the vicious murder of police officer George Sullivan was it. But of course, you didn't hear any weeping and wailing about it on television. You didn't see Janet Reno or Bill Clinton or any other politician or bureaucrat talking about it and calling for new hatchet-control laws or citing the murder as an example of "hate crime." And of course, you understand why that is so. The real question is, why do you tolerate it?

The politicians won't stand up and ask why America is overrun with Asian gangs and murderous Tongans because they really don't care. They won't ask why we keep our borders open and allow more and more non-Whites to flood into our country because that would be a Politically Incorrect question. They will express public outrage whenever any heterosexual White male

commits a crime against a homosexual or against a non-White, but they wouldn't think of complaining about the gang-rape of a White woman by Asians or the murder of a White man by a White-hating Polynesian.

Do you think I'm wrong on that? Do you think I'm being too hard on our elected officials? Do you think I'm condemning them unjustly? Is there an honest one somewhere that I haven't heard about? What about Pat Buchanan, you ask?

Well of course, Pat Buchanan isn't an elected official yet. Judging by the almost unbelievably vicious and hateful attacks on him in the controlled media recently, the Jews are determined that he never will be an elected official. He made one or two less-than-worshipful comments about the Jews in the past and then refused to apologize and grovel, and so they are going all out to make him seem dangerous and hateful.

In his recently published book, *A Republic, Not an Empire*, Buchanan points out that America could have and should have stayed out of two world wars in this century, that neither of these wars was necessary to defend America, and neither that served American interests. Such statements send the Jews into a spitting, shrieking frenzy of hatred and vilification. Oy, veh! Who cares about America's interests? If America had stayed out of the First World War, we Jews never would have been able to seize control of Russia and murder 60 million Europeans. And if America had stayed out of the Second World War, Hitler would have thrown us all out of Europe. Oy, veh!

So the Jews see Buchanan as a dangerous anti-Semite for putting America's interests ahead of theirs, and they treat him accordingly in their media -- and so do the politicians.

Now listen: I'm really not a Buchanan supporter. He's far too soft on race and on the Jews. But the way the Jews hate and vilify him is a clue as to why all the rest of the politicians are nothing but liars, hypocrites, and traitors: men who never stand up for our interests. Here's the way it works: Democracy is about winning elections. No one wins an election in America, above the county level, if the Jews are determined that he should lose. With their control of television they can destroy any candidate. Politicians understand that, and being practical, self-interested people, they don't buck the Jews. That's why you see them behaving the way they do. That's why you see them now putting on hypocritical displays of outrage over Pat Buchanan's comments, for example. It's an opportunity for them to demonstrate their Political Correctness, an opportunity for them to prove that they have learned what the mayor of Fredericton is learning, an opportunity to prove their loyalty to the people who give them good press.

So now we hear them pretending to be indignant that Buchanan is making chumps out of the Americans who fought in the Second World War; he's calling those who fought suckers, they say, and that's unpatriotic, and so we ought to shun him. Never mind that that's not really what Buchanan said. Buchanan pointed out that Roosevelt, by giving secret assurances to Churchill that America would back him in a war against Germany, led us into a war which not only was unnecessary but which cost us 300,000 killed, cost the Germans millions killed and millions more raped by our gallant communist allies, cost the lives of millions of other Europeans, and delivered half of Europe to communist rule for 50 years. Never mind all that; Roosevelt kept

Hitler from sending all the Jews packing, and that's all that the people who give the politicians good press care about. Historical truth matters no more to these politicians than political truth. Their habit is to posture and to lie about anything, anytime, if they believe it will help them win elections.

That's the way democracy works; it's a system which encourages hypocrisy and lying, which virtually guarantees it, whether Jews are involved or not. And when Jews are involved, when Jews control the process, then we get what we have in America today: open borders and a continuing flood of non-Whites into America, darkening our cities, darkening our schools, raping our women, killing our men, degrading our culture, destroying our civilization, with no elected official willing to stand up and speak out against it.

So at least let us, let you and me, stand up and speak out.

Clinton's Call for "Tolerance"

I receive a number of letters from listeners who tell me, "Hey, I agree with what you say about America's race problem, but I don't understand why you're so hard on Jews. Certainly, the Jews who run the media are bad, but the rest of them are just like us. Why do you talk about them as if they're non-White?"

Actually, I've answered that question a hundred times on my programs. Let me answer it again today. As you undoubtedly are aware, Pat Buchanan will be a candidate for President of the United States in next year's election. The other candidates presumably will be George Bush, Jr., for the Republicans; and either Al Gore or Bill Bradley for the Democrats. At present, Buchanan is a Republican, but he may end up running as the candidate of a third party, since he is unlikely to beat Bush for the Republican Party's nomination.

I want to make it clear that I am not a Buchanan supporter. Buchanan is the only candidate who even comes close to being honest, to being a man of principle, a man who means what he says and says what he means. I have agreed with some of Buchanan's positions in the past, but we also disagree on a number of fundamental issues, and I will not be supporting him, partly because I cannot support the system under which all the candidates will be running.

What I think about Buchanan isn't really important here, though. It's what the Jews think about Buchanan that we'll talk about today. As you might suspect, Buchanan is not a favorite with the Jews. For one thing, he's a conservative. For another thing, he's spoken out against several of the Jews' favorite wars. And he doesn't take orders well. So we shouldn't be surprised if they don't give him rave reviews in their media, such as the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.* And they don't. But if you really want to know how the Jews feel about Buchanan, you must read what they say about him among themselves. When the Jews write in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post,* they are writing for Gentile consumption. But they have their strictly kosher publications, which the Gentile public never sees.

An example is New York's *Jewish Press,* which bills itself as the world's largest-circulation English-language newspaper for Jews. Three weeks ago, in the October 1 issue of the *Jewish Press,* a Jewish spokesman, Professor Howard L. Adelson, had a column titled "Another Sewer Rat Appears." Professor Adelson wrote:

"Out of the slime of the sewers and into the filth of the gutter a desperate Patrick J. Buchanan, the neo-Nazi, has crawled into the political arena using anti-Semitism as his principal device to secure a future for himself."

Well that's just the beginning of a very long column by Professor Adelson, and every sentence oozes a vicious, Talmudic hatred. He goes on to say that Buchanan "always was a neo-Nazi," whose "ignorance is astounding" and "reveals the shallow quality of his tortured, sick, defective mind." Et cetera. In a separate column in the *Jewish Press,* Rabbi Rafael Grossman, the honorary president of the Rabbinical Council of America, gives us his own outpouring of Jewish hate against Buchanan.

In another Jewish newspaper, the October 1 issue of the *Forward,* which also is published in New York, Harvard Law School Professor Alan Dershowitz writes:

"Let there be no mistake about it. Pat Buchanan is a classic anti-Semite with fascist leanings who hates Israel and loves Nazi war criminals."

And Dershowitz raves on and on, concluding:

"Let us begin to think about Pat Buchanan realistically. He is a bigot who appeals to the worst of America. That's why he will always be a loser."

Actually, that last statement of Dershowitz's displays the same sort of deception that characterizes Jewish statements intended primarily for the Gentile public. If Dershowitz really believed that Buchanan always will be a loser because he "appeals to the worst of America," then Dershowitz and his fellow Jewish leaders wouldn't be knocking themselves out to vilify the man. The real meaning of Dershowitz's statement is that the Jews themselves must do everything needed to insure that Buchanan becomes a loser and doesn't gain any influence over American policy.

Another *Forward* article, in the September 24 issue, reports on the strategy the Jews are using to keep Buchanan from gaining any influence. The article has a remarkably frank headline, namely, "Leadership Presses Bush in Bid to Block Buchanan from Republican Ranks." The "leadership" referred to consists of the leaders of the whole Jewish community, not just the media bosses: Jews such as Abe Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Matt Brooks, executive director of the Republican Jewish Coalition; and Ira Forman, executive director of the National Jewish Democratic Council. If you think it strange for the head of the Republican Jews to be working out a plan with the head of the Democratic Jews to apply pressure to the principal Gentile Republican candidate to shut another Gentile Republican candidate out of the election, then you still have a lot to learn about Jews.

There are many other Jewish leaders and organizations involved in this effort to stifle Buchanan. The *Forward* article lists, for example, leaders of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, the American Jewish Committee, and so on. One of the most interesting recommendations in the *Forward* article is that the Jews themselves should stay in the background in their campaign against Buchanan and should use Gentile "front" men as their tools against Buchanan: men such as Republican candidate George Bush, Jr., New York real estate developer Donald Trump, and Arizona Republican Senator John McCain. The idea is to keep the public from understanding that the campaign against Buchanan is a Jewish campaign, lest there be a public reaction against the Jews and in favor of Buchanan.

And by the way, both the *Jewish Press* and the *Forward* are accessible to anyone who wants to check for himself the excerpts I have quoted. The Jews try to keep them out of sight of the Gentiles, but they can be gotten hold of through any big library. They both have web sites on the Internet, although you won't find the most revealing articles posted there. But you can obtain

subscription information from their web sites and subscribe to them and read everything in them if you really are interested.

Now, I'll say it again: I am not a Buchanan supporter. Buchanan and I have quite different policies on a number of issues. Buchanan believes, for example, that the United States should give Israel a permanent commitment that we will use our weapons and armed forces to guarantee Israel's military superiority over its neighbors. I am totally against that. I am simply using this Jewish campaign against Buchanan as an illustration of the way the Jews think and the way they work, so that you will understand that Jews really are not like White people. They have a psychology entirely different from ours. They are a race unto themselves, a race with a totally subjective way at looking at the world. Buchanan has never attacked Jews as such. He works with Jews; he has Jewish associates. He simply refuses to let himself be used as their puppet, the way virtually all the other politicians do. And because of this the Jews are consumed with hatred against him and go all out to keep him from gaining any public influence in America. The Jews simply cannot tolerate an honest, independent Gentile leader. They are scared to death of an honest man becoming President -- or even a dishonest man who is independent, who will not take orders from them: a man they cannot control. They understand that they have a tiger by the tail, and if they lose their grip they are all goners.

Here's another illustration: Back during the Nixon period, 25 years ago, I was puzzled as to why the Jews hated Richard Nixon so much, why they worked so hard to destroy him. It is true, of course, that Nixon didn't like Jews. I mean, who does? But Nixon did have a Jew, Henry Kissinger, running America's foreign policy. He had another Jew, Leonard Garment, as his chief White House counsel. He had a Jew, William Safire, as his chief speech writer. He put a Jew, Herb Stein, in as chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers. He appointed a Jew, Arthur Burns, chairman of the Federal Reserve. He gave Israel everything the Jews demanded. But the Jews obviously hated his guts, the way they hate Buchanan today. Back then I didn't understand why.

Today I do understand. Richard Nixon, remember, gained his first political prominence as a prosecutor of communist spies. And of course, virtually all of those communist spies were Jews. The Jews as a whole, not just those who were actively involved in communist espionage, never forgave Nixon for that. That, coupled with Nixon's obvious dislike for Jews, convinced them that he was a man who couldn't be trusted, a man who might turn on them under the right circumstances.

Another example: I was a physics graduate student at Caltech, in Pasadena, back in 1955 and 1956, and I was totally non-political at that time. I used to run around with a fellow physics student who was a Jew, Leo Levitt. Leo and I didn't talk politics, because I wasn't interested in politics, but the two of us were in a group of other students one day when someone mentioned Senator Joseph McCarthy, who a couple of years earlier had made headlines by investigating communist subversion in the government and in the U.S. Army.

Leo's whole demeanor changed when he heard McCarthy's name. He was practically foaming at the mouth as he expressed his hatred of Joseph McCarthy in the vilest language imaginable. Killing was too good for McCarthy, Leo said. He should be tortured to death in fiendish ways,

which Leo described in detail. Leo's expression of hatred was so vehement that it has stuck in my mind for nearly 45 years. Leo wasn't a practicing communist himself and had never been involved in politics. He was simply expressing a racial hatred that virtually all the Jews, of every political persuasion, seemed to have against McCarthy, because they regarded him as a threat to the Jews as a whole, a threat to the Jewish race.

And the fact of the matter was that McCarthy never targeted Jews, as such, in his investigations and never made public statements against Jews. Like Nixon, he surrounded himself with Jewish aides, most notably Roy Cohn and David Shine. Cohn and Shine had a homosexual affair, and Cohn's efforts to keep Shine from being drafted by the Army and sent to Korea made a laughingstock of McCarthy's committee. The Jews hated McCarthy because they were unable to control him and because his efforts were exposing Jewish subversion and the extent of Jewish involvement in communism, even though inadvertently.

They hated Richard Nixon because Nixon also had exposed Jewish subversion and the extent of Jewish involvement in communism, although inadvertently. In addition Nixon did really dislike and distrust Jews and often expressed himself on this subject to subordinates in the White House. There's a lot of whining going on now as White House tapes with some of Nixon's comments about Jews are being made public. This week's issue of *Newsweek* magazine, for example, whines about Nixon's taped comment that "most Jews are disloyal. . . . You can't trust the bastards." The excerpts from the Nixon tapes in this week's *Newswee* also gave an example of why Nixon didn't trust Jews. Referring to his work as a Congressional investigator of communist infiltration of the U.S. government, Nixon said:

"The only two non-Jews in the communist conspiracy were Chambers and Hiss. . . . The only two non-Jews. Every other one was a Jew."

Both McCarthy and Nixon, by investigating and exposing communists, had frightened and angered Jews collectively. They tried to stay on the good side of the Jews by appointing Jews to important posts -- hiring lots of Cohns and Kissingers -- but the Jews still considered the two men a danger, just as they consider Pat Buchanan a danger today, even though Buchanan is willing to give to Israel guarantees that should not be given.

And again, when I say that the Jews hate Pat Buchanan, just like they hated Joseph McCarthy and Richard Nixon, I'm not talking about just Jewish communists or the Jewish media bosses: I'm talking about the Jews as a whole, the Jews as a race. And I know that there are individual exceptions. McCarthy had his Roy Cohn and David Shine. Nixon had his Henry Kissinger and Leonard Garment and Arthur Burns and the rest. And Buchanan has his court Jews also. But don't be fooled by that. The Jews hate Pat Buchanan collectively and subjectively, with the sort of vicious, irrational hatred that is peculiar to Jews and not even conceivable to us. They are different, and it is correct and necessary to think of them as a whole, despite individual exceptions.

While we're on this subject, let's explore it a little further. As I mentioned earlier, nobody really likes Jews, and that includes politicians who surround themselves with court Jews for protection. But the Jews tolerate and support some of these Gentile politicians, while they undermine and

attack others. What accounts for the difference in the way they responded to Richard Nixon, say, and the way they respond to Bill Clinton?

The brief answer to this question, is that Nixon, despite the strenuous efforts he made to please the Jews, despite his willingness to do nearly everything they demanded of him, still held back a bit from being the totally willing tool they wanted. Every time they made new demands on Nixon, they sensed his hatred. Bill Clinton, on the other hand, has no reservations whatsoever about serving the Jews. I'll give you an example.

Last week I told you about the kidnap, rape, and murder of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising by two adult homosexuals in Rogers, Arkansas, on September 26. I told you that the news of this horrible crime had been deliberately blacked out of the national news media by the Jewish media bosses, but I provided information to help listeners find the news on the Internet by going to the web site of the *Northwest Arkansas Morning News,* which did report the crime. Some listeners reported back to me that they still hadn't been able to find the news on the Internet, so I'll add now that the crime also has been reported fairly extensively in the *Benton County Daily Record* and in the *Rogers Hometown News.* Some of the nastier and more lurid details of the crime are mentioned in these two local newspapers. For example, one of the homosexuals, Davis Don Carpenter, a 38-year-old hairstylist who brags that he has lived in 26 states and has boy friends in all 50 states, showed his homosexual partner, 22-year-old Joshua Macave Brown, the proper way to tie up and position a child for raping, even providing diagrams showing the proper procedure and naming the best drug to use for sedating the child during the rape.

Well, probably the technique worked well enough for earlier child-raping episodes, but something went wrong when they raped little Jesse Dirkhising. When they noticed that the boy had stopped breathing and was turning blue they called 911. Police were met by a stark naked Joshua Brown in the hallway, who explained that they "were just playing a game" with the dead child.

One other detail in connection with this crime: on October 2, just six days after Jesse Dirkhising was raped to death, President Bill Clinton was exchanging hugs and kisses with one of the larger groups of his homosexual supporters. He was the speaker at a Democratic fund-raiser in Los Angeles hosted by a group called Action Now for Gay and Lesbian Equality. The perverts donated $850,000 to the Democratic Party at the dinner. The theme of Clinton's talk to the group was that Americans need to become more tolerant of homosexuals and their life-style.

More tolerant. Really. You know, there was a court hearing for Carpenter and Brown on September 28, in Bentonville, the county seat. The local people were pretty unhappy, and so the two homosexuals were protected by bulletproof vests and under heavy guard. Even so, a local reporter in the courtroom could hear a woman outside yelling that the homosexuals would "burn in hell." If Janet Reno had been there she would have had the FBI arrest that woman for intolerance, and Clinton could have collected another couple of hundred thousand dollars from the homosexual lobby.

It's not just that Clinton chose to visit his homosexual supporters in Los Angeles and to ignore the murder of little Jesse Dirkhising in his home state. The government and the controlled media

of this country, by encouraging homosexuals, by trying to make us all believe that homosexuals should have the same rights as everyone else, that they should be allowed to be teachers and Boy Scout leaders, and that we all should be nice to them and let them do what they want and not be suspicious of them or shun them, created the atmosphere in which the murder of Jesse Dirkhising became possible. The two rapists were emboldened by all of the propaganda calling for more tolerance for homosexuals; by all of the media hullabaloo to win sympathy for Matthew Shepard, the homosexual who was killed last year when he tried to pick up a "date" in a bar in Laramie, Wyoming. This pro-homosexual propaganda by Clinton and the media not only encouraged homosexuals to come out of the closet and flaunt their perversion in public, it led some of them to push harder than before against the heterosexual society around them, to take chances they would not have taken before.

Did I make myself clear? I'm blaming the rape and murder of 13-year-old Jesse Dirkhising on the Jewish media and on the government which dances to the media's tune. They encouraged Davis Don Carpenter and Joshua Macave Brown to take a chance they would not have taken in a more traditional moral environment.

I'm also saying that Bill Clinton, by ignoring the homosexual rape and murder of Jesse Dirkhising and, just six days after that horrible crime, running off to tell his homosexual supporters in Los Angeles that we all need to be more tolerant of homosexuals and their behavior, proved once again to the Jews that he is the sort of man they can trust, the sort of man utterly without honor or scruple or principle they want as our President.

The New Protocols

I was amused to note that Bill Clinton's twin across the great water, Tony Blair, struck another blow for dee-mo-cra-cee and ee-qual-i-tee last week. On October 19, Blair's Jewish Home Secretary, Jack Straw, announced that henceforth lunatics would be entitled to vote in all elections in the United Kingdom. Previously, people confined to lunatic asylums were not permitted to vote, the assumption being that a voter ought to be a responsible citizen who understands what he's doing and can make a rational choice.

Of course, that was just hypocrisy; nobody really believed that voters knew what they were doing. Football fans and Jamaican immigrants and couch potatoes on the dole were allowed to vote; that's how Tony Blair became prime minister. So why not let lunatics vote too? They can be unstrapped from their beds and given a pencil and a ballot just long enough to stab the appropriate spot on the paper. What's wrong with that? I mean, if we really believe that everyone is equal, let's show it!

I'm just kidding, of course, but Jack Straw isn't. Lunatics really will be given the vote in the United Kingdom. The Jewish Home Secretary told the press last week that his move to give mental patients the vote will be "a major landmark in this country's electoral history." Yes, undoubtedly it will rank right up there alongside Magna Carta.

Did you ever wonder why the Jews are such great proponents of democracy? Whether in Indonesia or Pakistan or Serbia or you name it, whenever there is some threat to universal suffrage, the Jews are ready to send the U.S. armed forces in to bomb and kill until everyone is permitted to vote.

Why is that? Why can't the Indonesians have an Islamic theocracy if they want? Why can't the Pakistanis have a military dictatorship? Why can't the Serbs run their own country the way they prefer? What is the appeal in making sure that people whose minds have been wasted by Alzheimer's Disease vote?

Well, let's not beat around the bush: the appeal of mass democracy lies in the fact that in essentially every country in the world today, the number of persons unable to think for themselves is substantially larger than the number able to make independent decisions. Those unable to think for themselves have their thinking done for them by the people who control the mass media. Which is to say, democracy is the preferred system because it gives the political power to those who own or control the mass media and at the same time allows them to remain behind the scenes and evade responsibility for the way in which they use that power. And the more inclusive the democracy is -- that is, the more Alzheimer's sufferers and Mongoloid cretins and paranoid schizophrenics and people who live in empty packing cases in alleyways and Jamaican immigrants and football fans are able to vote -- the more certain is the grip of the media masters on the political process.

Those voters who buy astrology magazines at the checkout stand and spend their time watching soap operas, game shows, and Oprah absorb their general attitudes on things through the

television screen. They learn which ideas are fashionable and which are not by noticing the facial expression and tone of voice of Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather when the news is announced each day. Their opinions on specific issues are formed as they view televised sidewalk surveys taken by reporters. The only uncertainty about these people is whether or not they'll be able to pry themselves loose from their couches long enough to vote for the designated candidates. That's why it's important to have lots of them.

And wherever there are lots of them, the men who control the mass media also will control the outcome of elections. It's a much surer way of controlling governments than bribing corrupt dictators or slipping seductive whores into the king's bedroom *a la* Esther and Ahasuerus -- or Monica and Bill.

Believe me, one day soon the Jews on both sides of the great water will institute a web-TV voting system that allows the couch potatoes and the ball game fans to vote without having to get up from their couches, just by clicking their remote controls at their TV screens to select the next President or prime minister. That will be real democracy.

You know, back close to the beginning of this century, around 1901 or so, a book first was published containing the text of what became generally known as *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.* The publisher was a Russian academic, Professor Sergei Nilus. Nilus himself allegedly had obtained *The Protocols* from a Russian official, who had obtained the text from a patriotic Russian noblewoman, who in turn had purchased the material from a Jew in Paris about 15 years earlier.

The Protocols purports to be a collection of minutes or reports of meetings held by the leaders of the world Jewish community, at which they summarize the progress they had made to that time in their quest for world subversion, world ownership, and world power and outline their plans for continuing the process in the future. They talk about gaining control of the banking systems of various countries, about fomenting wars and revolutions to weaken and destroy Gentile power, about corrupting music and art and education, about subverting various Gentile institutions, about taking over the press everywhere and controlling the flow of information to the masses, about undermining the family and bringing family values into disrepute, and so on. The Elders of Zion really are a satanic bunch of schemers. Reading *The Protocols* makes one's flesh crawl.

We should remember that when *The Protocols* began circulating in Russia in the first decade of this century, that country had not yet fallen victim to Jewish Bolshevism, but that wasn't for lack of trying on the part of the Jews. The Jews were generally recognized as a dangerously subversive element in Russia, as the schemers and stringpullers behind every attempt to damage or upset the established order in Russia, and so Professor Nilus' publication of *The Protocols* found a ready market among the Russian public. After the Jewish Bolshevik revolution of 1917 overthrew the Russian government and established a communist dictatorship in Russia, anyone found with a copy of *The Protocols* was liable to be summarily shot. The text already had been translated into a dozen other languages and distributed far and wide outside Russia, however. Since then it has been published in virtually every language which has a printed form and has been read by tens of millions of people around the world.

The Jews have been claiming hysterically since *The Protocols* first appeared that the text is "a forgery." I guess that's their way of saying that it's not what it purports to be: namely, the actual minutes of meetings of Jewish leaders discussing their plans for world domination. The great American industrialist and automaker Henry Ford was very strongly impressed by *The Protocols* and helped circulate the text in the United States. When told by newspaper reporters in 1921 about the Jews' claims that *The Protocols* was "a forgery," Mr. Ford responded that all he could say about the material was that it fit what was actually happening in the world and had been happening ever since the *The Protocols* first appeared in print.

Of course, what Mr. Ford had especially in mind when he made that remark were two momentous things which had happened during the previous decade. One was the Jews' success in taking over Russia and imposing communism on the Russians, and the other was the recently ended First World War: a horribly fratricidal and senseless war, which had destroyed the old order in Europe, had spilled the blood of millions of the best Europeans, and had weakened all of Europe's long-established institutions, leaving every European country open to all manner of social, political, and cultural ills -- in particular, to the further spread of communism.

Well, Henry Ford was a very hard-headed, practical sort of man, and it's easy to understand his attitude. He had no way of knowing whether or not *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* was actually what it purported to be, but he was quite impressed by the fact that the plan for world subversion and domination by the Jews outlined in the book seemed to be happening pretty much as described.

I'll go a step further than Henry Ford was willing to go in assessing *The Protocols.* I think that they very likely are not what they purport to be. In the first place the text of *The Protocols* doesn't ring true. It's too straightforward, too open. It doesn't use the sort of deceptive, weasel-worded, self-justifying language that Jews customarily use in expressing themselves, even to one another. When a group of Jewish leaders get together to discuss their plans for the destruction of a host nation, they don't use straightforward expressions such as "encouraging miscegenation" and "leading the *goyim* to the slaughter." They use weasel-expressions, such as "building tolerance," "increasing diversity," and "eliminating inequality."

In the second place, it's difficult for me to imagine the head Jews laying out such a complete, self-contained, and pat explanation of what they're up to. It's just too convenient for those of us who aim at alerting our people as to what the Jews' intentions are and then putting a monkey wrench in their gears.

I wouldn't call *The Protocols* "a forgery," as the Jews do whenever the book is mentioned. I'm inclined to believe Professor Nilus was an astute observer of the Jews and also was a patriot. He wanted to warn the Russian people of what the Jews were planning to do to them, and so he imagined how the Jews' plan might look if it were all laid out in straightforward language. I believe that he wrote the text he published, but that he believed it was a reasonably accurate description of what the Jews actually were doing. And the reason that *The Protocols* ended up being translated into hundreds of languages and read by millions of people is that many people, like Henry Ford, saw that they fitted what was happening.

Sometimes I have tried to imagine what Professor Nilus might have written if he were writing today instead of a century ago -- and if he were writing still in the straightforward sort of language he used earlier. A 1999 version of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* might read something like this:

Greetings, my fellow Elders of Zion! Today I am happy to report to you that our plan for the destruction of the hated Gentiles and the acquisition of their remaining wealth is practically complete. There remain only a few loose ends to tie up, and then the struggle in which we have been engaged for thousands of years against the filthy *goyim* against the Nations, against all the non-Jewish peoples of the world, finally will be victorious, and we will be able to devour everything they have created, as Yahweh, the god of our tribe, has commanded us.

Everywhere we already rule behind the scenes, with puppets completely under our control in the offices of power. In Russia, where they resisted us for so long -- where the ordinary people always hated us as exploiters, as moneylenders and tax collectors and purveyors of alcohol and merchants in the sweet, white flesh of their daughters and sisters, and where the aristocrats also hated us, as subversives and troublemakers, and kept us confined to only certain areas of the country, so that we could not exploit all of the people -- in Russia we used the doctrine of our dear, departed Elder of Zion, Karl Marx, to divide the Russian people against themselves and get the power into our own hands, where it remains to this day. We butchered their Czar and his whole family like the Gentile cattle they were. With the help of the common people we slaughtered all of the Russian aristocrats and took their wealth.

And then we turned on the common people. First we murdered their leaders -- their writers and teachers and intellectuals and military officers -- so that there would be no one able to turn them against us, and then we began murdering the common people themselves, the farmers and workers, first by the millions and then by the tens of millions in labor camps and death camps all across Russia. And most of them never did understand what was happening to them. One of them, who had been studying to become a Christian priest, we corrupted and made into our ally. His name was Stalin. Later, like the pharaoh who knew not Joseph, Stalin tried to turn against us, but one of our women was his doctor, and we poisoned him before he could harm us.

When the system based on the theory of our departed Elder Marx had bled the Russian people dry, we launched a "privatization" scheme, which put most of the remaining wealth which had belonged to the government directly into our hands. Their gas and oil, their forests and their lumber industry, their mines and factories -- and especially their television broadcasting facilities -- are now owned by us acting as capitalists. Today we have a drunken, sick, old Russian clown, Boris Yeltsin, as the nominal leader of the Russians, but one of our people, Boris Abramovich Berezovsky, tells him what to do and keeps him under tight control through bribes.

In England, the country from which all of us were expelled by the king as exploiters and troublemakers just over 700 years ago, we now have another puppet, Tony Blair, in place as the nominal leader of the English, but like Yeltsin he is completely under our control. One of our people, Michael Levy, finances his election campaigns and controls his purse strings. Another of our people, Jack Straw, controls his domestic policies.

America, however, is the prize example of our success. Just as in England and in Russia, also in America we have been able to put a totally corrupt Gentile politician into the position of nominal power and then to surround him with our own people, who wield the real power. Actually running the American government, our people are in charge of America's State Department, America's Defense Department, America's Federal Reserve System, and America's Treasury Department. When one of our people, Robert Rubin, retired recently as secretary of the treasury, we simply moved another of our people, Lawrence Summers, into that position. Clinton appoints to every high office in the American government, whether the Supreme Court or his own cabinet, only those people we suggest to him, and the totally corrupt politicians of the Senate dare not disapprove anyone we suggest, lest we label them as "anti-Semites."

We have gained nearly complete control of America's educational system, from kindergarten through the universities. No ideas or facts may be taught unless we have given them the stamp of Political Correctness. We have made it impossible for anyone in an American university to contradict anything we have claimed, no matter how preposterous, about what happened to us during the Second World War. We now have the American government, just like every government in Europe, paying us "reparations," because not enough was done for us during the war.

We have succeeded in corrupting and then dominating America's art and music and literature. We have made degeneracy the touchstone for American culture. We own the art galleries and set the standards for painting and sculpture. We have the Americans lining up and paying admission to see a "work of art" which consists of animal dung smeared onto a crude painting of a Negress, which we tell them is their Virgin Mary. They read the depraved and trashy novels we tell them to read and believe that these novels are "literature." Their children listen to Negroid rhythms and chant Negroid "rap" ditties, because we control the popular music industry.

Through the immigration policy we have imposed on America we are increasing the percentage of non-White minorities in every part of the country. Within the next few years we will succeed in making White Americans a minority in their own country.

Our success in America has been due to two things: our control of the mass media of news and entertainment, through which we control the ideas and attitudes of the masses; and the system of mass democracy, which ensures that the votes of the masses under our control determine which figurehead politicians actually make up the American government. Since the last part of the 19th century we have been gathering the power of the mass media into our hands. In those days many of us were only rag-pickers and dealers in used merchandise, recently off the boat from Russia or Poland, but whenever a Gentile newspaper got itself into financial difficulties, we were ready instantly to pool our resources and buy it out, so that henceforth it could be in the hands of one of our people.

In the 1920s, when radio was becoming a powerful medium of persuasion, we began buying broadcasting stations and putting together networks. At the same time we saw the potential for motion pictures and began moving into Hollywood. By working together with each other we were able to bankrupt or buy out every Gentile film producer except Walt Disney. We had to

wait until he died to take control of his film company, but by then we already dominated the entire motion picture industry.

After the Second World War, when television became the most powerful medium of mass persuasion, we were ready to move in and dominate the TV industry from the beginning. Today no motion picture can be made and no television program can be broadcast in America without our approval. Only a few independent commercial radio stations, a few shortwave radio stations, and a handful of book and magazine publishers remain free of our control. But the American masses, for the most part, never see or hear anything we have not approved. They do not understand shortwave, and they are afraid to read any publication we have not approved, for fear that it might be "hate" material.

There is, of course, that pesky Internet, which is not yet under our control, but we are moving rapidly to deal with that matter. We expect soon to have our puppet politicians enact "hate speech" legislation in America, similar to that which we already have succeeded in having enforced in Europe, so that no one can say anything on the Internet that has not been approved by us. The couch potatoes will not object, because we will tell them that the new laws will make them safe from terrorism. By that time we also should have achieved our goal for the disarmament of the American population. And then, my fellow Elders of Zion, we can do to the American people what we did to the Russian people. With our power of television, we will have them voting for their own slaughter.

Long live our mass media! Long live democracy! Long live the power of triumphant Zion!

Fighting Together for the Future

This week I was in Germany. I was there to participate in a congress of the youth division of the National Democratic Party of Germany: the NPD. I had been invited to address the congress. Now, don't let that word "democratic" in the name of the party fool you. These are really decent people: nothing democratic about them at all. Political life in Germany has been rather strange since the end of the Second World War. Germany, of course, was divided into two major occupation zones at the end of the war, East and West. In the East, the only political party permitted by our Soviet ally was the Communist Party. In the Western Occupation Zone, the democratic allies, chiefly the United States, ruled. And of course, the United States did things the correct way, the "democratic" way. We had, after all, brought "freedom" to Germany, we claimed.

Our way was to permit any political party to operate and to participate in elections --- as long as it was "democratic" and had approved policies. It was the same way with newspapers, magazines, and so on. There was "freedom of the press." Anyone who wanted could publish a newspaper -- so long as he was given a license to do so by the U.S. Occupation authorities. And the only people who were given licenses to publish were those certified as "democrats." The same policy applied in Germany whether the Democratic Party or the Republican Party was in power back in the United States.

Anyway, what this policy in Germany meant in practice was that publishing licenses were given only to people who could prove that they had been opponents of the prewar German government: which is to say, communists, social democrats, draft dodgers who had fled abroad to avoid military service, Jews, and the like. Jews automatically qualified for everything. And it is absolutely astounding how many of them who had miraculously managed to survive the so-called "Holocaust" suddenly appeared.

And what the policy meant for political parties was that if the Occupation authorities decided that they were not sufficiently "democratic" they were simply banned, and their leaders were thrown into prison. And the eventual withdrawal of most of the Occupation forces, the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, and so on didn't change this policy. The present German government is a lineal descendant of the one installed by the U.S. Occupation army.

So today in Germany any genuinely patriotic political party is obliged to employ a good deal of camouflage in order to avoid being banned. Nobody is really fooled by the camouflage, though. Certainly, the enemies of the German people aren't fooled: Communists, Jews, homosexuals, feminists, anarchists, and the rest generally protest outside NPD meetings and attempt to disrupt them. That happened at an NPD meeting I attended last year, but the one this week was peaceful -- perhaps because it was held in a lovely, little Bavarian town, Falkenberg, where the supply of local Jews, feminists, etc. was very limited; also because several dozen heavily armed riot police patrolled the area outside the meeting hall. If protestors had appeared, and the police hadn't been there to protect them, there were at least 200 very sturdy, young NPD members with shaved heads and heavy boots among those attending the meeting, who would have loved nothing better than to send at least twice their number of protestors to the nearest hospital emergency room.

Perhaps the most bizarre aspect of political life in Germany today is the consequence of Occupation legislation prohibiting any Politically Incorrect speech: at least, any Politically Incorrect speech touching on such ultra-taboo topics as race, the Second World War, and -- most of all -- the Jews. There is a special branch of the German secret police called the *Verfassungschutz* -- ironically, that means "Defense of the Constitution" -- whose principal responsibility is to ferret out and arrest anyone suspected of having published or said anything in public that might be offensive to Jews. The *Verfassungschutz* also arrests people for displaying banned symbols or for making forbidden gestures. A German patriot must be careful never to raise his right arm in any way that might be considered "provocative" by the *Verfassunschutz*, even if he is only shielding his eyes from the sun or greeting a friend. A great many German patriots are in prison today for having gone afoul of the *Verfassungschutz* in one way or another.

What all this means is that speeches like the one I gave at the NPD meeting this week must employ what amounts to a code. One cannot say in public something like, "Jews in New York, Washington, and Tel Aviv are the principal moving force behind the immigration policy that is bringing millions of non-White immigrants into Germany." One must say instead something like: "Those who are the enemies of every nation but their own are behind the immigration policy that is bringing millions of non-Whites into Germany." Using this code is a bit of a nuisance, but at least everyone at an NPD meeting -- and indeed, every politically aware German -- understands exactly what is meant.

Unfortunately, however, millions of ordinary Germans don't understand. Just as is the case with White Americans, most Germans are lemmings and couch potatoes. They are self-centered, addicted to comfort, materialistic, conformist, consumption-oriented, and very fashion conscious; in fact, they are desperately eager to be fashionable, and every fashion comes to them through their television screens, just as in America. In the various German hotel rooms I was in this week, I scanned the television channels in order to sample the fare being fed to the Germans. On about half the channels were exactly the same programs seen by Americans: programs made in Hollywood or in New York by Jews, but with German speech dubbed in instead of English. On a couple of channels they didn't even bother to dub in German.

Judaeo-American garbage culture has so thoroughly penetrated Germany that on some of the programs for the lowest-grade lemmings, programs with the dialogue consisting mostly of slang expressions and standard cliches, the average German viewer can follow the primitive English as well as the average American. MTV is an example of this. German teenagers receive their daily dose of poison from New York television Jew Sumner Redstone in precisely the same flavor as American teenagers do. And the television channels with original German programming are not really much better. No such thing as an independent idea ever appears on German television. If it did, the *Verfassungschutz* certainly would haul the offending programmer off to prison.

And the poison has its effect. German teenagers, at least in the cities, are looking more and more like American teenagers: slovenly and undisciplined and addicted to Negroid music, Negroid grooming, and Negroid life-styles. A disgustingly common sight is a blonde German girl walking along hand in hand with a Negro from Africa or the West Indies. All too often there is one or more flat-nosed, dusky-hued offspring toddling along after them. To the establishment

politicians and the Christian clergy, there is nothing at all wrong with this. The Christian clergy, in fact, encourage it in every way they can.

Although I was never in Germany before the disaster of 1945, I have seen enough German films from the 1930s and the early 1940s to make comparisons. One of the mental comparisons I made during my trip this week was between the apathetic, brainwashed, "democratic" German youth of today and the clean, healthy, athletic, enthusiastic, and disciplined boys and girls in the German youth organizations instituted by Hitler. The boys of the Hitler Youth and the girls in the League of German Girls were proud of their nation and proud of their race and were eager to become proud citizens of a strong, healthy and progressive Germany and march forward together into a bright future. What a difference a few decades of Jewish television propaganda can make!

And television is not the only medium through which Judaeo-American "culture" has penetrated Europe. Indeed, one sees familiar American advertising slogans, in English, on about half the storefronts and billboards in the larger German cities, just as one sees graffiti in English scrawled on walls and in subway cars. This contamination of European culture -- and not just German culture -- has always seemed to me even worse than what the Jew has done to culture in America. Even before the Second World War the Jew had built a new nest for himself in America and moved his center of operations here from Europe. Hitler, of course, helped him make his move with a good, strong kick in the backside. Now the Jew is throwing his filth from his new nest back into the old one, fouling the source of our cultural spring. And of course, this is deliberate.

The really unfortunate thing about it is that, outside the NPD and a few other patriotic organizations, Germans do not really care about this cultural contamination, nor do they object to it. As with Americans, as long as there is plenty of beer in the refrigerator and entertainment on television, they don't care what is happening to their country, their culture, or their race. They don't see anything amiss in turning on their television receivers and seeing Oprah's Black face grinning back at them.

I'll get back to this subject of Judaeo-American cultural contamination in a minute. First, I want to mention that, despite my horror and disgust at what 54 years of contact with America has done to Germany, my whole purpose in being in Germany this week was to increase at least one facet of that contact: namely collaboration between my organization, the National Alliance, which operates mostly in America, and the NPD, which operates exclusively in Germany. In fact, as I told the NPD congress in my talk, it is essential -- not just helpful, but necessary -- for genuine nationalist groups everywhere to increase their degree of collaboration across national borders. The natural tendency for a nationalist group, of course, is to devote all its effort to building its strength in its own country and to educating the people of its own nation. The National Alliance is really unique in that it has no geographical restrictions on membership; we define nationality in terms of race, not geography.

Our enemy also does that. To the Jews it makes no difference whether another Jew was born in Russia or Canada or England or Brazil or the United States. All that matters is whether or not he was born a Jew. And the fact is that the Jew is the common enemy of every nation but his own and of every nationalism but his own. The same Jews who are attempting to plunder and weaken

and destroy White America also are attempting to plunder and weaken and destroy Germany. And the Jews in Germany are in constant and total collaboration with the Jews in Russia, in England, in the United States, and in every other nation which is being used as a host by them. And they have had centuries of experience at such collaboration.

So if nationalists are to gain real strength anywhere -- ultimately, if we are to survive anywhere -- we must overcome the international Jew, and we can only do that through collaboration across national borders. If a genuine nationalist movement gained governmental power anywhere and began taking appropriate cleansing action in its own country to undo the damage done by decades of Jewish policies, then the Jews in every other country would not hesitate to combine forces and unleash all of their military strength against that one country. They wouldn't stop even at unleashing a nuclear war if faced with the prospect of completely losing their grip on a major nation. We have seen that happen before, 60 years ago, and we must not let it happen again.

Perhaps a nationalist movement in the United States might be able to become successful without having to worry about being suppressed by outside forces, but really, we're just about the only country for which that's the case. Nationalists in every other country need to worry very much about Jew-instigated suppression from outside, as the Serbs certainly know. In fact, that's what the New World Order is all about. Even in the United States, nationalists -- the National Alliance, for example -- can benefit from nationalist successes elsewhere.

What this means is that success for nationalists everywhere -- even those in the United States -- will be much more likely if all nationalists coordinate their activities: if they grow together. We must not become too successful anywhere before we have become at least moderately successful in a few other places.

Well, I talked to the NPD congress about specific ways in which we ought to be collaborating across international borders: ways beyond merely exchanging publications and inviting one another to our big meetings. I talked about nuts-and-bolts details that I won't bore you with now.

I also talked about the spiritual side of nationalist collaboration across borders. In the long and difficult struggle that lies ahead of us, nothing is more important than a deep belief in the rightness and the necessity and the beauty of our cause. Belief should be able to exist alone, in a single individual, but in fact it thrives best in company. One person who believes very strongly in something may devote his entire life to serving his belief, but if he knows that tens of thousands of his kinsmen around the world also are serving the same belief, then he has a great advantage: the advantage of confidence, of optimism, of enthusiasm. Most of all, he will act more boldly, with more daring, in the knowledge that he is not alone. And really, there's nothing more important for us, outnumbered and outgunned as we are, than courage, than boldness, than audacity.

Certainly, we must be wise; we must plan tactics and strategy with the greatest care; we must avoid serious errors; but above everything else we must act with confidence and boldness, and the greatest guarantor of boldness is the assurance that many others share our belief and are acting with us, that they will cheer our successes and aid us in our difficulties. And if our allies are spread throughout many nations, so much the better. That makes the rightness of our cause

universal. It is not just I who believes that we ought to be free, that we ought to be the masters of our own fate: the Germans agree with me; the Russians agree; the Irish agree; the Poles agree; the Magyars agree; the Swedes agree; the Romanians agree. In every country in Europe voices are being raised now for the same cause. This certainly strengthens our mutual conviction that we are right and that we must prevail.

That, among other things, is what I told the delegates at the NPD congress in Germany, except, of course, that I had to phrase everything in the peculiar sort of double-talk required by the *Verfassungschutz.* And let me tell you, in plain language, nationalists everywhere need all of the moral support they can give each other, and that is nowhere more true than in Germany. The Jews really are doing a job on Germany. Munich, where I spent more time than anywhere else this week, already is one-third non-German. Turks and other Asians are everywhere. Blacks are increasingly numerous. The kindergartens and public elementary schools in Germany's larger cities are as much as 80 per cent non-German. And non-Germans continue to pour into Germany. One non-German group whose numbers in Germany have increased especially rapidly in the past two years is the Jews. They have been pouring into Germany from the former Soviet Union. The German government welcomes them with open arms and gives them a number of valuable subsidies to start them off on a more prosperous track than other immigrants. Jews from Russia and Ukraine already completely dominate organized crime, including the White slave trade, in Germany.

Whenever a German complains in public about what is being done to his country, if he phrases his complaint carefully enough so that the *Verfassungschutz* doesn't lock him up for "hate speech," the sold-out politicians, the Christian clergy, the Jews -- and all too many of his brainwashed, guilt-ridden fellow Germans -- are all over him, accusing him of "racism," "anti-Semitism," "fascism," you name it. In Austria, which was torn away from the rest of Germany by the victorious democrats and communists at the end of the war, a conservative leader, Jorg Haider, won a surprisingly strong second-place in the elections last month. The Jews in Germany immediately went into their Chicken Little act, shrieking that the sky was falling. "Oi, veh! Vasn't six million enough, already? Vhy do you vant to make us suffer even more, already?" Et cetera. They made the sort of viciously intemperate remarks about Jorg Haider that they make over here about Patrick Buchanan. And the really unfortunate thing about it is that Haider is not an anti-Semite. He has appointed Jews to high positions in his party. He merely opposes some Jewish policies, especially the one which is flooding Austria with non-German immigrants. But even that opposition, especially on the part of a German, is enough to send the Jews into a spitting, shrieking rage.

Fortunately, there are Germans, though Haider seems not to be among them, who want to send the Jews into something besides a rage. I was with a group of them this week in Bavaria. And their number is growing. There remains much, much more work to be done in Germany, however. The average German is still inclined to grovel and begin apologizing whenever the Jews begin complaining about how persecuted they are and how much the Germans owe them. The Germans as a whole, probably too polite and too civilized to begin with, have let themselves be beaten down by the anti-German propaganda of the postwar period until they are in a truly pitiful moral state today, with no pride and no backbone: nothing but guilt and self-hatred. With

a birthrate well below the replacement level, the number of Germans is declining every year, while the number of non-Germans on German soil grows.

But the resistance also is beginning to grow, as I mentioned. The Jews and their collaborators in the government and the Christian churches are desperate to keep this resistance under control. My personal opinion is that they will fail. I want to do whatever I can do to assure that they fail, because, as I told the Germans at the NPD congress, our destinies are linked. If the Jews succeed in destroying the German nation, they will have an easier time destroying us. And if the Germans successfully resist their efforts, then our own success in overcoming the Jews and their collaborators will be much more likely.

Germany and America

Last week we talked about conditions in Germany, where I had been to address a congress of the National Democratic Party of Germany. I emphasized two things: the racial and cultural degradation of Germany during 54 years of rule by an Occupation government and the lack of freedom of Germans today: specifically, their lack of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. That's as good a place as any to start today.

What I want to talk about today is the evidence that the same people who are degrading Germany and preventing Germans from speaking and assembling freely are also degrading America and are doing their damnedest to take away Americans' freedom as well. Much of the evidence I'll give you is merely suggestive. With my limited investigative resources that's all I can do. You'll have to make your own judgment on what the evidence means.

Let's begin with the case of Gary Lauck. Mr. Lauck is a native of Lincoln, Nebraska. For years he published materials characterized by the Jewish media here as "neo-Nazi," and he shipped these materials to friends in Germany, who distributed them to the German public through "underground" channels, much to the annoyance of the German government, which does not permit Germans to read such materials. In fact, the German government complained long and loudly about Lauck, and the Clinton government in Washington apologized and said that, unfortunately, there was nothing it could do to punish Lauck or stop his publishing activity, since, unfortunately, the U.S. Constitution permits American citizens to do that sort of thing. Well, actually there was something the Clinton government could do to stop Lauck, and that's what it did. In 1995, when Lauck was visiting friends in Denmark, Mr. Clinton's government, which keeps track of the coming and going of U.S. citizens, tipped off the secret police in Germany, the *Verfassungschutz*, that Lauck was in Denmark. The *Verfassungschutz* asked the Danish government, which since the Second World War has not been much better than the German government, to arrest Lauck and extradite him to Germany. And that's what happened. The German government then put Lauck in prison for four years.

Think about it. Lauck broke no law in the United States, and he broke no law in Germany. The German government imprisoned Lauck because of his perfectly legal activities in the United States: because of his Constitutionally protected activities. And the Clinton government helped the German government do it. The Jews and the other Clintonistas like to talk about "freedom" and "civil rights" and so on, but what they mean is freedom for homosexuals to flaunt their life-style in public and become Boy Scout leaders, freedom for Haitians and Mexicans to pour across our borders unchecked, freedom for feminists to make rules that everyone else must obey, freedom for Blacks to mug and rape Whites, secure in the knowledge that the Whites can't defend themselves because the government has taken away their guns. That's what they mean by "freedom."

The Clintonistas do not mean freedom for White Americans to exercise their Constitutional rights. They hate the idea of civil rights for heterosexual White males. That scares them. Heterosexual White males are the enemy. They don't deserve freedom. That is what the Clintonistas really believe. They couldn't figure a way to lock up Lauck themselves, so they

arranged for the German government to do it. And then they grinned and sat on their hands for four years while Lauck rotted in a German prison. Not a word in the mass media over here and not a word of protest from the Clinton government to the German government: not a single letter from Madeleine Albright or any of the other Jews running our State Department.

Can you imagine the hullabaloo Madeleine Albright would have raised if a Jew from the United States, while visiting Jordan, say, were arrested by the Jordanian government and extradited to Iraq at the request of Saddam Hussein, and then were sentenced to four years in an Iraqi prison because while in the United States he had published unkind things about Saddam? Can you imagine how that horrid, old Jewess would shriek until Saddam released the Jew and apologized? I mean, really, the Clinton State Department would have threatened war and would have been happy to blast Baghdad with more cruise missiles. But when precisely the same thing happens to an American citizen who is a heterosexual White male like Lauck, the Clinton government ignores it, and the mass media ignore it. They really believe that Lauck shouldn't have freedom of speech, because he publishes Politically Incorrect things. The Jews and their collaborators in the Clinton government are really happy that they were able to punish Lauck for publishing things they don't approve of.

Well, Gary Lauck served his four years in a German prison and returned to the United States earlier this year. Then he decided to buy a handgun and applied for a pistol permit as required by Nebraska law. On the application he answered "no" to a question as to whether or not he is a convicted felon, because he has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, and he considered his conviction in a German court for his exercise of his Constitutional rights in the United States to be spurious and of no legal validity. The state of Nebraska routinely checks all applications for pistol permits with the FBI, and the FBI reported back that Lauck was indeed a convicted felon because of the German government's charges against him. He was arrested last week and charged with swearing falsely on his application for a permit. He faces up to five years in prison and a $10,000 fine. The Jews in the Clinton government are really giggling over this one, but I'll bet you haven't even heard about it before this broadcast, unless you happen to live in Lincoln, Nebraska. What this amounts to is an affirmation by the U.S. government of the German government's treatment of Lauck.

You know, what was done to Gary Lauck is really outrageous. It shouldn't happen to an American citizen. The Clinton government not only permitted it to happen without protest but actually caused it to happen because the Clintonistas don't like what Lauck publishes. They really do want to have the same sort of laws in the United States that the Jews have imposed on Germany, so that only Politically Correct speech is protected by the Constitution. They lie about it. They put on a big show of defending free speech, but it is all pretense and deception.

Here's another example of their deceit which shows the parallels between what they've done to Germany and what they're doing to America. First a little background: Since the end of the Second World War the biggest Jewish racket has been the bleeding of Germans for "reparations." The so-called "Holocaust" has been used to extract more than 60 billion dollars from the German people supposedly to compensate Jews for the suffering and loss they claim to have experienced during the war as a result of Hitler's anti-Jewish policies. "Oi, veh! The Nazis took all our gold and put us in gas chambers. So now you must pay us!" Well, this racket worked for more than 50

years, but many Germans were getting tired of it. They said, "The Nazis are all dead. We weren't born until after the war. We aren't Nazis. We don't owe you anything."

So the Jews shifted their tactic. They said, "Oi, veh. It vasnt chust the Nazis. It vas all the Germans. You all persecuted us." A Jewish professor at Harvard, Daniel Goldhagen, came out with a book titled *Hitler's Willing Executioners,* the theme of which was that all Germans, not just the Nazis, had hated and mistreated Jews, and so all Germans owe the Jews reparations. The book was given an inordinate amount of publicity by the Jewish media, and the browbeaten Germans began groveling and apologizing again. Just to drive the point home, the Jews and their collaborators organized a traveling photo exhibit to persuade the German people that the entire German military establishment, not just Hitler's elite SS troops, had persecuted the Jews and committed atrocities during the war. Therefore, all the Germans still owe the Jews. The exhibit, titled *War of Extermination: Crimes of the Wehrmacht, 1941-1944,* has more than 800 photographs supposedly showing atrocities committed by German soldiers. During the four years this exhibit has been traveling around Germany, German veterans and other patriots have protested that many of the photographs are fakes and that the whole exhibit, in effect, is a lie intended to make Germans feel guilty and to extort more payments from them.

Despite the protests, the German lemmings continued to view the exhibit and to feel guilty as intended. And I should mention that Jews are not the only ones promoting it. Treasonous German liberals, in business, in politics, and in the academy, who have hitched their wagons to the Jewish star and have tried to outdo one another in expressing hatred for their own people, are enthusiastic supporters of the exhibit. Its biggest financial support comes from a billionaire German cigarette maker, Jan Reemtsma. The exhibit was scheduled to begin a tour of the United States next month, opening in New York on December 2.

Well, all that was changed a few days ago, when a few courageous historians came forward with convincing arguments that the exhibit is, in fact, a lie. I say "courageous" because in Germany the government puts people in prison for contradicting any aspect of the "Holocaust" story. The historians presented irrefutable evidence that several of the "atrocity" photographs had been staged after the war, and that others, while showing genuine atrocities, were of atrocities committed by the Soviet secret police, the NKVD. The historians pointed out that piles of bodies in some of the photographs, claimed to be victims of the *Wehrmacht,* are in fact Polish, German, and Baltic civilians murdered by the Soviet NKVD. This is especially embarrassing to the exhibit's promoters, because the NKVD at the time the photographs were taken was led and heavily staffed by Soviet Jews. So the exhibit has been withdrawn while the matter is studied. It will not be coming to New York next month after all. And that's too bad, because it might do the American lemmings some good to see what the Jews -- those poor, innocent, persecuted darlings -- were themselves doing to non-Jews during the war. But let me tell you something: If it weren't for the fact that the evidence of fraud uncovered by a few courageous historians is beginning to find its way into the historical journals, where it no longer can be ignored, the promoters of this anti-Wehrmacht exhibit would have brazenly continued their road show, knowingly deceiving Germans and Americans in order to promote their own Jewish agenda.

Do you begin to see what all of this is suggesting? Let me give you another recent example. Before Madeleine Albright launched her murderous war against Serbia earlier this year, Jewish

television was full of atrocity stories about what the terrible, Nazi-like Serbs were doing to the poor, innocent, persecuted Albanians in Serbia's Kosovo province. Albright's Jewish spokesman, James Rubin, was on the air every night moaning about the "genocide" and the "ethnic cleansing" in Kosovo. Before the bombing began, Rubin claimed that 2,500 Albanians already had been killed in Kosovo by the Serbs. Rubin and other Jews in the government and the media were constantly and stridently calling for war -- except that they didn't call it "war"; they called it "humanitarian intervention."

Careful observers may have noted that many of the alleged Serb atrocities being shown to American television viewers during the prewar period had an uncanny similarity to each other. We saw the same Albanian corpse or alleged massacre site on our screens night after night, just filmed from a different angle and with slightly different commentary each time. The intent clearly was to make a few killings seem like many. And the politicians participated in the deceit. Before the bombing started, the Jews' number one step'n'fetchit in Britain, Clinton clone Tony Blair, announced:

"We must act to save thousands of innocent men, women, and children from humanitarian catastrophe, from death, barbarism, and ethnic cleansing by a brutal dictatorship."

Eight weeks after the bombing started, when the war was coming under increasing criticism from dissidents, in an effort to build voter support for the war, Clinton's Jewish Secretary of Defense, William Cohen, announced that as many as 100,000 Albanians of military age had been murdered in Kosovo by the Serbs. Tony Blair's ministers were not quite as hyperbolic as Bill Clinton's, but Blair's Foreign Minister Geoff Hoon announced on June 17:

"According to the reports we have gathered . . . it appears that around 10,000 people have been killed in more than 100 massacres. The final toll may be much worse."

After Slobodan Milosevic finally caved in and permitted NATO to send its troops into Serbia, the media continued to announce huge numbers of Albanians supposedly murdered by the Serbs. When NATO had occupied all of Kosovo province, we still were hearing figures of 44,000 butchered Albanians, hundreds of mass graves, etc. Then the figure of murdered Albanians dropped to 22,000, then to 11,000. Bernard Kouchner, the United Nations chief administrator in occupied Kosovo, announced that 11,000 bodies already had been found in mass graves throughout Kosovo. Altogether 20 forensic teams were sent in to dig up the mass graves and count the bodies.

Well, that was more than four months ago, and somehow all of the body-hunters, including a team from the FBI, found a grand total of 670 bodies of Albanians, and not all of those were killed by Serbs. It's beginning to look as if that's all they ***will*** find. That's fewer Albanians than Madeleine Albright killed accidentally, when her "smart" bombs went astray or her trigger-happy pilots shot up refugee columns. And of course, it's a lot less than the number of Serbs murdered by KLA gangsters under NATO protection since the bombing stopped in June. Those murders, by the way, are continuing on a daily basis, but the Jewish media no longer bother to report them.

I mean, it's becoming a bit embarrassing for them. If they begin reporting the continuing murder of Serb civilians by the KLA, that might remind people to ask how many Albanians the Serbs killed, how many mass graves have been uncovered, and so on. It's hard enough to keep the more independent-minded UN inspectors from blurting out the facts. The chief Spanish forensic inspector, Juan Lopez Palafox, told a Spanish newspaper:

"They told us that we should prepare ourselves to perform more than 2,000 autopsies. The result is very different. We found only 187 cadavers, and now we are going to return [to Spain]."

Inspectors were told that there was a mass grave near the town of Ljubenic containing 350 bodies. They dug everything up and found just seven bodies. They were told that the bodies of 700 Albanians had been dumped down mine shafts at Trepca, in northern Kosovo. After an exhaustive search inspectors concluded that there were no bodies at all there.

It might seem a bit reckless of the Jews to try to justify an unpopular war, such as the recent one against Serbia, with lots of phony atrocity stories they knew wouldn't stand up to scrutiny. But just consider the way it has worked out. Madeleine Albright, Bill Clinton, and Tony Blair still are able to claim in public that their murderous bombing of Serbia was a "humanitarian mission," that they saved the lives of many thousands of Albanians by chasing the Serb Army out of Kosovo, and that their so-called "peacekeeping" troops have brought peace and security to the region. They are able to claim these things despite the facts I have cited, because only a few voters know the truth. Only a few voters are interested in the truth. Most voters know only what they see on network television, and network television isn't about to make Madeleine or Bill or Tony look bad. It was a Jewish war, and so it had to be a good war, a justified war.

I'll reiterate: in a democracy like we have in the United States, the truth isn't really important. What's important is what the mass of voters believe to be true, and since the mass of voters never investigate anything or even do any independent reading, whoever controls television controls what they believe. Someone like Gary Lauck can have his Constitutional rights violated, and the voters never will know about it, because it won't be on network television.

The Jews can cook up the most outrageous atrocity stories, whether about what supposedly happened to them during the Second World War or what the Serbs supposedly did to the Albanians before Madeleine began her bombing, and the stories don't really have to hold water in order to be effective. They can be the flimsiest and most transparent lies, because the average voter simply isn't discriminating enough to see through them. They believe whatever Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather or Peter Jennings tells them to believe.

I'm really surprised that the phony Wehrmacht atrocity exhibit was pulled just because a few historians were raising hell about faked photographs and NKVD Jews murdering Gentile civilians and blaming it on the Germans. The sports fans and soccer moms, who learn what's going on from Tom Brokaw, Dan Rather, and Peter Jennings, certainly never would have learned what the historians were saying. If the German liberals weren't so wishy-washy, the historians simply could have been thrown in prison for "hate speech," the exhibit could open in New York as scheduled, and the lemmings would have believed everything they were told.

One thing that may have played a role in killing the phony Wehrmacht exhibit, is that information about the faked photos in it has been circulating on the Internet during the past couple of weeks. The Jews are working hard to keep what they call "hate" off the Internet. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and other Jewish groups are lobbying to make it mandatory to have what they call "hate filters" installed on all school and library computers, so that the kiddies can't have their minds polluted by inconvenient facts about phony Wehrmacht atrocities or phony gas chamber stories or phony Serb massacres of Albanians.

Well, my point today is that what is happening in Germany and what is happening in the United States are connected. They are connected by the same lies told by the same liars. Many of the things that have been done to Germany -- mass immigration by non-Whites, the cultural degradation, the non-White crime, and so on -- also have been done to the United States. The loss of our freedom of speech and assembly will be next.

Tribal Thinking

Quite often I make fun of liberals on this program: you know, feminists, egalitarians, New World Order enthusiasts, the kind of people who identify with Bill Clinton as a fellow child of the '60s and who admire Hillary as the very model of the modern American woman; people who have filters on their minds to keep out Politically Incorrect facts and ideas; people who refuse even to look at the world except through Politically Correct goggles.

I mean, it's pretty hard to take such people seriously. Hypocrisy makes such a wonderful target, and practically everything a liberal says or does is glaringly hypocritical. Liberals think it is terrible that Serbs were rough on Albanians when the Serbs had the upper hand in Serbia's Kosovo province, but they don't want to hear about what the Albanians do to the Serbs when the tables are turned. They claim to be for peace and love and brotherhood, but they are the first to call for cruise missiles and smart bombs when someone who doesn't share their peculiar mind-set gets in the way of one of their pet projects. They say that they are against war on principle, that negotiation and arbitration and compromise are the ways to handle international disputes, but they were solidly in favor of the most terrible and destructive war in history, and they ridiculed as "appeasers" and "isolationists" those who made serious efforts to prevent that war through negotiation, arbitration, and compromise.

Liberals' hearts bleed at the thought of pickaninnies going hungry in Africa, but it bothers them not at all that the policy of their favorite President has caused the deaths of nearly a million children in Iraq. When South Africa had a White government just a few years ago, liberals were constantly in an uproar, demonstrating, agitating, lobbying, writing editorials, screaming for new sanctions, and flying into a rage at the news of every new incident of perceived "racial injustice" or White mistreatment of Blacks. Then there was an instant of delirious joy and triumph among liberals when the White South Africans foolishly permitted themselves to be persuaded to vote for Black rule in their country. Since then, however, as South Africa has descended into chaos and ruin under Black rule, liberals have completely lost interest in what used to be their favorite preoccupation. They don't want to hear anything about South Africa these days. If you press them on the matter they will tell you smugly that the epidemic of murder of White South African farm families by Black gangs and the rape of White South African women by Blacks is just retribution for years of apartheid. But the fact that ordinary Blacks in South Africa, whom White liberals in America used to cherish and sympathize with -- the fact that ordinary Blacks are much more likely to be crime victims now than they were under White rule doesn't interest liberals in the least.

For years liberals have deplored violence by skinhead gangs in Europe and America, especially since that violence often is directed against non-Whites. And they complain about White football hooligans, who are notorious for starting riots after soccer matches in Britain. But when seven Black thugs were expelled from a high school in Illinois just a few days ago after starting a Black riot at a football game in which a number of White students were beaten severely, liberals began marching with the Reverend Jesse Jackson to pressure school officials into rescinding the expulsions.

In America police brutality always has been a favorite source of liberal indignation. They love the thrill of outrage that they feel when they remember how the police used fire hoses to wet down disorderly demonstrators in Selma, Alabama, or thumped so-called "freedom riders" with their nightsticks. They still work up a pretty good head of steam over those things after more than 30 years. One of the liberals' folk heroes today is Black cop-killer Mumia Abu-Jamal, formerly known as Wesley Cook. In December 1981 Abu-Jamal walked up behind a young White policeman, Danny Faulkner, in Philadelphia and shot him in the back. When the White policeman fell to the pavement, the Black killer stood over his body and pumped four more bullets into him.

Abu-Jamal was tried, convicted, and sentenced to death in 1982 on the basis of testimony from eye witnesses. There has hardly been a more clear-cut case of cold-blooded, first-degree murder adjudicated in an American court. Well, that conviction was more than 17 years ago, but Mumia Abu-Jamal has so far avoided being punished because White liberals have decided that he is a martyr in the struggle for justice for Blacks. Prominent media liberals, including a number of Hollywood stars such as Paul Newman and Susan Sarandon, have demonstrated for his pardon and release. Mention murdered White police officer Danny Faulkner to them, and you'll get nothing but a sneer.

But don't jump to the conclusion that just because there is a conflict somewhere between the police and members of a despised minority that liberals always will be on the side of the despised minority. In Israel, for example, police always have routinely tortured Palestinian prisoners in order to extract information from them. A number of Palestinian prisoners have died from torture at the hands of Jewish authorities. When the question came up in Israel just a few weeks ago of whether or not the practice of torture by police during the interrogation of arrested Palestinians should be continued in the light of international disapproval, and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak came down on the "yea" side, there was even discussion of the issue in some American publications. But that's all very ho-hum stuff to liberals.

People other than me have pointed out this selective indignation and selective compassion which is a distinguishing characteristic of liberals. I sometimes have characterized liberals as trendy airheads because of their inconsistencies. But I don't really mean to imply that I think liberals are stupider than the bulk of the American population. The very fact that they are utterly inconsistent, that they do not base the positions they take on principle, but nevertheless are able to march in ideological lockstep with one another means that they have to be fairly alert always to know what the Politically Correct position on every issue is at any given moment. They have to know instantly whether a particular incident is one they should be outraged about or should ignore. They have to know whether or not a specific individual victim of injustice or a specific group of victims deserves their compassion or their scorn. That requires a certain degree of mental agility. Liberals certainly are crooked, but not necessarily stupid.

No, when it comes to stupidity I believe that conservatives take the prize. Let me read you a letter I received this week from a conservative listener. I'm reading the whole letter from a true-blue conservative, a real believer in the Protestant work ethic. He writes:

"I am a single, white, non-Jewish male -- a Lutheran -- who resides in New York City. As you've mentioned, Jews do control a decent portion of this country's media as well as permeate most of corporate America. But I believe this was done through hard work and promotion of education among their people. Instead of slighting them at every opportunity, why not highlight their achievements as a positive motivation for us Gentiles to excel. Otherwise you come off sounding like a whiny hillbilly who is simply jealous. America is a free country. If Jews have excelled faster than the rest of us, hats off to them." -- J. Koepp.

You know, living in New York City does something to people, and I might attribute Mr. Koepp's letter to the morally debilitating effect of his environment, except that I've received letters from conservatives in other parts of the country that are just as stupid. Well, anyway, Mr. Koepp's letter made me think about conservatives and liberals: about their differences from each other and also about their similarities.

How are liberals and conservatives different from one another? I believe that their most fundamental difference is that liberals enjoy destroying things, smashing up existing structures and institutions, while conservatives are much more inclined to hang onto what already exists: not only to hang on, but to support it, so long as it has an aura of authority, whether that makes sense or not. Conservatives respect authority and crave respectability for themselves; liberals respect nothing and desire above all else to be fashionable.

The conservative and the liberal are similar in that neither is a systematic thinker -- at least, not with regard to the ideas and policies that define his conservative or liberal nature. He does not derive his ideas on specific matters from general principles, but rather from attitudes or psychological tendencies.

Mr. Koepp believes that we should take our hats off to the rich and powerful Jews who control Hollywood, New York, and Washington. Why? Because, according to his letter, they have worked hard for their wealth and power. Should we also take off our hats to Mafia bosses who have worked hard and taken big chances to become capos? Mr. Koepp probably would say "no." Why not? Well, Mr. Koepp might not be able to tell you, but in line with the conservative's way of thinking it's because the Mafia bosses aren't respectable, while the Jewish media bosses, using their control of the media for the purpose, have managed to wrap themselves in a cloak of respectability. The media bosses are respectable in the eyes of the conservative, and the Mafia bosses aren't, despite the fact that the media bosses do infinitely more damage to our society than the Mafia does. Probably the conservative would agree that the Negroid anti-culture promoted among our young people by Sumner Redstone's MTV is not a good thing. But Mr. Redstone is a very rich and very powerful Jew: a respectable Jew, by Mr. Koepp's standards. Well, anyway, as I said, conservatives are not systematic thinkers. Nor are liberals.

I'll tell you who the systematic thinkers are: the Jews. The Jews not only think systematically, they think tribally. Jews aren't afraid of hard work when it is necessary, but they don't really work harder than conservatives or liberals -- at least, it's not just hard work and education that are responsible for their wealth and power; it's their systematic approach to things, their tribal approach. That is the secret of their success. They're not distracted by things such as conservatism or liberalism. They know what they want, and they go after it in a rational way.

Back during the early part of this century conservatives used to scratch their heads and try to figure out whether Jews were basically capitalists or communists. Jews had become very successful as capitalists in America and had amassed huge fortunes. But in Europe the Jews were leading the communist movement, and Jewish capitalists in America were giving them financial aid. The conservatives couldn't figure it out. It was too much of a puzzle for them. As I said earlier, conservatives are not very bright.

The answer to the puzzle, of course, is that Jews are basically neither communists nor capitalists. But they also are both when it suits their purpose. I'll repeat to you an anecdote told by Lazar Kaganovich, the bloodiest and most powerful of the Jewish Bolsheviks during the height of communist power in the Soviet Union. Kaganovich was known as the Butcher of Ukraine and the Wolf of the Kremlin and was personally responsible for the murder of millions of Ukrainian and Russian farmers and workers. In 1957 Nikita Khruschev himself publicly accused Kaganovich of murdering 20 million Russians.

Kaganovich told the anecdote to his American nephew, Stuart Kahan, who wrote the official biography of his uncle, which was published in this country in 1987 by William Morrow and Company. Kaganovich's own uncle, Levick, had told the young Kaganovich as a boy in Ukraine the basic rule by which he expected the young Jew to guide his life: "Whatever is good for the Jews. Follow only that line of reasoning." Actually, Kaganovich mentions several other occasions on which his Uncle Levick impressed him with the same rule of conduct, the same rule to guide his thinking, during the time when the young Jew, who was a *yeshiva* boy, was attending his first communist meetings in the synagogue in Kiev.

The interesting thing about that in this connection is that wealthy capitalist Jews have written about the same rule being pounded into their own heads by their elders when they were boys: "Always base your decisions on what is good for the Jews. Always choose the policy which benefits the Jews. That must be the rule which guides your life, my boy." That is tribal thinking. And it is successful thinking. And neither conservatives nor liberals understand it.

In the 1970s, after it was apparent to astute observers that communism was bankrupt and would not last much longer in eastern Europe, thousands of Jewish intellectuals in America who formerly had supported Marxism, began changing their tune and announcing that henceforth they would be conservatives. Today they are called "neoconservatives" or "neocons." And Gentile liberals felt betrayed. They believed that their Jewish fellow travelers had let them down, had betrayed the cause of liberalism. They didn't understand that the Jews had no more been genuine Marxists or genuine liberals in the past than the neocons are genuine conservatives today. They were just doing what was good for the Jews, paying lip service to whatever ideology was best for the Jews at the time, and as the times changed, so did the ideology.

Today, despite the abandonment of Marxism and the large number of Jewish neocons around, Jews generally are still regarded as "liberals" by most people. That's because, regardless of whether they support Al Gore or Bill Bradley or George Bush, Jr., for President -- regardless of their economic policies or their party affiliation -- they virtually all are for gun control, for open borders, for multiculturalism and more "diversity," for racial mixing, for permitting homosexuals to be Boy Scout leaders, and so on. But the essential point, which both conservatives and liberals

fail to understand, is that the Jews don't base their policies on any inherently "liberal" tendency. They base their policies on what's good for the Jews. And that also means, in nearly every case, on what's bad for the Gentiles, on what weakens the Gentiles, on what makes easier prey of the Gentiles. Tribal thinking.

We live in a rapidly shrinking world, with rapidly increasing competition for limited resources. Everywhere, both in America and in Europe, the land that used to be exclusively ours is being overrun by non-Whites. We already are a minority in California, and we're headed toward becoming a minority everywhere else in a hurry. We are losing our neighborhoods, our cities, our public schools, our workplaces to non-Whites. Really, that's an understatement. We've ***already*** lost many of our cities and many of our public schools, and the suburbs and the private schools are going fast. Racial intermarriage is skyrocketing. Our young women, thoughtlessly trying to be fashionable and imitating what they see on television, are running with Blacks and other non-Whites in increasing numbers.

We have before us the example of South Africa. That is, those of us who pay attention to what is actually happening in the world and don't depend entirely on Tom Brokaw, Dan Rather, and Peter Jennings, have that example before us of a formerly White civilization going down to ruin in just a few short years after the Whites there relaxed their grip. We have that example before us, and we can see what is happening all around us in America, just as we can see on our television screens where the Jews are pushing us. And the conservatives among us tell us that we should take our hats off to the hard-working folks in Hollywood, New York, and Washington who are orchestrating this wonderful Jonestown, America, while the liberals are elbowing each other aside in their eagerness to be first in line at the Kool Aid dispenser.

It's about time for those of us still capable of thinking tribally to begin doing so. It's about time for those of us who understand what it means to be White, to be European, to be Aryan in a darkening world, and who understand what it used to mean -- those of us who treasure our heritage, who honor the sacrifices and achievements of our forefathers and appreciate the civilization they created for us -- those of us who feel a sense of responsibility to the future and are determined that our people shall inherit the future, not the mongrel offspring of the rappers and jivers we see on our television screens, but ***our people*** -- it's about time for us to begin thinking and planning and acting systematically in a manner aimed at our racial survival.

It's time to stop being spectators, to stop listening to the hypocritical cant of the liberals and the mindless ramblings of the conservatives. It's time to base everything -- ***everything*** -- on the proposition that we must survive, our people must survive. If a policy strengthens our people, if it increases the survivability of our people, it is a good policy. If it weakens us or puts us at a disadvantage in the struggle for survival, it is a bad policy. That's all that matters. That's all that we should consider. Racial survival, racial victory in the struggle for life and dominance, must be the goal of every plan, of every policy, of every thought and action. Tribal thinking.

We used to understand that, back before television. Everyone understood it who survived. The Jews still understand it. We'd better learn it again -- soon.

Books and Freedom

A listener sent me a clipping from the *New York Times* last month, the November 14 edition, and I just got around to reading it. It's the obituary of a writer and Harvard professor, Dr. Richard Marius. Marius had a pretty unremarkable career: a Southern Baptist divinity school graduate and student of the Reformation who wrote several very forgettable books and taught aspiring authors at Harvard how to write. We wouldn't be interested in him, except for one detail: in 1995 he was fired as a speech writer by Al Gore. The reason he was fired is that in a book review he had written three years earlier, which was published in *The Harvard Magazine,* he had criticized the way the Jews in Israel treat the Palestinians there: you know, torturing prisoners, collective punishment for the families of suspected activists, and so on.

Again, this criticism of the Israelis was not in a book written by Marius, but in his review of another author's book, and book reviews are generally a bit more ephemeral and less weighty than the books themselves. But Marius' review was published in *The Harvard Magazine,* and Jews, of course, scan very closely everything published anywhere by Harvard professors, so that they can keep their Gentile brethren at Harvard on the straight and narrow path of Political Correctness. Martin Peretz, the Jew who edits the leftist magazine *New Republic,* was apprised of Marius' transgression, and Peretz complained to Al Gore, who promptly fired Marius. The Jews trumpeted the firing of Marius around the circle of liberal literati of which Marius was a member, denouncing him as an anti-Semite, and his friends began avoiding him. He protested loudly that he was not an anti-Semite, but it availed him nothing. He was washed up for good with the Clintonistas.

But really, what a jerk, not to have understood that it's proper to condemn Serbs, say, for torturing prisoners and dynamiting the homes of families suspected of having a family member who isn't sympathetic to the government, but it's certainly not proper to condemn Jews for doing the same thing. How could anyone be a speech writer for Al Gore and not understand that Jews are very special people, who must never be criticized, under any circumstances? I mean, we all know that the ordinary rules of behavior don't apply to them. If the Germans or the Poles or the French or the Americans do something very illiberal, then we expect a Harvard liberal to criticize them. But not if they are Jews. Then the expected behavior of a Harvard liberal is to pretend that he doesn't notice. So Marius broke the rule and was punished. Too bad. I really can't feel sorry for a Harvard liberal -- certainly not for a Harvard liberal who also was a speech writer for anyone in the Clinton administration.

Reading Marius' obituary called to mind the very special status Jews have in our society. We may criticize anyone -- except Jews. Of course, a liberal isn't likely under any circumstances to be critical of a homosexual or a feminist or a non-White or a member of any other group currently patronized by liberals. But as long as he assures everyone that many of his best friends are perverts or Blacks or what have you and that his criticism is intended to be constructive, he will be forgiven for an occasional sharp remark aimed toward them. But if he ever makes the mistake of referring to Jews in anything but the most flattering terms, his name goes on a hate list and is never removed.

I can think of a number of examples of literary figures far more illustrious than Marius: there's T.S. Eliot, and there's H.L. Mencken, and, of course, there's Ezra Pound. They've all been dead for more than a quarter of a century, but whenever something is written about one of them today there's a great deal of anguished soul-searching over the question, "How could So-and-so have been such a great poet or such a clever writer and nevertheless have made nasty remarks about Jews?" The Jews pretend not to be able to understand it. They pretend that it is an inexplicable mystery to them how anyone can be intelligent and creative who doesn't love and admire Jews. They conclude that it had to have been some character flaw in the writer. And these were writers who only made passing remarks about Jews -- except, perhaps, for Pound, who really despised them.

And the Jews prefer not even to mention exceptionally popular writers like Louis Ferdinand Céline or Jack London or Feodor Dostoevsky, who were quite outspoken in portraying Jews in an unfavorable light. They are a real mystery to the Jews. Perhaps the explanation is that they were dropped on their heads as children. If that is so, then most of our greatest writers of the past must have been dropped on their heads. Not every writer made much of it, but the general opinion was that Jews were not just different from their Aryan hosts, but unpleasantly different and dangerously different. These opinions about the Jews generally were not based on ignorance, social snobbery, or Christian bigotry, as the Jews would have us believe.

Consider the three outstanding writers I just mentioned. Neither Céline nor London was a Christian, although Dostoevsky was, and none of the three was wealthy or considered a snob. London, in fact, was an illegitimate child raised in poverty. At the age of 13 he was working 12-hour days in a cannery for ten cents an hour. London and Dostoevsky became intimately acquainted with Jews before expressing opinions about them. London for a while thought of himself as a Marxist and moved in Marxist circles, where he got a good, strong whiff of Jews at work and play. Dostoevsky was sent to prison on the suspicion that he had revolutionary sentiments, and he spent four years in a Siberian prison with Jews who really did have revolutionary sentiments. All three writers denounced the Jews for their hatred against Gentile society, for their deceitfulness, and for their destructive and parasitic activities.

And Céline, London, and Dostoevsky were not really exceptional in their attitude toward the Jews. Their attitude was that of the majority of the most perceptive, sensitive, and thoughtful men in our society. I chose these three not because their attitudes toward the Jews were exceptional, but because they were the most outstanding writers of their time: Céline in France, London in America, and Dostoevsky in Russia. So why are things different today? Why don't we have America's leading literary lights warning us about the Jews' destructive intentions toward us, the way we did in the 19th century -- and in this century up until the Second World War? Did all of our honest writers get killed during the war?

Actually, I can think of one honest writer of the first rank who survived the war and warned us about the Jews -- although in a somewhat more muted voice than the prewar writers. It's a curious fact that Alexander Solzhenitsyn, just like his countryman Feodor Dostoevsky a century earlier, was arrested by the secret police and sent to a prison camp on suspicion of being a dissident. While in prison Dostoevsky had observed closely the Jews around him and developed

the conviction that if they ever got the upper hand over the Russians, the Russians would be devoured by them. That, of course, is exactly what happened.

Solzhenitsyn, a mathematician and an officer in the Red Army, was arrested in 1945 when a Jewish political commissar opened and read a letter written by Solzhenitsyn criticizing the communist regime. Solzhenitsyn spent the next 11 years in communist prison camps and had a good chance to observe at first hand the gulag system which already had devoured some 30 million of his countrymen. When he was released from prison in 1956 Solzhenitsyn, a man of exceptional courage and integrity, began writing books critical of the communist regime.

The Jews in his books were treated with some degree of subtlety, but not with enough subtlety to keep the Jews from whining immediately that he is an anti-Semite. I am sure that the Jews have more sensitive antennae for detecting anti-Semitism than I do, but in fact after reading two or three of Solzhenitsyn's novels even I had a strong suspicion that he was trying to tell us something about the Jews. And after reading his *Gulag Archipelago* I was sure of it. Solzhenitsyn didn't come right out and say, "The Jews are our deadliest enemies, and we ought to kill them all as soon as we can," but for the perceptive reader the message was there. For example, in *Gulag Archipelago* he names some of the communist secret police commissars who set up and ran the murderous system of forced-labor camps which consumed the lives of so many Russians. There are photographs of six of these communist butchers in the book. All six of them are Jews. And this in a country where less than one per cent of the population is Jewish.

But you know, Solzhenitsyn is really the exception in the postwar period, whereas before the war he would have been the rule. So again: what has happened to our writers? Why are there almost no writers of the first rank today who will speak openly of the Jews? Actually, I might rephrase that question and ask why there are virtually no writers of the first rank today, at least in the English-speaking world? We have a huge flood of trash literature being published, but very little of lasting value.

The same answer fits both questions, at least in part. We have fewer writers today publishing honest and significant commentaries on the Jews because of what happened to Professor Marius -- and also because of the greatly increased degree of direct control Jews have over what can be published and sold. A really competent, established novelist can write a first-rate novel in which the villain is a greasy kike, a la Ehud Barak or Ariel Sharon, who heads some Israeli murder organization -- but he would be quite unlikely to find a major publisher interested in handling his book, and even if he did the major bookstore chains would boycott it, and the reviewers would give it the silent treatment. He would have infinitely better luck by making the villain a Nazi. And what is true of fiction also is true of non-fiction.

I'll back up just a bit here, because there are few absolutes in the world of literature. Tom Wolfe is one writer who just might get away with a novel in which the villain is a sly, despicable, lecherous rabbi who kidnaps 12-year-old Gentile girls from the streets of New York, rapes them, and then sells them to an Israeli White slave gang, which is finally broken up by a blond hero with distinctly Nazi overtones to his character, who says, "Die, you Jewish pig," as he dispatches each of the White slavers.

Well, I'm exaggerating a bit. I might write such a novel, and I'd really enjoy doing so if I had the time, but no major publisher would come near it. If Tom Wolfe wanted to write such a novel he would make it quite a bit more subtle than I have described it, undoubtedly leaving out the "die, you Jewish pig" comments as the hero slits the throats of the Israelis. But, judging from some of his other work, he just might get away with a subliminal version of the story. He certainly pushes the envelope about as far as it can be pushed today.

And in non-fiction there is the truly remarkable and valuable work of Professor Kevin MacDonald, whose trilogy on Jewish psychology, Jewish behavioral characteristics, and the interaction of the Jews with their Gentile hosts has been published in the past five years. It is really surprising that these books are available even to scholars. I am quite sure, however, that the same information could not be published and sold in a popular context today, where any Joe or Jill Sixpack could pick it up at the corner newsstand.

Anyway, Solzhenitsyn and Wolfe and MacDonald are the rare exceptions, simply because of the massive degree of Jewish control in the book publishing and marketing industries -- and even more so in the book reviewing business -- and because of fear on the part of timid writers who don't want to write anything Politically Incorrect and suffer the fate of Professor Marius.

And that also explains in part why the American literary scene has become such a wasteland today. Jewish tastes and Jewish sensibilities are more important today in determining what is published than Gentile tastes and sensibilities. Which is to say, what has happened to art and music since the Jews decided to become our cultural arbiters also has happened to literature. This really goes beyond a Jewish publisher looking at a manuscript and deciding not to publish it because it is hostile to Jews or reveals something the Jews don't want publicized, such as the names and ethnicities of the commissars who ran the extermination camps in the Soviet Union. It's more a matter of using his own, Jewish taste to decide that the public would rather read a novel with a Jewish flavor -- a Norman Mailer or Philip Roth or Saul Bellow flavor -- than a Gentile flavor.

This process of replacing Gentile tastes with Jewish tastes is self-reinforcing, because it involves more than the big, New York publishers and the bookstore chains. It also involves the literary critics and the universities. Jews have arrogated to themselves the office of deciding what's good literature and what isn't and of interpreting literature -- ours as well as theirs -- for us. What passes for "literature" in American universities today is almost unimaginably different from what students were introduced to 60 years ago. And certainly, students want to be fashionable. They want to have the "right" tastes. They want to be part of the avant-garde.

Since most Americans don't do much serious reading these days, perhaps the question of who our literary critics and literature professors are seems unimportant. Actually, it's extremely important, if we're interested in such things as freedom and survival. Certainly, we can't become terribly excited over Professor Marius' loss of his job as speech writer for Al Gore. Al Gore can hire or fire anybody he wants. But having Jews interpret our literature for us is a more serious matter.

In a literate society a people's sense of who they are is passed from generation to generation through their national literature. A people's values and standards of behavior are expressed in their literature. Their history, the lives of their heroes, their attitude toward the world are all incorporated in their national literature. To permit an alien people, with different values and standards, a different history, a different sense of identity, a different attitude toward the world to become custodians of a nation's literature and to begin changing it, reinterpreting it, denigrating it, and replacing it is tantamount to national suicide. It leads immediately to a loss of the sense of peoplehood, a loss of the sense of national identity. It leads immediately to alienation and the breakdown of public and private morality. It leaves a people easy prey to those whose aim is to control and exploit them.

And that is why the Jews have, in their inimitably pushy manner, made themselves the masters of our literature. Of course, if you discuss the matter with a Jew, you will hear other excuses for this development. Some will try to turn your questions aside with the old jealousy ploy: "Oh, you're just jealous because we Jews are smarter and work harder than you do. That's how we became so prominent in your cultural activities." Others will try to convince you that their Allen Ginsberg was promoted as a talented poet and their Philip Roth and Norman Mailer were treated as serious writers by Jewish publishers and Jewish reviewers and Jewish literature professors because that's what they really were; that they were sensitive and creative writers deserving to be studied and discussed by Gentile university students, that their books were bought by fashion-conscious Gentile yuppies because that's really what the yuppies wanted to read.

And to be honest about it, we have not been without fault in this, because we let it happen. We foolishly opened our city gates to the enemy, because we already had undergone a long process of subversion and decay. We had in our own ranks, even before the Second World War, idiots with pretensions to learning and culture such as Professor Marius, ready to welcome the alien distorters and destroyers of our culture into our midst, ready to fawn on them and believe whatever the enemy said. Well, how that came about, how fools like Marius became predisposed to accept the Jews and believe them, is another story. We may be amused that Marius got bitten, but our task remains as formidable as before: and that is to break the grip of the Jews on the minds of our people by breaking the Jewish monopoly on our mass media.

Until we do that, modern American literature and the rest of modern culture will remain a wasteland, devoid of the real spirit, the real genius of our people. It will remain a culture that corrupts rather than uplifts our people. It will not be a culture that inspires them to fight for their freedom and their racial integrity and their survival as a people. Quite to the contrary, in fact. A people with no real culture of their own -- or at least, a people who have lost contact with their own culture -- will be victimized and exploited and eventually exterminated. That is the aim of our current cultural arbiters, at Harvard, in Hollywood, in New York, in Washington, and elsewhere.

Well, we do still have creative individuals among our people: writers of talent, musicians and graphic artists of talent, who are able to renew our culture, to put us back on the right cultural track, to inspire us to value the things that our people used to value before the Judaization of our culture. When we make it possible for these creative individuals to express themselves and to reach the masses of our people, so that our people have a choice between Jewish culture and our

culture, then we will begin to see some changes. Anyway, our task, my task, the task of the National Alliance, remains to provide the media -- free media, non-distorting media -- through which our writers and artists can reach our people.

Thoughts on Government

Some of my listeners tell me that I talk too much about the Jews, that I blame them for too many things, that the Jews aren't the only ones to be blamed for the wrecking of our civilization and our culture, that there are many Jews who aren't involved in destructive activities, and so on.

Well, I agree in part with these critics. Certainly there are people who are not Jews who are destroying our civilization and our race and taking away our freedom, and there are many Jews who are involved in these things only to the extent that they are members of the Jewish community and thereby are supplying material and moral support to the Jews who are active wreckers and subverters.

You know, the reason I speak so often about Jews is not that Jews are my favorite topic; it is that Jews, through their domination of our news and entertainment media, have a more powerful influence on public opinion and thereby on our government than any other coherent group. Well, there's more to it than that. Jews are not only more powerful than any other group, they are special in other ways as well: cleverer, more deceptive, more malevolent. Anyway, we cannot solve our other problems without first solving our Jewish problem. That is a fact. That's why I talk so much about Jews.

As I said, however, there also are people who are not Jews who deserve the attention of patriots. There are politicians as a class, for example. I always have considered politicians to be a special subset of the much larger set of amoral persons. I don't believe that it's a good idea for me to try to probe too deeply into the psychology of morality on this program. I am not knowledgeable enough about the subject, and besides, radio isn't the best medium for such a discussion. Let's just define an amoral person as someone who believes -- no, someone who feels -- that getting what he wants is so much more important than anything else in life, that he will not permit himself to be swayed by any other considerations. He will make winning everything that he wants for himself personally his only goal, and in choosing his tactics for winning the only thing that will count will be cost effectiveness.

I don't really know, but I suspect that many people -- perhaps most people -- who have this attitude are born with it. Others are taught by their elders or by their peers. And some make the decision all by themselves to become amoral, to strive consciously to shed their inhibitions and to look out for Number One, to the exclusion of everything else.

Of course, we're all like that to a certain extent. We all have personal goals, personal needs, personal desires. We strive for the things that we personally want. But most of us also consider other things when we strive. We consider how our striving will affect other people, how it will affect our community, how it will affect our race. We deliberately impose certain rules of conduct on ourselves. We value more than just our own personal welfare or our own personal wealth or our own personal security. We have a code of morals. Amoral people don't.

Some people believe that morality is only for suckers, for losers -- that the amoral people are the smart guys, who are more likely to get what they want, because they impose no restrictions on

themselves. Some people even make a religion of selfishness: the Libertarians, for example, and the followers of the Soviet Jewess Ayn Rand.

Actually, however, most of us are moral because morality has had survival value for us for a very long time. It evolved with us. We developed the tendency to be moral over the course of many thousands of generations because those groups of people, those communities, with a high percentage of moral people in them were more likely to survive and prosper than those groups consisting primarily of amoral people.

We evolved not only as individuals but also as members of groups. A group whose members all had the attitude that it's every man for himself when the group was attacked by another group or experienced some other threat just wasn't likely to survive for a long time. The group and its members and their genes perished together. A group whose members were a bit less selfish had a better chance for survival under natural conditions, under the sort of highly selective conditions that prevailed during most of our evolution. Which is to say, a community whose members really believed -- really felt -- that they had a responsibility to protect each other and to look out for the welfare of the community as a whole was a stronger and more fit community than one composed largely of amoral people.

Inside a community, of course, different considerations applied, and the amoral person who was sufficiently clever might indeed have an advantage. If he were not sufficiently clever, however, his head ended up on a spike above the town gate or on a pole at the community latrine to serve as a warning to others. Our ancestors developed a sixth sense for sniffing out the amoral fellows in their midst, and then they got rid of them.

And here we should remind ourselves of the difference between amorality and immorality. The immoral person has morals, but he just isn't very good at being ruled by them, usually because of insufficient self-discipline, insufficient power of will. Our ancestors didn't approve of immorality either, but they always had a much greater horror of the amoral person than of the person who was merely immoral. The amoral person usually had to be very deceptive in order to survive.

When we began moving from small, rural communities to cities, the amoral individuals among us were better able to avoid being detected, and amorality had more survival value. You could cheat people in one part of the city until there were threats to put your head on a spike and then move to another part of the city, where you weren't known, and cheat new people. I should mention in this regard that Jews, who also need cities in order to flourish, are not necessarily amoral or even immoral people. Jews, in fact, are probably more moral, in the strictest sense of the word, than the average Gentile, because group loyalty and group survival always have been at the top of their agenda. It's just that Jewish morality is quite different from ours. They have an entirely different set of rules for dealing with other Jews than they have for dealing with us.

Amoral individuals really gained an advantage over the rest of us with the ascendancy of mass democracy. The 19th and 20th centuries have been the golden age of amorality, the age in which clever scoundrels have been able to rise to the top of the dungheap with ease and without having to worry about losing their heads. All they have had to be able to do is fool large numbers of the least perceptive and least discriminating members of our society -- that is, large numbers of

voters -- and that is a lot easier than fooling the most perceptive and most discriminating people -- that is, people of the sort who used to be the leaders of our society in less democratic times.

Every time an election year rolls around, all of the amoral people who also have good acting skills are prancing across our television screens in an effort to persuade the voters to put them into public office. I look at someone like Al Gore, for example, or John McCain trying to act like a normal person, like a person with morals, and I shudder with revulsion. These guys aren't even good actors, but they're plenty good enough for the dumbed-down and feminized American electorate.

What really scares me is a politician who is a good actor. Bill Clinton, for example, is a superb actor, the sort of fellow who could sell refrigerators to Eskimos -- or start a war in order to please some powerful minority among his supporters and then convince the general public that the real purpose of the war was to defend the country. I can think of a few more: Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson. Whenever I see any politician giving a sales pitch, I see that secret, little smile -- that fleeting smirk -- which tells me that he is thinking to himself that he is getting away with it, that he is fooling the suckers again. This is the same sort of fleeting smirk I see on the faces of salesmen and hucksters and manipulative people trying to persuade me to do something against my better judgment.

Actually, perhaps I don't really see anything, but my sixth sense sets off a little alarm inside my brain that tells me that this guy's head needs to be mounted on a pole outside the community latrine. And I'm sure that many other people also have this same sixth sense about politicians. I'm sure that there are many other people in our society who would like to put all their heads on poles. The problem is that the average couch potato, the average ball game fan, the average voter doesn't have this sixth sense. When Bill Clinton gets in front of a television camera and tells the boobs that he feels their pain, they believe him. Instead of getting an itch in their trigger fingers when they hear his oily voice, they get misty-eyed. "Oh, he really cares about me," they think.

When a person like Bill Clinton or Al Gore or George Bush tells a lie, I believe that he doesn't even think of it as a lie. He doesn't think in terms of what's the truth and what's a lie; he thinks only in terms of what is advantageous or disadvantageous for him to say at the moment. Truth or falsity doesn't really matter; what matters is, can I get away with it: will the voters believe me? When a politician agrees to collaborate with the Jews, he doesn't think of it as a betrayal of his people. He thinks of it only as a way to get better press or a bigger campaign contribution. When he sponsors a bill that is harmful to the interests of his race, that's not what concerns him. The only thing that concerns him is, how will it be perceived by his constituents and by the media? Will it gain him votes or cost him votes? That's all that matters.

Anyway, that's democracy. It's a system that practically guarantees rule by amoral people, even if there are no Jews around to make things worse.

What can we do about it, at a time when we don't yet have the means to put all of the politicians' heads on poles? About all we can do at the moment is try to understand the problem as well as we can and then plan ahead for a better system to be implemented at the time when we can begin putting heads on poles.

One of the first things to understand about this problem is that it is not just academic; it really must be dealt with. We can't continue with a system that puts a man like Bill Clinton in the White House and then offers us a man like Al Gore as a suitable replacement. We won't survive.

Another thing to understand is that it's a problem with two components: the politicians and the people who vote for them. If the voters were a lot smarter and a lot more perceptive than they are, then we would at least have a higher grade of amoral person in public office. But making the voters substantially smarter is a job requiring generations. We could start by sterilizing everyone on welfare, and we certainly should do that at least. But in the long run we want more than just a higher grade of politician. We want no politicians. We want a different system.

I know that there are many of my people out there who would like to have no system at all: no government. They just want to be left alone. And I sympathize with them. More than that, I believe that it would be a lot healthier for us in several ways if we could begin living again the way we did 3,000 years ago. We would be rid of most of the liberals and weaklings and other defectives pretty quickly. We wouldn't even have to sterilize them. We could reestablish healthy, natural relationships between men and women. We could have healthy, functional families again.

Unfortunately, we can't get along with no government -- not as long as the Chinese are still around. In an all-White world we might go back to doing whatever we want, but as long as there are more than a billion organized and armed Chinamen on the planet -- Chinamen who now are more dangerous than ever with the new military technology given to them by the Israelis and by Mr. Clinton's campaign fund-raisers -- as long as that situation prevails, we need a government. We need to be organized as long as any of our competitors for ownership of this planet are organized.

The evil is not in government *per se*. The evil is in the way in which government has been used in the past and is being used now. Just because we have a government in Washington now whose primary functions are to send out the so-called "entitlement" checks on time, to protect homosexual Boy Scout leaders from "hate" criminals who would like to stomp them to a pulp, to ensure that Black drivers aren't pulled over by the highway patrol any more often than White drivers, and to enforce a thousand other unnatural and destructive social and racial programs that could not be maintained without a centralized police state doesn't mean that government is unnatural and destructive *per se*. We have an unnatural and destructive government now because it is a government run by amoral men who respond to organized pressure groups, who cater to organized voting blocs, who dance to whatever tune is being played by the organized Jewish minority, and who absolutely do not give a damn about what their policies are doing to the country and to our race. They really do not care.

Do you think Bill Clinton lost even one night's sleep over the Serb women and children his bombs and missiles were killing in Belgrade earlier this year? Those were White women and children, members of a European nation that had not harmed or threatened America in any way, but he was ready to begin killing them wholesale as soon as his Jewish advisers told him to. While the bombs fell on Belgrade, back in the White House it was fun and games as usual. And the people in the Congress were no better. In a moral society, with a moral government, someone with access to Clinton would have done whatever it took to stop him. But no politician raised a

hand against him. As long as we keep a system that depends upon the votes of the masses to choose the people making the policies, we will have politicians -- amoral men -- running the show, and things will not improve in any substantial way.

Can you imagine a government run by people who aren't amoral? Can you imagine a government with a purpose that extends beyond the next election? Can you imagine a government that sees itself as an instrument of a people, of a nation, a government that exists to protect that nation and to advance its interests? Can you imagine such a government led and staffed by men who are not politicians but who are men selected for their moral qualities as well as for their intelligence and who are trained to perform their official functions and are held to high standards of performance? Can you imagine such a government ruled by a fundamental law, by a constitution, that rectifies the inadequacies in the present U.S. Constitution?

I can imagine all of these things. And again I want to remind you that these questions and these things I imagine are not just academic. We are faced with a crisis. The country is being swamped with non-Whites. Thousands more of them flood into the country every day, and the government has no intention at all of trying to slow the flood. The politicians are afraid that if they try to stop the flood they will be called "racists." And as I said, they really don't care what this Third World flood is doing to America, just as they don't care when the President and his Jewish advisers decide to start another absolutely unnecessary war: a real war, not an imaginary war.

We must do something drastic, and we must do it soon. It's time for us to be thinking about what we need to do, to be thinking about more than just fighting for our bare survival. We should be guided by an ideology. We should be thinking about the details of the sort of society we want to have in the future. That's a contentious thing, of course. Some of my friends think that everything would be fine if we could just go back to the Constitution of 1787 and the first ten amendments, of 1789, the Bill of Rights. They believe that all of our problems today are the consequence of having abandoned that fundamental law. And I agree with them to a certain extent. Certainly, if we had a firm grip today on the Bill of Rights and had not cluttered up the Constitution with a number of ill-advised, additional amendments during the past 200 years, we'd be much better off than we are.

The fact is, however, that conditions have changed a great deal over the past 200 years. For all practical purposes we had no mass media then, and we had no Jews. We were separated from Asia and from Africa by huge oceans. Now we need a Constitution for a new society that is based on race and on a clear recognition of the Jewish problem. In 1787 the people who drew up our Constitution didn't think about race or about the Jews. They believed that these things would never become a problem, that the common sense of the people would prevail. Big mistake!

Beyond this we really do need to put a final end to the flaws in our political thinking that have resulted in a system that brings amoral men to positions of control and influence. The idea that anyone who could shout and wave his arms well enough to persuade the lowest elements in our society that he loved them and was thereby suited for leadership -- this idea really has to go. We really need something sounder for the future, something a little less primitive, or we won't have a future.

I believe that we can build something sounder, that we can have a healthy society and a healthy government, if we put our minds and hearts to the task. That's what we're doing now in the National Alliance. I'd be pleased to have you working with us on this essential task.

Deliberate Deception

In our weekly discussions here I sometimes use careless language that leads to misunderstanding, and when I do I'm sorry for it. The problem is that I really have a great deal of work to do, and I usually don't have time to refine and polish my remarks before I go on the air, and so sometimes I don't make myself as clear as I might. One listener criticized last week's broadcast because I referred to Ayn Rand as a "Soviet Jewess" who preached a religion of selfishness. He wrote to me that that was like saying that Ayn Rand was a believer in both communism and individualism at the same time, and that didn't make sense.

Actually, my reference to Ayn Rand as a "Soviet Jewess" was intended to mean only that she was a Jewess from the Soviet Union, not that she was an apostle of communism. Unlike many of her fellow Jews at the time, she did not preach communism. She was, however, an apostle not only of selfishness but also of other destructive ideas preached by nearly all of her fellow Jews, such as the idea that race doesn't matter. In her book *The Virtue of Selfishness,* after railing vehemently and at length against what she called "collectivism," she wrote:

"Racism is the lowest, most crudely primitive form of collectivism."

Furthermore, Ayn Rand's brand of selfishness was a far cry from the sort of self-reliance and individual responsibility in which I believe. The atomistic sort of selfishness she preached was intended -- again I say ***intended*** -- to sever a person from his racial roots, to kill his feeling for his race, to lead him to put his personal interests above his responsibilities to his race as a whole, and, in fact, to abjure his racial responsibilities altogether. And this was deliberate.

I don't like to sound spooky or irrational about this, but I should tell you that many years of experience have led me to believe that a maxim we all ought to be guided by is, "No good thing cometh out of Israel." When a Jew preaches anything to us -- whether collectivism, as in the case of Karl Marx, or extreme individualism, as in the case of Ayn Rand -- it is intended to do us harm, to deceive us, to weaken us, to make us more vulnerable. Even when it appears to be anti-communism, it is slyly twisted so as to equate communism with every form of collective feeling, and from there to make any form of racial feeling akin to communism. And as I said, this is done very slyly, very cleverly, so that it fools many people, especially the simpletons of the Right. Many anti-communists today have let themselves be persuaded by Rand and her cohorts that racism is a form of communism. A thousand generations of practice in the marketplace have given Rand and her fellow tribesmen a rare talent for deception, for misdirection.

Let me mention a specific example of this. According to all accounts the defining event for the Jews of the world today is the so-called "Holocaust." More professional Jews -- that is, Jews whose profession is their Jewishness -- make their living today from the "Holocaust" than from anything else connected with their Jewishness. It was, they tell us, the most horrible crime in the history of the world. And they have trained a lot of Christian preachers and Gentile politicians and Gentile media hacks to say the same thing. And they have been sending to all of us the bill for this alleged "most horrible crime in history" for quite a while now.

First it was the Nazis, those terrible people in Germany who, for some inexplicable reason, didn't like Jews and so beginning in 1933 tried to get them all out of Germany by prohibiting them from owning newspapers or radio stations, or from practicing law and so on, and then after the start of the Second World War began putting them in concentration camps. So after the Second World War the Nazis were hounded and hunted down and murdered wholesale. The Jews still gloat over that and complain among themselves that they didn't get to kill as many as they wanted to.

Now, if you're confused because that image of the bloodthirsty, gloating Jew doesn't quite match the image presented by Hollywood of the lovable, benevolent, funny, clever, and helpful Jew -- the wise, thoughtful, humanitarian Jew presented to you every day on your television screen -- let me read you part of an article that appeared in a New York Jewish newspaper just three weeks ago. The article is in the November 26 edition of the *Jewish Press*, and it was written by New York Jewish Assemblyman Dov Hikind. It's about a Jewish organization with the Hebrew name *Nakam*, an organization that certainly would be called a "hate group" -- if it weren't Jewish, of course.

Assemblyman Hikind writes:

"Recently two elderly Holocaust survivors proudly related their involvement in *Nakam*, a brigade of survivors who attempted to avenge the murders of their families. In a documentary made for Nuremberg TV, Liepke Distel and Joseph Harmatz, both nearing eighty, confirmed that they had conspired to kill Nazis by poisoning their bread with arsenic. Regrettably, the arsenic wasn't potent enough, and the German POWs became ill but did not die. It's a shame that the tens of thousands of Nazis who avoided capture and punishment did not suffer at the hands of their former victims."

Assemblyman Hikind then goes on to rage that some Germans have had the nerve to suggest that the two Jewish poisoners should be put on trial for war crimes.

Oi, veh! The very idea of punishing Jews for crimes against Germans gives Hikind a fit. It's fine for Jews to track down 80-year-old Germans alleged to have killed Jews during the war and send them off for a show trial somewhere. There's good money in that for the Jews, although Hikind doesn't put it quite that way. What he says about the Germans is this:

"There should not be a moment of peace for those who committed those horrible crimes. They should never feel secure, should never enjoy the tranquility of a family life they tore from so many."

But as for the Jews who murdered Germans after the war, why, of course, they should not be punished. They were just nice Jewish boys doing what comes naturally for Jews, and regrettably they didn't use enough arsenic.

Anyway, the contrast between the bloodthirsty hatefulness displayed by Hikind talking to his fellow Jews in the *Jewish Press* and the image of the Jews presented to us by Hollywood is instructive, I believe. It's also instructive to contrast Hikind's account of this arsenic episode in

the November 26 *Jewish Press* with what really happened. In 1945 and 1946, in the months after the Germans surrendered and the democratic and communist occupation forces moved in, the Jews were running wild in Germany. Under the protection of the occupation armies, bands of Jews murdered thousands of disarmed Germans. Going from door to door at night, they took Germans out and shot them or cut their throats.

But that wasn't enough for the Jews. They wanted to kill Germans in much larger numbers, and so they decided to poison the water supplies for several major German cities. By the time the Jews had gotten the poison together, however, the cities of Germany were swarming with hundreds of thousands of Jews released from the concentration camps, who had miraculously managed to avoid the gas chambers, and the poisoners were afraid that some of these Jews might be killed if they poisoned the water supplies.

They decided to poison German prisoners of war instead. On the night of April 13, 1946, two Jews broke into a bakery in Nuremberg which supplied bread to a large German POW camp. They poisoned 3,000 loaves of bread with arsenic. Several hundred German prisoners who ate the poisoned bread the next day died a painful death, and several thousand were hospitalized. But New York Assemblyman Dov Hikind rages that not enough arsenic was used. If they had used more arsenic, then they could have killed thousands instead of hundreds, and he finds it "regrettable" that that didn't happen.

Now, 54 years later, the supply of German POWs has pretty well dried up, so the Jews have announced that it's all of the German people, including those born after the war, that must be held responsible for mistreating the Jews. They must pay and pay and pay, because they committed the "most horrible crime in history." And in fact, we all must pay. It was the Germans who did it, but we let them do it, so we must pay too. We must continue to support the bandit state of Israel, financially, militarily, and diplomatically. We must wage war against Israel's neighbors when they fail to obey a United Nations directive or when we suspect they're trying to develop weapons of mass destruction. But Israel can ignore all the UN directives it wants, continue to develop new Jewish settlements in territory stolen from its neighbors, continue to torture Palestinian prisoners and dynamite the homes of their families, and continue to build up its illegal stocks of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and we must look the other way. That's because we owe the Jews a free ride, right? It's because we didn't stop the Germans from mistreating those nice, Jewish boys soon enough. We let what they call the "most horrible crime in history" happen, and so we must pay.

I always have been amazed at how well this swindle works. Of course, it's easier to swindle a nation when you control what that nation sees on its television screens. But still, I am surprised at the gullibility of my own people, at how easily they are deceived. I am surprised even though the swindlers, as I said a moment ago, have a rare talent for deception. I mean, just look at the facts. The Jews call what the Germans did to them the "most horrible crime in history." Consider what the Jews did to the Russians, to the Ukrainians, to the Poles, and to the Balts, not to mention what they did to the Germans. A conservative estimate of the number of Russians and Ukrainians killed by Jewish communism between the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and the end of the Second World War is 30 million.

Now, even if one accepts the canonical figure of six million Jews killed in the so-called "Holocaust," that alleged "most horrible crime in history" is dwarfed by the slaughter of Slavs and Balts by the Jews. In the Baltic countries before the war, the Communist Party was a kosher enterprise, consisting almost exclusively of Jews. When the Red Army occupied Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in 1940 and installed communist governments, Jewish commissars began arresting and murdering what they called "the class enemy," but which really was the Gentile enemy. Teachers, professors, writers, policemen, military officers, businessmen, doctors -- even lawyers -- were rounded up by the secret police and then murdered, sometimes after horrible tortures. The Jews wanted no one left alive who might be looked upon as a leader by the masses. They murdered more than 60,000 members of the leadership elite in tiny Estonia alone, which had a total population of only 1.2 million. They decapitated the Baltic countries.

They did the same thing in Poland, only they didn't have a chance to do it on such a huge scale, because the Germans seized the larger part of Poland, including most of the cities, before the Reds did. But in the part of Poland occupied by the Red Army the Jewish commissars rounded up 15,000 Polish leaders, mostly military officers, and murdered them. The Germans later discovered the corpses of more than 4,000 of them in mass graves in a forest near the Russian village of Katyn. The rest have never been found.

The Jews complain loudly today that when the Germans liberated the Baltic countries in 1941, the local Balts were much more eager to kill Jews than the Germans were. The Germans had to hold the Balts back for the sake of order. And in Poland at the end of the war, after the Germans had left and before the Reds had clamped down, there were several mass lynchings of Jews by the Poles. In the Polish town of Kielce in 1946, for example, the local Poles killed 43 Jews before the communists could stop them. The Jews claim to have no clue as to why the Balts and the Poles hated them so much. They pretend that it's a mystery to them. Why should those nasty Slavs and Balts want to hurt the poor, inoffensive, long-suffering, humanitarian Jews, who have done so much for mankind? And even today American school children are much more likely to hear about the 43 Jews killed in Kielce by the Poles in 1946 than they are about the 15,000 Polish leaders killed by the Jews in the Katyn forest and elsewhere in 1940. And they are quite unlikely to hear about the deliberate poisoning of German POWs after the war by Jews, just as they are unlikely to hear any genuine expression of sentiment by leading Jews, such as New York Assemblyman Dov Hikind's expression of regret that the Jewish poisoners didn't use more arsenic.

You know, the history of the Second World War is a big and complex subject. So is the so-called "Holocaust." There are many aspects of both of these subjects which still ought to be investigated to determine where the truth is. But most of the misunderstanding that exists today is not due to the complexity of the subjects. It is due to deliberate deception. The mass murder of the elites of the Baltic countries is not something that is too complex for the average American to understand. It is simply something that the people who control the mass media in America prefer that the average citizen not know. What they want the average citizen to think about is how the poor, blameless Jews suffered, through no fault of their own, and how we didn't do anything to stop their suffering, so we owe them a free ride today.

One can read specialized history books to learn about the genocide committed against the Balts and the Poles and the Ukrainians by the Jews. One can even read a little about this genocide in the *Encyclopedia Britannica.* But no school teacher in America will mention it, for fear of losing his or her job. In America's public schools, just as on television, genocide means only one thing: the killing of the poor, blameless Jews by the wicked anti-Semites of the world, especially the Nazis. And since Americans don't read specialized history books -- and very few of them ever pick up an encyclopedia -- what Steven Spielberg says about genocide in his movies is what most Americans believe it is. That's deliberate deception.

And this deception has serious consequences. I am sure that many Americans believe that what happened in a war that ended 55 years ago is no longer relevant and certainly not worth arguing about. But even if I and every other Gentile agreed not to belabor the issue any more, the Jews wouldn't agree. They're making too much money from it. And that's not just the billions they're shaking down the Swiss and the Germans and the French and everybody else for. The extortion money is the least of it. Much more important is the psychic aspect: the feeling on the part of a brainwashed public that it's reprehensible to criticize Jews for anything, because they have suffered so much more than anyone else -- and through no fault of their own, poor dears. That's why people are afraid to say anything about Jewish media control in America, afraid even to acknowledge its reality. And Jewish media control is destroying America, destroying our civilization, destroying our race. Virtually every destructive policy coming from Washington -- immigration policy, affirmative action, forced school integration, the promotion of feminism and homosexuality, the ramming of multiculturalism down our throats, you name it -- is a consequence of Jewish control of the mass media. So it is important to get over this feeling that the Jews shouldn't be criticized or held accountable. And to get over it we need to understand what really happened during and after the war and why it happened.

I have one more comment on this subject. I am often criticized -- sometimes even denounced in extreme terms -- because of what some listeners believe is bloodymindedness on my part. Some people thought that it was just terrible that I spoke last week about putting politicians' heads on poles outside the community latrine. What an uncivilized thing to say! Some people suggested that this shows that I am not really sane, that I am filled with barely repressed homicidal impulses.

Well, I have spent more time than my critics, I believe, acquainting myself with what goes on in the real world. I have spent much time studying the details of what the Jews did to the Estonians and to the Ukrainians and to the Poles -- and also to the Germans. These are terrible and uncivilized things, but they are real. Just because Steven Spielberg never will make a movie about them makes them no less real and no less terrible. And it is my knowledge of the reality of these terrible things -- my conviction that this is what the world is really like -- and that the terrible things that happened before to our people will happen again if we let them happen. And we won't stop them from happening by sipping tea and engaging in polite conversation with the people who are responsible for these things happening.

We must deal with the real world, and the real world has been a bloody and terrible place in the past, and I firmly believe that it will continue to be that way. Survival is a bloody business. Let us not be fooled by our momentary comforts into believing otherwise. The mess we are in

presently is more likely to be resolved by somebody's heads being put on poles than it is by being polite and avoiding the more unpleasant aspects of reality.

I am not really obsessed by the desire to cut off the heads of any group of people -- not even the heads of the politicians. But I am obsessed by the idea that we must not, through inaction or through an insistence on being polite and civilized, allow the enemies of our people to do again to us what they did in Estonia or in Ukraine or in the Katyn forest or in the prisoner of war camp at Nürnberg. And as long as they continue in their efforts to deceive us, as long as they continue in their efforts to prevent people like me from contradicting them, I will continue to be obsessed.

Timothy McVeigh and The Turner Diaries

I've had several film crews visiting my office during the past few weeks: BBC, the History Channel, the Discovery Channel, Arts and Entertainment; you name it, they've been here. Reporters and photographers from the print media too: the *Washington Post, Rolling Stone* magazine. The main thing they're focusing on is my acquisition of a couple of record companies for the production and distribution of resistance music. They want to tie that in to my two novels, *The Turner Diaries* and *Hunter* -- especially *The Turner Diaries* -- and to suggest that all of the things I do are somehow connected with the growing threat of terrorism in America. Their position is that Timothy McVeigh read *The Turner Diaries* and got his friends to read the book, and then he blew up the Federal Building in Oklahoma City; therefore, *The Turner Diaries* is a terrorist book and is responsible for the bombing.

I always tell them, no, my book is not what caused Timothy McVeigh to blow up the Federal Building; it is what the Federal government did in Waco, Texas, two years earlier that caused the bombing. It was the murder of all those women and children in the Mt. Carmel Church by the Clinton administration that made Timothy McVeigh decide that someone had to strike back at a tyrannical and murderous government. Someone had to send the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington a message that there are Americans who will not tolerate such behavior. And I cite the evidence to these media people: Timothy McVeigh went to Waco during the Federal siege of the Branch Davidian church and expressed his outrage to other people who were there. And at the time he was sentenced to death by the Clinton government, Timothy told the court why he had bombed the Federal Building. He told the court that the Federal government, by setting the example of terrorism against its own citizens, was provoking counter-terrorism against the government.

Well, of course, the media people already know these things, but they won't report them. They won't put the blame for the bombing on the Clinton government. They love the Clinton government. It's their kind of government. Bill Clinton is their kind of guy. Janet Reno is their kind of butch-feminist attorney general. And all those people the government burned and shot to death in Waco, why, they don't really count. They were just a bunch of wackos; they were separatists; they were unfashionable people; they weren't even liberals. They weren't part of our wonderful TV society, our consumer society, our Clinton-era, feel-good society. They just wanted to be left alone, and people who want to be left alone are dangerous. You can't trust them. It's all right for the government to kill them.

Anyway, the media people certainly are not going to blame the Oklahoma City bombing on the Federal government, with which they identify. They'd much rather blame it on me and on my book, because my book predicts growing terrorism in America and explains why it will grow. And the explanations in my book are not Politically Correct. My book is not in tune with the Clinton era. I am a boat-rocker, and it's people like me, who aren't happy with more diversity and more feminism and more homosexuality and more multiculturalism and more government intrusion into our lives, who are dangerous, who are a threat to everything the media people hold dear.

They take the same attitude toward the music I distribute through my record company, Resistance Records. It is resistance music. It is opposed to everything the Clinton government

and the media people stand for. And their position is that my music is responsible for the violence in which young people often are involved. They say that my music is responsible for the anger so many young Americans feel.

And I tell them, no, it's not my resistance music that makes young Americans angry. It is the conditions around them, the conditions in which they are obliged to live, which make them angry. It is the alienating conditions in our society, in our cities, in our schools, which make young people angry. It is being forced to go to school with non-Whites, being forced to live in an increasingly non-White environment, that makes young people angry. It is seeing their heritage stolen from them that makes them angry.

All of that seems clear enough to me, but the media people pretend that they don't understand. How could anyone not like going to school with Blacks? Such a culturally enriching experience! How could anyone not like growing up in the multicultural sewers that our cities have become? How could anyone object to having his heritage taken away, when it's for such a good cause: the cause of more feminism, more homosexuality, and a non-White majority in America? No, no, these things couldn't be alienating young people and making them angry, the media people think, because these are all good things. It must be my music -- or perhaps violent video games, anything except the Clintonista filth, which the media people are helping the Clinton regime ram down our throats.

You know, these media people really cannot imagine why the prospect of a non-White America; a mongrel America; a coffee-colored, Third World America of Black basketball players and rap music and high fives and Ebonics, should make anyone angry. They just can't imagine it. Take a look at *Newsweek* magazine for this week. It has a picture of what these spiritually sick media liberals want the America of the 21st century to look like. They really want it to be an America without White people. *Newsweek*, of course, is owned by a Jewish company, the Washington Post Company, but it pretty well represents what all of the media people, Gentles as well as Jews, think. And they believe that is the way everyone else should think. They don't understand why their vision of America should make young people angry. So it must be my music. It must be people like me who are making young Americans angry by providing them with Politically Incorrect music.

I tell the media people that the purpose of resistance music is not to make young people alienated or angry; instead it is to give them a rationale for their alienation and a target for their anger. It is to explain to them why they are alienated; it is to help them understand the causes of their alienation by showing them who and what are responsible for the alienating conditions around them. The purpose of resistance music is to direct their anger outward, toward a proper target, so that their anger will not become self-destructive but instead can help them by helping our people.

But whenever I say something like this to a media person I just get a vacant smile. What I'm saying either doesn't register because it's too far off his wavelength, or he's deliberately tuning me out because he knows that if he really reports accurately what I'm telling him he'll need to look for another career shortly thereafter. I'm inclined to believe that in most cases it's the former: at least, in the case of the rank and file reporters and writers. The media bosses, the ones who set the party line, lie deliberately, but the media people in the ranks tend to be a highly

socialized group, very dependent on their interactions with their peers. I don't think they're even capable of independent thought. They can think only as a group. Each of them can think only what the others are thinking. If you put one of them in a room by himself somewhere, his brain would just shut down until another media person came into the room. Perhaps this is the way people tend to be who were raised in day-care centers, always surrounded by other children when they were very young.

Be that as it may, whether the media people deliberately twist and distort the reality they present to the public or do it unconsciously, it really is a big problem for all of us. Most Americans depend almost entirely on the mass media -- on television, radio, newspapers, and newsmagazines -- for everything they know, or think they know, about the world outside their own neighborhoods. And when that view of the world is distorted, is falsified, then we have difficulty making correct decisions and acting in a way that is consistent with our interests as a people.

There are other ways of learning about the world besides watching network television, of course. One can find out almost anything by using the Internet as a research tool. By learning where to look and how to read critically, one can pretty well get around the media controllers -- which is why they're working so hard now to try to build public support for their effort to control the Internet too, so that they can censor it. They want to protect us from pornography and terrorism, they tell us. What they really want to do is protect us from the truth, because if most Americans had any hint of the truth, the media bosses would have to start swimming for Israel to save their hides.

Well, as far as the public is concerned all of that is pretty much irrelevant. Expecting the general public to read anything critically or to learn how to use the Internet for research is just a pipe dream. The public may use the Internet for on-line shopping, but for 99 per cent of them that's it. Most of them always will get their news and their ideas from the easiest source, which is television, and they will believe what they see on the screen and what Tom Brokaw or Peter Jennings or Dan Rather tells them to believe.

Is that important? Is it really important what fools believe?

Well, yes, it is important. In the first place, we still have a crazy system where what the couch potatoes and lemmings believe has a big influence on public policy and on the type of government in Washington. When evil men, whose interests are diametrically opposed to the interests of our own people, are able to determine what the voters believe, then that is a matter of concern to us. That is the root of most of our problems today, this deliberate deception of the voters by the media bosses.

But even if couch potatoes weren't allowed to vote, we still should care what they believe. We often may be contemptuous of people who can't think for themselves and who are so easily misled, but the fact is they make up the bulk of our people, and if we want a truly healthy society again, we need for even the sports fans to have at least a rudimentary understanding of what's happening in the world and why. We want at least the great bulk of our people supporting the goals of our society.

Anyway, that's in the future. Let me give you a very specific example of the way in which the masses of the American people are fooled today. I'm sure that you remember the massacre at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, in April. I've already spoken about that at length on earlier broadcasts. The slant that the media people immediately tried to put on that massacre was that the two killers were neo-Nazis of some sort, or at the very least White racists, who had deliberately targeted Black students. And they put this slant on it knowing that one of the killers was a Jew -- hardly the neo-Nazi type -- that only one of the 13 victims was a Black, and that both killers were explicitly anti-racists and talked about how they wanted to kill White racists. And it has been this slant that has stuck in the public mind, even though the facts have been available, not only on the Internet but even in some widely distributed print media. It is television that makes a lasting impression on the average sports fan, not the news on the inside pages of the *New York Times.*

Even now, with excerpts appearing in *Time* magazine from the transcript of a video the two killers made before the massacre, most couch potatoes still believe they were neo-Nazis, because that's what Tom Brokaw and Peter Jennings and Dan Rather told them back in April and have been hinting at ever since. We need to get those neo-Nazis under control. We need new "hate crime" laws. That's the media message. Even with the video made by the killers now public, you can ask most sports fans, "Hey, you remember those two neo-Nazis who shot all the kids at Columbine High School?" and they'll answer, "Yeah, I remember them." Which just goes to show that it's a lot easier to fool people than it is to un-fool them.

Nevertheless, the video made by Klebold and Harris is very interesting, because it ties in with some other issues I've commented on. One of the first things that struck me when I read the transcript of the video the two killers made in Klebold's basement was the statement made separately by both the killers in slightly different words to the effect that they hated everyone: "It's humans that I hate," Klebold said. That reminded me of something the first-century Roman historian Tacitus wrote about the Jews more than 1900 years ago: "They hate all humanity, except their fellow Jews."

Christians, especially, seemed to be hated by the two killers, and they made a number of obscene and derogatory comments about those of their fellow students who were Christians whom they intended to kill. Is this something Klebold learned from his Jewish mother? We don't really know, and we certainly won't find out from Tom Brokaw. One thing that is clear from their video, however, is the almost total sense of alienation felt by the young killers. They really hated the world.

Now, they certainly didn't learn that hatred from reading one of my novels or listening to the resistance music I distribute or from visiting one of my Internet web sites or even from playing violent video games -- and yet Jewish groups and much of the media have been trying to convince the public that they did. Actually, there are some trendy folks out there who are an easy sell for that theory. There are people in America -- White people -- who really believe that things are getting better and better as they become more and more "diverse," more and more chaotic, more and more multicultural, more and more Jewish. They can't imagine why young people should be more likely to be alienated growing up rootless in the Clinton era. I mean, it just couldn't be the feminism, the homosexuality, the racial mixing and the behavior of the Federal

government -- all of ***those*** things are just so wonderful -- so it must be those awful heterosexual White males who put hate on the Internet and write hateful novels and distribute hateful music.

Anyway, the value in the video that Klebold and Harris made, and the reason that you should read the transcript on the Internet or at least read the excerpts in *Time* magazine this week, is that it provides a horrifyingly graphic picture of the depth of the alienation and the intensity of the rage inside many young Americans today. And keep in mind that Klebold and Harris were not my kind of young Americans. They had no healthy racial feelings, no understanding of what was happening to their world. One of them was a Jew. And yet they were totally alienated. This sickness around us -- this liberal, Jewish, feminist, egalitarian sickness -- corrupts everyone. The video Klebold and Harris made will convince you, if you weren't already convinced, that the world young Americans are growing up in is profoundly unnatural and unhealthy. Some adjust to it, more or less, but a growing number do not. Instead, they become alienated, and they become filled with rage, and in the years ahead there will be hell to pay.

This Klebold-Harris video being made public now is a fluke. It gives a perceptive few a chance to see some evidence that they wouldn't otherwise have seen. It's not likely to sink into the consciousness of the sports fans, however, because it won't get the intensive TV coverage the original story got. Most couch potatoes still will believe that Klebold and Harris were neo-Nazis who learned to hate from the Internet and from listening to the wrong kind of music. And so most Americans still won't have a clue as to why more and more young Americans are intensely alienated and angry. And not having a clue, they're not likely to exert any pressure on the government to change things in the right direction. And that's the way the media people want it. They like the way things are going now, and they intend to keep on protecting the voters from the truth.

Listen! Being in the resistance music business has given me an even better opportunity than before to talk with young Americans. When I tell you that their alienation and rage are growing, I know what I'm talking about. There are hundreds of thousands of young, White Americans who would like nothing better than to rip out the throats of the people who have made their lives pointless and meaningless. You can't build enough prisons to hold them all. You can't become safe by passing new gun control laws. The rage building now will find a way out. My aim is to help it find the right way, a constructive way. Not the Klebold and Harris way, certainly, but a way that will result in a lot of throats being ripped out nevertheless: the throats of the people who have been deliberately destroying our world, stealing our heritage, and trying their damnedest to keep the American people from learning the truth and healing themselves.

We will be healed. We will be cleansed. We will bring the truth to our people despite the controlled media. We will take our heritage back. The young people who listen to resistance music will be the vanguard of our army of liberation. Woe to those who try to stand in their way!

How to Bring Down the House

This first day of a new millennium is perhaps a good time for me to respond to a letter from a listener, Alfred D., who wrote to me last week to express his appreciation for *American Dissident Voices.* He especially appreciates the information about crimes committed against White people by non-Whites -- information that is suppressed by the controlled media because it doesn't fit their Politically Correct agenda: an agenda that requires keeping White people feeling guilty and apologetic. And he adds that such information leaves him, "feeling powerless to do anything but feel bad about all of it."

Mr. D. then goes on to ask:

"What can we ever do to rid our culture of the Jewish stranglehold on our media and the liberal hold on our institutions? It seems like we can't do much without wealthy and wise people at the top, like our founders two centuries ago, who will stand up and seize the reins of our Republic to restore order and decency to our communities."

I quoted from Mr. D.'s letter not because it is exceptional in any way, but rather because it is typical of many letters I receive. People tell me, "Hey, I've really learned a lot from your broadcasts. I understand much better now what's going on, but what can I do about it? I'm frustrated and angry, but how can I help to fix things? It just seems that the Jews and their friends are too powerful."

Well, before I begin answering this question of Mr. D. and of many other listeners, let me discuss with you a couple of recent news items that are relevant to the question. One of them I'm sure you've already heard a great deal about: it's the uproar that came from the media when Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker made a few frank comments to the magazine *Sports Illustrated.* Rocker, who is a native of Georgia, expressed his dislike for New York City. He said that riding the subway in New York one finds oneself crammed in with all sorts of alien and distasteful people: freaks with purple hair, homosexuals with AIDS, Black criminals just out of jail for the umpteenth time, welfare moms surrounded by their swarms of brats. And he also said:

"The biggest thing I don't like about New York are the foreigners. You can walk an entire block in Times Square and not hear anybody speaking English. Asians and Koreans and Vietnamese and Indians and Russians and Spanish people and everything up there. How the hell did they get in this country?"

Hey, you know, I've felt like that every time I've had to go to New York City. The subways ***are*** like a freak show. Times Square ***is*** like a freak show. New York ***is*** a disgusting and depressing place. And you know what? Millions -- and I mean millions -- of other White Americans feel the same way about it as John Rocker and I do. I mean, let's face it, New York City is a disgusting place. It's filthy, degenerate, perverse, and above all else alien. There's nothing American about it. If I had the power to nuke the place -- make a huge, self-illuminated, glass parking lot out of the place -- I wouldn't hesitate for a second.

So anyway, what happened to John Rocker when he simply expressed an opinion shared by millions of other White Americans? The Jews went berserk. Rocker was talking about their city! He was saying he didn't like all of the wonderful diversity and multiculturalism they have worked so hard to bring to New York, to make New York the sort of place they can feel comfortable in, like a Middle Eastern bazaar. And so the Jews trotted out all of their Gentile auxiliaries -- their feminists and their queers and their liberals and their bought politicians, starting with Mayor Giuliani -- to demand that Rocker be punished. "Get rid of him!" demanded the terminally liberal Gentile sports editor of the Atlanta Constitution, Mark Bradley.

The Rocker story was the biggest thing in the news last week. Why? A baseball player says in public what everyone knows is true, and the Jews and everyone in their camp demand that he be banned from his profession and ostracized by all Politically Correct Americans. From the hateful tenor of their denunciations of him, I suspect that many of them would like to see him crucified in Times Square. Again, why?

Well, I'll tell you why. It's because the Jews have built a house of cards, and they are afraid that someone will breathe on it too hard, and it will come tumbling down. If John Rocker had said something patently false, such as announcing that the earth is flat, or if he had expressed a personal dislike for his fellow White Southerners, say, then no one would have made a fuss, even though he is a celebrity and so his publicly expressed views might conceivably have led some kids to believe that the earth is flat or to develop an irrational hatred for Southerners. But he said something that everyone knows is true, and he said he doesn't like it, and the Jews demanded his head.

You see, we're all supposed to pretend that we like it. We're all supposed to pretend that we think diversity is a wonderful thing. We're all supposed to pretend that we really appreciate the opportunity to ride the subway next to a queer with AIDS or a Black thug with dreadlocks or a welfare mom with a horde of pickaninnies. We're supposed to pretend that we find it a culturally enriching experience to walk through Times Square and not see anyone who looks like us or hear anyone speaking English. Because if we don't pretend, then others may stop pretending too, and the house of cards will come tumbling down. It's like the child in the crowd of spectators who says out loud, "But, Mommy, the emperor is naked!"

The salient point here is that the Jews and their dependents know that their whole existence is built on lies, that it depends on make-believe for its continuation. The feminists and the queers and the welfare rabble and the non-Whites also know that, despite their apparent façade of strength, despite their voting majority, their position is very precarious. They know that they haven't earned their privileged position in our society. They know that it is artificial, a device of smoke and mirrors, and that if we decide to stop supporting them and to stop tolerating their antics, they will be on their own, and they will be in trouble. The politicians feel their collars becoming tight -- in their guilty fear they can imagine the rope on their necks -- when someone like Rocker expresses a simple truth that threatens the whole power structure from which they draw their sustenance.

The Jewish media bosses made such a fuss about Rocker because they are frightened of the truth. If they were standing on solid ground they would have nothing to fear. But they aren't standing

on solid ground, and they know it. That's why they become hysterical when someone states the truth loudly enough for others to hear. That's why they're demanding John Rocker's head. Think about the significance of the Jewish reaction to John Rocker, and I'm sure that you'll agree with me.

The other recent news item I'll mention is the announcement by the Jews that they're willing to make peace with their Arab neighbors in the Middle East -- if we will pay for it. And the bill they are presenting to us is $100 billion. I'll read you the first few lines from the front page of the English-language edition of the *Jerusalem Post.* This was three weeks ago, the December 10 issue:

"If all goes as planned, 10 months from now Palestinian and Israeli negotiators will be scrambling to put the final touches on a permanent peace accord as the government security and finance gurus calculate the cost of peace. The technocrats will add it all up and write down a sum -- of up to $100 billion, according to some diplomats. They will then look to the U.S. government to bankroll the bulk of the agreement."

The *Jerusalem Post* article then goes on to complain that not all Americans are inclined to hand over $100 billion to Israel and that it will require a bit of Jewish pressure to persuade them. The article quotes Alabama Republican Congressman Sonny Callahan, chairman of the House subcommittee on foreign aid. Calahan says:

We are happy to give Israel economic assistance, but for goodness sake! One hundred billion dollars so there will be an agreement to stop Israelis from killing Palestinians and Palestinians from killing Israelis? The President and Madeleine Albright seem to think there is a money tree here in Washington, and all they have to do is come up with an idea that sounds good and then come back and get the funds."

Callahan went on to say that the Jews may very well get their $100 billion from the American people, but they will have to do it without his vote.

The *Jerusalem Post* quotes other U.S. politicians who are more sympathetic to Jewish needs than Callahan. Florida Republican Mark Foley, for example, says no price is too high to keep Israel happy:

"The price may be astronomical, but the peace process is at a critical juncture. We can spend billions of dollars on an escalating conflict defending Israel, or we can put the money up front for peace."

How many times in the past when the Jews had their hands out have we heard that excuse about "helping the peace process" along. We have financed the Jews' wars against their neighbors, and now we're supposed to finance the military buildup they want so they can feel safe if they make peace with their neighbors.

And of course, the Jews are quite confident that Clinton will do whatever he is told in this matter. They believe that before Clinton leaves office they can get their $100 billion from the American

taxpayers, even without Congressman Callahan's help. They are a little more worried about continued support after that, however. Even though people close to George Bush have told the Jews not to worry, that Bush will be an obedient servant of Israel, the Jews are concerned that many Americans may be reaching the limit for how much of their blood they are willing to have sucked from them by the Jews. The *Jerusalem Post* cites with disapproval what it calls a "wave of neo-isolationism" sweeping the country.

You know, we've been coughing up money to support Israel whenever the Jews demanded it -- $70 billion in the last 25 years alone -- and getting kicked in the teeth in return, as the Jews spy on us, steal our military technology, and then sell it to the Chinese -- not to mention what they're doing to us in America with their government-enforced programs of diversity and multiculturalism.

Let's look a little more closely at this latest demand. They've been hinting at this during most of the year, but the amounts they have talked about have been smaller, because these smaller amounts were only to pay for a pullback from occupied territory in one place or another; they never told us what the total bill would be for peace with all their neighbors. For example, they recently told us we would have to cough up $18 billion if we want them to return the Golan Heights to Syria, from whom they stole it 25 years ago -- with our help, of course. They have told us that $10 billion of that $18 billion will be used to resettle 17,000 Jewish settlers from the Golan Heights to Israel.

Now, you know, these Jewish settlers tend to have larger families than city Jews, but let's just make a very conservative estimate of 3.4 Jews per settler household: that's 5,000 Jewish households needing to be relocated -- for $10 billion, or $2 million per household. Really! The Jews are demanding $2 million dollars from us for each family of 3.4 Jews resettled from stolen Syrian territory to Israel. And these Jewish settlers were settled in the Golan Heights contrary to United Nations resolutions and contrary to requests from the United States government not to settle Jews in illegally occupied Arab land. Now we are supposed to give each of these Jewish families $2 million, from our pockets, so they can buy for themselves the sort of palatial accommodations in Israel they believe Jews are naturally entitled to. One thing I will say for these Hebes: they have a lot more brass in them than anyone thought possible.

Let's do a little more arithmetic. There are approximately five million Jews living in Israel: let's say 1.5 million Jewish families. Over the 51 years of Israel's existence, Americans have coughed up approximately $100 billion in aid -- as I said a moment ago, $70 billion in just the past 25 years. The German people have coughed up approximately the same amount. Now the Jews are aiming for another $100 billion from us before their boy Clinton leaves office a year from now. Three hundred billion dollars divided among 1.5 million Jewish families comes to an endowment of $200,000 per Jewish family. That doesn't include the interest, And they're constantly whining for more! "Oi, veh! Giff us back the gold you took from us during the war. Giff us our salaries from the time we worked as slave laborers during the war. Compensate us for this! Compensate us for that! Oi, veh! You let the Germans push us into the gas ovens during the war, and you didn't help us. Now you must pay us for that! And if you don't giff us $100 billion now, we won't make peace with our neighbors, and it'll be your fault."

Well, now, the editors of the *Jerusalem Post* are pretty sure that the politicians in Washington will go along with their latest demands -- and I believe they're right about that -- but they're worried that the American taxpayers may be getting fed up. They're worried about what they call a "wave of neo-isolationism." They're worried that the average American may begin doing a little arithmetic. Americans who are working double shifts now so that they can save money to put their kids through college might wonder why they should pay $2 million for each Jewish family relocated from the Golan Heights.

So will Americans begin doing a little arithmetic? Certainly not by themselves. It's not that they can't do the arithmetic. It's that they won't do it on their own initiative. And even if they did, they would be afraid to draw the right conclusions from it, because those conclusions would be Politically Incorrect. They need someone to set an example for them, someone to tell them that's it's all right to be outraged by Israel's claim that it needs $2 million of our money to give to each Jewish family that is settled illegally on stolen land in the Golan Heights -- just as they need someone like John Rocker to say aloud what they themselves have been thinking about the growing multicultural chaos in America.

So now you can see how these two news items we have just discussed are relevant to the question asked by Alfred D.: "What can we do to break the Jewish stranglehold?" The overblown, almost hysterical reaction to John Rocker's simple statement shows us how precarious the Jews themselves understand their situation to be: how afraid they are that someone will awaken us from our trance and that we will be able to break their stranglehold. And their astoundingly brazen and greedy grab for another $100 billion from us before Clinton leaves office shows us one of their principal vulnerabilities. They always overreach themselves. They believe that we are so stupid, so gullible, so sheep-like, that they can get away with anything, that we'll never figure it out and never strike back. And even if we do figure it out, they've got the votes to keep us under control. They have debased our electorate to the point that all of the people who are dependent on them for unearned privileges -- the feminists, the homosexuals, the non-Whites, and the welfare rabble -- will be able to outvote us and keep us in our place.

It's a strange situation, the Jews greedily grabbing for more and more, and at the same time terrified that their host may wake up and decide to rid himself of them. But then, the Jews are strange creatures, to say the least. And it's clear that the most important thing we can do at this time is to cry out, loudly and repeatedly, to an ever larger crowd: "Behold! The emperor is naked!"

We must do deliberately what John Rocker did inadvertently, and we must do it with every medium available to us, not just with magazines for sports fans. And we must talk about more than the freak show the Jews have made of New York City. We must talk about the Jews' open-borders immigration policy, the Jews' push to increase the rate of interracial marriage between Whites and non-Whites, about what the Jews have done to our schools, about the Jewish control of our news and entertainment media, about the Jewish grip on our government, about the Jews' corruption of our politicians -- and about the Jews' ongoing theft of our national wealth.

Listen! Even the most jaded couch potato, even the most thoughtless lemming, can be made to feel indignant about the Jews' plan to steal two-million-dollar of our hard-earned money and give

it to each Jewish family now settled illegally in Syria's Golan Heights, if we rub his nose in it. We may not have John Rocker's celebrity status, but we are gaining a louder and louder voice, and you can be sure that we will not grovel and apologize the way the celebrities customarily do when the Jews rap their knuckles for Political Incorrectness. With the Jews themselves providing us with issues such as their latest demand for $100 billion to make peace with their neighbors and for us to pay for resettling Jewish families in two-million-dollar million mansions in Israel, we eventually will have even celebrities speaking out and refusing to apologize. And the house of cards will come tumbling down.

That's the answer to Mr. D.'s question. The Jews are vulnerable. The emperor is naked. We have to speak out, without fear or hesitation or apology. We have to set an example. If we do that, others will follow, and our people will be free.

Lies and the History Channel

The biggest threat to our people -- the biggest obstacle to our survival and progress -- is the Jewish control of the mass media of news and entertainment. I've said that to you many times. Today I want to talk about some very specific examples of the way in which this threat works. Last month a special television documentary program began airing on the History Channel, which is a subsidiary of A&E Television Networks. The "A&E" stands for "Arts and Entertainment." The name of the program is "Nazi America: A Secret History." It purports to be a serious history of the growth of the Nazi movement in America, starting with the German-American Bund and its precursor organizations in the 1930s and taking us right up to the present

I don't have the time to view many television programs except the national and international news each day, primarily to see what the party line is: that is, to see what "spin" the Jews are putting on the news. This History Channel documentary was of special interest to me, however, because I was part of it. Beyond the fact that I'm in the program, I knew intimately another person who was given major coverage in the program, and I have detailed knowledge of several other persons and events covered by the program. So when I viewed the program I paid careful attention and took notes. What I noted generally about the program is that in addition to the standard slant, which they put on everything they produce, there were a number of very clear-cut and blatant lies: lies of both omission and commission. And it occurred to me that these lies are so clear and so easily refuted by anyone who knows the facts that I should share them with you. They provide useful clues to Jewish motives -- and also perhaps an antidote to other Jewish lies.

One other thing about this particular History Channel program: it will be shown more than once. You can keep your eyes open for it and watch it the next time it is shown, keeping in mind the facts that I'll share with you today. If you're really serious about what's happening to America, you can even order a copy of the tape from the History Channel and then study it yourself the way I did. It'll cost you $29.95, but the lesson is worth it.

The first thing to note is the general slant of the program. That slant is to lump together everyone the Jews consider a threat to their own plans for America as a "Nazi" and then to portray Nazis as dangerous subversives and terrorists who need to be locked up in order for the country to be safe. Nazis are portrayed as weird and unpleasant people, strange and dangerous people, not at all like you and me. The purpose behind this is not just lingering Jewish hatred for the German Nazis, who put a real crimp in the Jews' plans for Europe 60 years ago. It is a current concern of the Jews that too many people are speaking out against them today, and too many people are listening, especially with the Internet not yet subject to Jewish censorship. The Jews' aim is first to demonize the people who don't like them and then to outlaw them, to cut them off from contact with the public, and to keep them from speaking out.

So let's look at the specifics. The first part of the program deals with 1930s organizations such as Friends of the New Germany and the German-American Bund, which tried to counter the Jews' hate-propaganda against Germany in America, to build unity among German-Americans, to help Americans generally understand what Adolf Hitler was doing in his rebuilding of Germany, and to a lesser extent to propagate Hitler's National Socialist ideas in America.

And I should tell you now that this part of the program on the German-American Bund, just like all the rest of the program, is chock full of errors which are the result of ignorance and sloppy research more than malice. For example, the program states that Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was published in 1924 and that Hitler was appointed chancellor of Germany in 1932. Both dates are incorrect, as anyone can determine by reference to an encyclopedia. In 1924 Hitler was in prison for revolutionary activity and was just beginning to write Mein Kampf. And he didn't become chancellor until 1933. I point out these errors simply to remind you that the controlled media very often are wrong in their facts even when they're not consciously lying, but they present those facts in an apodictic way, and few Americans question them.

In its treatment of the Bund, however, the program goes beyond sloppiness in its errors and turns to deliberate deceit. It talks, for example, about New York Congressman Samuel Dickstein's investigation and harassment of the Bund and his labeling of it as a subversive organization. What the people who wrote the program certainly knew but neglected to tell the audience was that Congressman Dickstein was also a Soviet espionage agent -- not just a communist or communist sympathizer like so many of his fellow Jews, but a secret agent actually on the payroll of the Soviet NKVD. So in the 1930s what we had was a Jewish-Soviet espionage agent pretending to be an American patriot denouncing what he called the "un-American" influence of the Bund. Dickstein's role as an NKVD agent was revealed as old NKVD archives were opened following the collapse of communist power and the breakup of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. But there wasn't a word of that in the History Channel program. Dickstein was represented simply as a concerned congressman. But because he was a congressman and a Jew, both the Roosevelt administration and the Jewish media collaborated with him in railroading the Bund's chairman, Fritz Kuhn, into prison on a trumped-up embezzlement charge in 1939.

Not revealing Dickstein's employment by the NKVD was a lie of omission. A really outrageous lie of commission occurs a little later in the program when it moves into the postwar period and focuses on George Lincoln Rockwell, the World War Two Navy flier and combat veteran who organized the National Socialist White People's Party in the 1960s. The program shows news footage of some of Rockwell's public meetings in Washington, while the program's narrator comments that Rockwell, "added gays and Catholics to his list of threats to the future of the White race." Then, between scenes of Rockwell speaking, a headline fills the screen. It reads: "Hate-Document Bared: 'I will kill every Jew, Catholic and Negro.'" The clear implication is that this statement about killing every Jew, Catholic, and Negro was made by Rockwell. But it wasn't. It was pure invention by the people who made this program.

I knew Rockwell quite well and worked with him closely on the production of a magazine for a year before his murder in 1967. He was totally removed from any sectarian bickering between Catholics and Protestants and accepted them on an equal basis. He had a number of practicing Catholics in his organization. This Jewish trick of trying to divide Catholics from Protestants has been used before, but in Rockwell's case it is especially inappropriate. Furthermore, Rockwell never made a statement about killing all homosexuals, although he certainly disapproved of homosexuality.

The deliberate deceit continues as the program moves into the period after Rockwell's death. The narrator announces that Rockwell's organization floundered after his death. . . until the next Nazi

leader came forward. Frank Collin emerged from Rockwell's shadow in 1970 . . . . I'm using the narrator's exact words here. The clear implication is that Frank Collin, a short, dark, hook-nosed, little man with a flair for theatrics, was Rockwell's successor. There is no mention at all of Rockwell's actual successor, a man named Matt Koehl.

And there is no mention that Collin was a Jew. Not only was he a Jew, but he was a poseur and an exhibitionist, pretending to be a National Socialist leader while putting on a media sideshow which attracted to him a small group of losers and misfits who liked to wear uniforms and strut around in public. While the media focused on Collin, whose sole claim to fame was the uproar he generated when he announced that he intended to march his uniformed freak show through Skokie, Illinois, a Jewish suburb of Chicago, Rockwell's real successor was left without access to the media.

At the end of the Collin episode, the narrator does reveal to us that Collin was convicted and sent to prison in 1979 for sexually molesting little boys, but we are left with the impression that this smirking, prancing, child-molesting little Jew was a real National Socialist, the successor of George Lincoln Rockwell. That's the image of a National Socialist, the image of a Nazi, that the writers of this program deliberately and deceitfully plant in the public mind.

Actually, Collin was exposed as a Jew in the Chicago press back in the 1970s. Interviews with his parents were published in the newspapers. But that was more than 20 years ago, and the folks at the History Channel figured that the public has forgotten about that. And Frank Collin is not the only Jew trotted out as a "Nazi" by this program that is supposed to tell us about the history of Nazis in America. The Columbine killers, Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris, also are represented as "Nazis," although they are not named directly in the program. Instead, as images flash across the screen, we hear the narrator naming a series of people involved in recent killings, and the narrator tells us, one at a time, that they are Nazis.

James Burmeister, an 82nd Airborne soldier at Fort Bragg, who shot a convicted Black drug dealer in Fayetteville, North Carolina, in December 1995, is described as a "Nazi," although there has never been any evidence presented in this regard. Certainly, he was not a member of any National Socialist group, or that fact would have been brought out at his trial. Then there is John King, convicted in the dragging murder of a Black in Jasper, Texas, in 1998. King also is described by the narrator as a "Nazi," although again there is no evidence to suggest this. What we do know about King is that he acquired a burning hatred for Blacks after being gang-raped by them while in prison.

Perhaps we are supposed to assume that everyone who doesn't like Blacks is a "Nazi" -- perhaps even everyone who is not Politically Correct. One of those in this series of supposed "Nazis" is Benjamin Smith, who killed a Black and a Korean in drive-by shootings in Illinois last year. Another is the apparently deranged Buford Furrow, who shot a Filipino postman in California last year after wounding several Jews in a Jewish community center. So far as we know, none of these killers was a "Nazi" in the sense of having a serious belief in National Socialism and belonging to a National Socialist group. So the way the program worked the Jewish Columbine killer Dylan Klebold into this series was to have the narrator recite a series of names of killers while their faces flashed on the screen and assert in each case that the killer is or was a "Nazi." It

went like this: James Burmeister (face), John King (face), the Columbine killers (no face), Benjamin Smith (face), Buford Furrow (face). Clever aren't they? They know how to lie without actually lying. Even a reasonably intelligent and perceptive viewer will be tricked by this technique, unless he happens to know the facts. The facts, of course, are that Dylan Klebold was a Jew, and both he and his partner were outspoken anti-racists. But the average couch potato certainly doesn't know that, and so he falls into the trap of believing that the perpetrators of the worst school massacre in U.S. history were "Nazis."

Timothy McVeigh also is represented in the program as a "Nazi" and the Oklahoma City bombing as an act of Nazi terrorism. The narrator tells us: "McVeigh was a . . . neo-Nazi . . . ." There is no evidence to suggest that he was or is. What we know about him is that he hated the Clinton government and decided, after the government burned all of those women and children to death in the Branch Davidian church in Waco, that he would send the government a message. We also know that he read one of my books, *The Turner Diaries.* If everybody who has read *The Turner Diaries* is a Nazi, then the media Jews really have a problem on their hands, because the number of readers is now somewhere close to half a million. But really, that's like saying that everyone who reads the New Testament is a Christian, and everyone who reads the Old Testament is a Jew, and everyone who reads the Koran is a Moslem.

A Nazi -- a National Socialist -- is a person who holds a very specific set of beliefs, a person who accepts the doctrine set forth in Hitler's *Mein Kampf,* just as a Christian is a person who accepts the teachings of Jesus and the claims made in the New Testament about his miraculous origin and his resurrection, and a communist is a person who believes the economic and social doctrines of the Jew Karl Marx. This History Channel program starts with real Nazis -- the leaders of the Bund -- continues with another real Nazi of a different sort -- George Lincoln Rockwell -- and then cleverly ties these real Nazis into a series of Jewish child molesters, antisocial freaks and exhibitionists of various sorts, and people who have committed racial killings or acts of terrorism. And it's all done very smoothly, in a very slick way, a very Jewish way.

The aim, of course, is not only to persuade viewers that Nazis are very unpleasant people -- as if more than 60 years of anti-German propaganda films from Hollywood haven't already done that -- but also to persuade us that Nazis are dangerous and that we need to do something about them. We need new laws to protect ourselves from these dangerous Nazis.

You might wonder why they don't just tell us the truth about Nazis and let the chips fall where they may. Why not just tell us that Nazis don't believe in equality, that Nazis don't believe in multiculturalism and enforced diversity, that Nazis don't believe that men and women are the same? Why not just tell us that Nazis don't approve of homosexuality? Why not just tell us that Nazis aren't democrats, that Nazis believe in self-sufficiency and self-discipline and personal honor and a natural hierarchy? Why not just tell us that Nazis are racists, and they don't like Jews? That should be enough, if all of the Jewish television propaganda about equality and diversity and democracy has had the desired effect. That should be enough to make every Politically Correct viewer hate Nazis. Why do they feel it's necessary to lie to us and try to make us believe that Nazis are people like the Jewish child molester Frank Collin and the Jewish mass murderer Dylan Klebold? Why do they feel it's necessary to try to make us believe that everyone

who has tattoos and doesn't like Blacks is a Nazi? Why do they feel that it's necessary to lie to us by telling us that Nazis want to kill Catholics? Are they afraid that all of their anti-German hate propaganda and all of their Political Correctness propaganda haven't "taken"?

I'll tell you what they're afraid of. They're afraid of the truth. Listen to the part of this History Channel program that is about me -- it's about 90 minutes into the program -- and they'll tell you that all of the violence and strife in America during the past few decades is the result of people reading my books, of people listening to the ideas I talk about. If I hadn't written *The Turner Diaries*, if I didn't have a radio broadcast every week, if I weren't on the Internet, they'll have you believe, there wouldn't have been an Oklahoma City bombing and a dragging in Jasper, Texas, and a Columbine High School massacre, and we'd all be getting along and loving one another in multicultural comfort and security. And then they very slyly tell you: Pierce is protected by his right to free speech, and they say it in a way that means: Pierce was able to get away with putting people up to all of this violent activity because he hides behind the First Amendment. What we need, they suggest, is new laws to keep Pierce from hiding behind the First Amendment. And you know, there are a lot of couch potatoes out there, a lot of women of both sexes, who believe that.

I get hate mail every day from people who ask me, "Aren't you ashamed for causing all of those people to die in Oklahoma City?" Others blame me for the Columbine High School massacre. Really. They don't blame the Clinton government. They don't blame the liberals for making a pigsty of America. They don't blame the people who force the races together and generate racial hatred by doing it. That would require independent thinking. No, they blame me, and they nod their heads wisely and agree with the History Channel narrator that we need new laws to keep people like Pierce from causing violence.

The Jews and their hangers-on are afraid of the truth getting to large numbers of people, especially through new media such as the Internet, and they do want to put a stop to it. That's why they tell the sort of lies that this History Channel program is full of. They want to scare the couch potatoes. And I want to make sure that the independent thinkers see those lies and understand that they are lies and also understand why they're being told.

If you want to help me with this work, then this History Channel program, "Nazi America: A Secret History," is a tool that you can use too. Talk to people you know about the lies in it. Help people to understand the poisonous and destructive way in which the Jews use their control of our mass media. Help people to understand that they're not being educated when they watch the History Channel; they're being brainwashed; they're being lied to. And talk about the details.

I don't know about you, but I'm always skeptical when someone waves his arms and makes a general statement. I want the specifics. I want the details. I want the facts, so that I can make up my own mind. Anyway, that's why I've spent so much time today talking with you about this one History Channel program. It dealt with a subject that I happen to know something about, so I could spot the lies and tell you about them. But there are literally thousands of other programs out there which also are full of lies. When you spot one, don't keep quiet about it. Speak out. Tell other people. And let me know about it too.

Illusion and Leverage

Today I'll continue with the same general concept we talked about a few weeks ago: the house-of-cards concept. The Jews maintain their power only by maintaining an illusion, and that illusion is that most people are in agreement with their policies and programs, when in fact a very large number of people are not. The Jews have, of course, a substantial number of willing Gentile collaborators, who collaborate because they depend upon the Jews to help them maintain their own unearned advantages: the feminists, the homosexuals, the welfare rabble, the politicians, and a significant portion of the business and corporate elite. And I'm speaking of White collaborators only. I'm not even concerned about non-Whites. But all of these White collaborators could be swept away were it not for the majority of Whites who are being fooled by the illusion.

After last week's broadcast a listener commented that the people who pretend to be shocked by Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker's expression of distaste for the denizens of Times Square and the New York subways are the same people who will never give an honest explanation of why they have fled the cities for the suburbs or small towns. The outflow of White families from the cities -- the so-called "White flight" -- is the direct consequence of the influx of non-Whites into the cities. The Whites are desperate to get away from the non-Whites -- but not one in 20 will admit it. They believe that everyone around them will condemn them if they do admit it. They are so terrified of being thought "racists" that many of them won't even admit the truth to themselves. Instead they invent a Politically Acceptable reason for their flight: the schools are better in the suburbs because of the higher teachers' salaries, the suburbs provide easier access to the shopping malls, or whatever.

How is this illusion maintained? Almost entirely through the Jewish control of the mass media of news and entertainment. Most people -- most White Americans, anyway -- like to believe that they observe the world around them and then come to objective conclusions about things. They like to believe that they are rational individuals. They like to believe that they are independent thinkers. And of course, a few of them are -- but most of them, about 95 per cent of them -- aren't. They are conformists. They conform their opinions, their thinking, their attitudes, to what they believe is expected of them.

Consider religion, as an example. People are not Baptists or Lutherans or Roman Catholics or Muslims because they have examined the various religious doctrines, compared them, and then made a rational decision. In 98 per cent of the cases one is a Lutheran or a Catholic or a Muslim or a Buddhist because one's parents and the other people in one's community are. A thoughtful person who takes his religion seriously may be prepared to argue about it and to defend cleverly the merits of his particular sect against the claims of a different sect, but the fact remains that his adherence to his own sect is not based on an independent decision. It was based from the beginning on conforming his beliefs to the perceived beliefs of the people around him. All of his arguments are only attempts to rationalize what in the first place was not rational. Think about it, and I'm sure you'll agree with me.

It works a little differently with other types of belief, but the psychology, the human element, remains the same. In America the government and the mass media don't take a position favoring one Christian sect over another or even a position favoring Christianity over Buddhism or Islam, say. The pressure to conform in religious matters must come from family and neighbors. But in political ideology the pressure to conform comes very much from the government and even more from the mass media. And when I say pressure comes from the government, I mean all government-controlled institutions, including especially the schools. All of the media and all of the government institutions promote the belief that mass democracy, American style -- television style -- is the best possible form of government.

Beyond this they promote the beliefs that men and women are essentially the same, except for the configuration of their genitalia, and that it is "unfair" to treat them differently in any way; that homosexuals are just like heterosexuals except for a different sexual orientation, and that it is "bigoted" to treat them differently in any way; that Jews are clever and witty people, good at business, but honest and also sensitive and caring, and it is "hateful" to have any other ideas about them; and that Blacks and other non-Whites may look different, but under the skin they are just like us -- in particular, they are just as intelligent, just as creative, just as good at solving problems, and just as inclined to accept personal responsibility.

Now, whether you personally believe these things or not, I think you'll agree with me that the government and the mass media do push quite hard for conformity to these beliefs. For example, have you ever seen any television news program showing people using computers -- children with computers in a classroom, say -- in which a Black wasn't shown at the keyboard? I mean, it's like there is a rule that all news program directors must follow: you cannot show a computer unless you show a Black at the keyboard. It's transparently obvious that they are pushing the idea that computers and Blacks go together, like blackeyed peas and collard greens. That's what they want the public to believe.

The reality, of course, is that computers are a White thing and always have been: the invention, the engineering, the programming, you name it. Blacks just aren't involved. You can teach a Black to use a computer, of course, just as you can teach a chimpanzee to ride a bicycle. But computers remain in the White domain, just as bicycles remain in the human domain. And that's certainly not because anyone is holding Blacks back. It's a matter of aptitude and inclination. Chinamen certainly are capable of understanding the science involved, which is why under the Clinton policy of globalizing the economy much of the computer technology we developed is moving to China, and we're now forced to buy some computer products from the Chinese. But if you ever see computer products being imported from Ghana or Zambia it will only be because someone who is not a Black has built a factory there to take advantage of the cheap labor. It will not be because a Black computer whiz in Africa has developed something on his own.

You know, most people understand this at a certain level. They know that this business of always showing Blacks at computer keyboards is a media trick, but they have a hard time resisting it. They feel a compulsion to believe that the illusion is real.

The same trick is used in other ways. If NASA has a public announcement to make about one of its scientific space probes, the chances are pretty good there will be a Black chosen to stand in

front of the television cameras, make the announcement, and explain to us the science involved -- unless, of course, there has been a screwup and the space probe failed to do what it was supposed to do. Then it's OK to have a White spokesman. Or if the National Institutes of Health or the Food and Drug Administration has something important to tell us, a Black in a white lab coat will be trotted out for the cameras. The idea is to create the illusion that technology and science and progress and intelligence are associated somehow with Blacks -- or at least, that Blacks are just as good at that sort of thing as we are.

And as I already mentioned, it's difficult to resist this sort of illusion. One cannot turn on a television set or pick up a mass-circulation magazine these days without seeing Blacks presented to us in White roles as if it were the most natural thing in the world. Flip through the channels, and you see Black face after Black face, and the smiling Whites all around them always are approving. Black doctors, Black businessmen, Black teachers, Black scientists, Black comedians, Black singers, Black dancers, Black announcers, Black ball players, Black detectives, Black men running off with White girls, and all the Whites around them smiling and approving. It's almost hypnotic.

But you know, it is an illusion. The smiling Whites who are so approving of the Blacks are being paid to smile. The Whites in the television audience aren't being paid, of course, but it's difficult for them to resist smiling too. It's a very primitive but very strong impulse, this need to laugh when those around you are laughing, to smile when everyone else is smiling. The television bosses understand this impulse perfectly, and they use it effectively.

And it's not just in the United States that this illusion is being promoted. The mass media and the democratic politicians in Germany have been collaborating with the Jews for the past 55 years in an effort to foster a similar illusion in the public consciousness of the German people. The Germans always have believed that there was something special about being German, about being born of German parents. Every German inherited through his genes something of the greatness of his nation, its history, its genius.

Of course, the French and the Russians and the English and the Irish have similar beliefs about their own nations. It's an ethnic thing -- but very undemocratic: something which the Jews and their collaborators have been trying hard to stamp out. So shortly after the beginning of this year, early on New Year's Day, German collaborators chose a newborn baby to be the "German of the Millennium." And of course, they didn't choose a German baby for this distinction; they chose a Turkish baby, born in a German hospital to two Turkish "guest workers." And for the past week politicians and the media people have been holding up this Turkish baby to television audiences in Germany as a typical German of the new millennium, and all of the collaborators and paid media people on the screen at the same time have smiled proudly whenever this announcement has been made. And unfortunately, all too many German television viewers have smiled along with them. That's the way our people are. And so the German public gradually begins falling victim to this carefully engineered illusion that Turks and Gypsies and Pakistanis and Zulus born in Germany are really Germans, just like all other Germans.

I've spoken of the Jewish power structure shielded by this illusion as a "house of cards." That's a reasonable term to use, I believe, but let's try now to understand it a little better. If tonight

Washington and New York City and Hollywood all were devastated by massive earthquakes -- if most of the people and the institutions which generate and maintain the illusion in America -- suddenly were destroyed, the house of cards would not immediately come tumbling down. In fact, the illusion would not instantly be replaced by a clear view of reality. Illusions have a tendency to persist for a while. People who were deceived by the illusion would continue deceiving themselves for a while; they would continue clinging to the illusion. Many people would need guidance in freeing themselves from the illusion and gaining a firm grasp on reality. Providing that guidance would be a far easier task and require much less work than the work the Jews and their collaborators have put into building the illusion. The truth does have its advantages. But still, uprooting the illusion and pulling down the house of cards would not be something that could be accomplished overnight.

There's another important consideration: the organizational consideration. If a minority wants to maintain its control over a majority -- especially if a substantial number of the members of that majority don't want to be controlled -- then the controlling minority needs to have an effective organizational structure through which to exercise its control. The organizational structure provides the necessary leverage which a numerical minority needs in order to control an unwilling majority.

Well, that's pretty simple and obvious, I guess, but it's still something to think about in coming to an understanding of our situation. The rule is this: the larger the disparity in numbers, the more the organizational leverage that is required; and the greater the leverage needed, the less is the stability. Which is why the Jews are pushing a number of long-range programs to decrease our numbers, both absolutely and in relation to the feminists, homosexuals, non-Whites, and the others in their camp. At the moment their situation is still quite precarious, in that without governmental compulsion they could not maintain their control; illusion alone would not hold their house of cards up.

At this time, however, they have both: they have the machinery of illusion in their hands, and they have organizational leverage. And they need both. If someone could put a big enough monkey wrench into the gears of the illusion machinery to shut it down for an extended period, the leverage would become very shaky indeed. The politicians and the bureaucrats and the secret police agencies and the military people don't do the will of the Jews because they love the Jews. They do it because they are part of an organization, part of the governmental establishment. Their paychecks come from the government, and they are hoping that one day their pensions also will come from the government. But the government itself still is based on the idea of popular support, on the idea of elections and votes. When the illusion machinery is no longer available to control the votes, the politicians will be making new calculations, and so will the head bureaucrats. In every case it will be their own advantage they will be seeking, of course. Patriotism is a thing of the past.

On the other hand, if a big enough monkey wrench could be thrown into the government's gears, then even a fairly small number of determined people could wreck the illusion machinery, and I believe it's not necessary for me to explain how that could be done. But now the government and the illusion machinery support each other, and I don't know of anyone who has a big enough

monkey wrench to shut down either of them. That's a shortcoming to which we must address ourselves.

Anyway, do you remember the miniature civil war in Russia back in the early part of the Yeltsin era, in September and October 1993? That was just six years ago. Boris Yeltsin, of course, was the candidate of the Jews -- sort of the Bill Clinton of Russia. He had been elected only with the all-out support of the mass media -- especially the television networks, which then as now were under the tight control of the Jews, most notably Boris Berezovsky and Vladimir Gussinsky. Progressive Russian patriots, along with conservative elements from the earlier era, tried to take the organizational machinery away from Yeltsin -- which is to say, away from the Jews. The Russian legislature -- the Duma -- voted to depose Yeltsin, but without anyone to take his place immediately the Army and the KGB continued to take their orders from him.

Patriots stormed the Russian parliament building in Moscow and also the main television station there. They broke through the troops around the parliament building, the so-called White House, seized the building, and barricaded themselves inside. They did not succeed in taking the main television station, however, because the KGB had its toughest troops -- its elite troops -- guarding the place. They were far more concerned about protecting the television headquarters -- about maintaining their hold on the machinery of illusion -- than they were about holding onto the White House and its legislative machinery. When the patriots tried to storm Berezovsky's television station, the KGB troops simply machine-gunned them, and they died in the streets. Keeping the population entranced with the usual television fare, it was then a simple matter to send tanks against the White House. Yeltsin had the Russian Army shelling the White House with tanks to drive out the patriots. And so Yeltsin and his gang -- which is to say, the Jews -- were able to hang onto power. How different it might have been if the Russian patriots had succeeded in taking over the machinery of illusion at the same time they were barricaded in the White House! A day or two of control of Russian television by a crew of intelligent patriots could have been enough to bring hundreds of thousands of ordinary Russians into the streets and also to cause the Army and KGB bosses to make new calculations.

We might also note that organizational leverage works at the international level pretty much as it works at the national level. During the 1993 crisis in Russia, the Jews and their collaborators over here were sweating the outcome. I don't know what threats and promises were made behind the scenes, but I can imagine. It's clear that any small country, without nuclear weapons, that doesn't take orders will get the same treatment Serbia got. It would have been quite a bit more difficult for the Jews if things had gone better for the patriots in Russia in 1993. And things still may take a turn for the better in Russia. Certainly, even a nuclear war, if it unhinges the leverage or wrecks the machinery of illusion, will be better than a continuation of the present course of events. The best chance for avoiding a nuclear war, however, and also for unhinging the Jews' international leverage, would be to put a big enough monkey wrench into the organizational machinery here so that the U.S. government cannot exercise the Jews' will against any other country using cruise missiles, the way it did against Iraq and Serbia.

Well, all of my talk today hasn't provided anything in the way of a concrete plan of action, but perhaps it may help us focus our thinking a little better when we do work out a plan. For now

what we must do is continue reaching our people in every way we can. I'll be happy to have your help in this endeavor.

Capitalism and Equality

I was amused last week when America's top baseball commissars ordered that Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker undergo psychiatric testing because he said that he finds New York City a depressing place, filled with queers and non-Whites.

What does that remind you of? What other country can you think of that, within recent memory, used to pack dissidents off to mental hospitals to silence them? What other regime claimed that anyone who deviated from the party line obviously must be crazy and needed treatment?

I am sure that the commissars of big baseball didn't see the humor in their response to John Rocker's comments. All they saw was someone who was rocking their gravy train and needed to be slapped down before he caused some gravy to be spilled. After all, baseball is big business. It's show business, with its multimillion-dollar celebrity contracts, its glitzy advertising, and its total dependence on television for bringing its product to the couch potatoes. The commissars of television were not happy with John Rocker's derogatory comments about their favorite city, and so the commissars of big baseball fell all over themselves scrambling to show that they also were not happy. And they didn't even notice the irony in their choice of methods to show their unhappiness. Here we had big capitalists dealing with an ideological dissident in exactly the same way the big communists used to deal with one: first make him publicly confess his guilt, and then either a bullet in the back of the head or compulsory psychiatric treatment.

The aim in both cases, of course, is to convince the public that it's a bad, bad thing to contradict the party line. Only crazy people do that. If you don't want everyone to think you're crazy you'd better keep your toes right on the party line. That's the way good people behave. That's the way sane people behave. In other words, it's crazy not to like to ride the New York subways with AIDS-infected queers, Black criminals, and welfare moms and their pickaninnies. It's crazy not to just love the glitzy, alien, decadent diversity of Times Square.

In the last two broadcasts we've talked about why the commissars are so afraid of dissent that they feel it's necessary to go to such lengths to discredit publicly anyone who dissents. Basically it's because they understand that their gravy train depends on maintaining an illusion, and any dissent threatens that illusion. It's interesting to note here that while the Jewish media bosses have their own specific reasons for maintaining the illusion -- reasons that we discussed in earlier broadcasts -- the Gentile capitalists of big baseball also have reasons. In the first place, they must keep the Jewish capitalists of television happy in order to assure the continuation of their lucrative collaboration; and in the second place, they don't like anyone who gets out of line, anyone who may change things in an unpredictable way, anyone who might be a threat to their profits. They want their employees to keep their mouths shut and do what they're told.

In addition to their attitude toward dissidents, there are other similarities between the communist regime of the defunct Soviet Union and the Clintonista regime under which we live in the United States today. You know, there are several reasons why communism has failed so disastrously everywhere it has been imposed on White people, on Europeans. It may work with Asians or with Africans; it may work with mestizos; but it doesn't work with White people. One reason, of

course, is that in Europe it was originally promoted and implemented by Jews for the purpose of exploiting the people it purported to be helping. The Jews used communism to bleed one nation after another dry.

Communism would have failed even under Aryan leadership because it was based on a false view of human nature -- at least, on a false view of ***our*** nature: which is to say, it was based on egalitarianism -- the notion that we are all basically the same -- and on the idea that we all should work only for the common good, like bees in a hive, and not for ourselves.

Egalitarianism is the most poisonously false and destructive myth ever foisted on our people. Though it is contrary to even the most cursory observation of the real world, egalitarianism has its destructive power in its appeal to the inferior, to the envious, and to the resentful. It says to the loser, to the sluggard, to the dull, the clumsy, and the drab: "You are just as deserving as the winner; you are just as strong and agile, just as bright and creative, just as imaginative and energetic, just as brave and skillful, just as beautiful and admirable in every way. The only reason you are a loser and he is a winner is that you have been cheated, and he has been given an unfair advantage."

Charlatans and Jews have used this line over and over again to tear down Aryan societies. Whenever we have relaxed our vigilance and permitted the rabble to become too numerous, those who hate us have gone to the rabble and preached the same sermon: "The first shall be last, and the last shall be first." And the rabble have responded and helped the charlatans pull down their betters and destroy the society.

That is the sermon the Jews preached to the rabble in Russia in order to incite them to destroy first the aristocrats and then the professionals and the middle class and finally the whole society. The rabble believed the Jews when the Jews told them they were just as good as the aristocrats and the middle class, just as able and just as deserving, but of course, they weren't as good, and after they had helped the Jews murder their betters, Russian society didn't work as well as before. Things started running downhill.

And what finally killed off the Soviet Union was the other underlying principle of communism: namely, that people should work only for the benefit of the hive, of the mob, not for their own benefit: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need," was what the Jewish apostle of communism, Karl Marx, preached. That appealed greatly to the losers, to those with much need and little ability, but it didn't do much to inspire those with ability to work harder. Output fell, and not even the threat of firing squads to punish so-called "saboteurs" and "wreckers" could make them work harder or more carefully or more creatively. Pilfering from one's workplace became the national pastime in the Soviet Union, because bosses had no really strong incentive to prevent it. Since everything theoretically belonged to everyone, everyone felt no compunction about helping himself to what he wanted when the commissar was looking the other way.

In the United States today one still can work for oneself, and an able person still is permitted to succeed and to benefit from his own efforts -- despite all the efforts of the Clintonistas. The growing burden of taxes -- and even worse, of government regulations and quotas and paperwork

-- has not succeeded in killing our ambition and our entrepreneurial spirit yet, but the Clintonistas still are working hard on it. Anyone in business for himself can feel their hatred and resentment.

It is the egalitarianism which is killing us here. It is the insistence that we all are equal, regardless of race, color, creed, sex, sexual orientation, IQ, work habits, character, morality, accomplishment, you name it. And I don't mean just equal before the law, implying everyone deserves a fair trial and so on. The promoters of egalitarianism are insisting on sameness, especially across racial and sexual lines. For example, if more Black drivers are being pulled over by the highway patrol, it must be that White cops are behaving in a racist way and deliberately targeting Blacks. It can't be that Blacks actually are committing more offenses, because they are the same as Whites in every way. So we have the current egalitarian pretense of indignation about the alleged offense of "driving while Black."

And it's the same with Black behavior in schools. The fact that Blacks are suspended or expelled from school far more often than Whites is prima facie evidence that White school officials are behaving in a racist manner, because, as everyone knows, Blacks behave the same as Whites. And the fact that Blacks don't perform as well on tests and are much more likely to flunk courses and fail bar examinations again is proof of institutional racism, because, as we all know, Blacks are just as smart as Whites. They have the same intelligence, the same problem-solving ability, so that in the absence of racism their performance will be the same as that of Whites.

And of course, crime statistics prove the same thing. The fact that Blacks are convicted of murder eight times more often than Whites on a per capita basis shows that the criminal justice system is biased against Blacks. That's what the egalitarians want us to believe. It couldn't be that Blacks are different, that their brains are wired differently, and that they are predisposed to criminal behavior. And the fact that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely as heterosexual White males to be HIV carriers just proves that the health-care system also is biased against Blacks; certainly, it's not that Blacks have any sort of biological predisposition to become infected with the virus. Oh, my goodness, no!

Homosexuals, according to the egalitarians, differ in no way from normal men except in the things they do to each other in the privacy of their bedrooms, and since those things are none of our business and have no relationship to anything else they do, we should treat homosexuals just as if they were normal. The fact that the things homosexuals do in their bedrooms are only one facet of a homosexual personality syndrome is something we're not supposed to notice. We're not supposed to notice that homosexuals, in fact, are different in their behavior and attitudes from normal men, and that their homosexuality colors every aspect of their lives. We're supposed to believe that aside from what goes on in the bedroom they're the same as normal men.

This sameness is an article of faith with the egalitarians. If one questions it, one is asking to be forced to submit to psychiatric examination. The relevant aspect of all of this for us is that this is even more true in the capitalist society we have in America today than it was in the communist society of the Soviet Union. I say "even more true," because even though egalitarianism was the party line in the Soviet Union, fewer people there believed it. During the greater part of their reign, the communists didn't have television as a tool for controlling the public's thinking. They

had the KGB, and so television wasn't quite so necessary for keeping people in line as it is in the United States. If you can make a man do what you want with the threat of a bullet, then it's not quite so important to twist his thinking into line with your propaganda.

And the thing for us to note is that the big capitalists in the United States today are as much enforcers of egalitarianism as the Clintonistas are and as the communists in the Soviet Union were. It wasn't a bunch of communists or Clintonistas who ordered John Rocker to undergo psychiatric testing last week because he inadvertently let slip the fact that he doesn't believe in equality. It was a bunch of capitalists: baseball capitalists, show-biz capitalists.

Baseball capitalists certainly aren't exceptional among capitalists in this regard. Pick up any slick magazine and look at the full-page advertisements for clothing, cars, cigarettes, and other consumer items. Racial mixing is more and more a theme of advertising these days. Mixed-race models -- mulattos, quadroons, and octoroons, some of them so light that it's hard to tell what race they are -- are in big demand for ads. The Madison Avenue companies that design the ads are mostly Jewish, of course, but the big manufacturing corporations which pay for the ads are mostly Gentile. The big corporate bosses aren't forced to be egalitarians. No one needs to twist their arms. If egalitarianism is in, they want to be on the bandwagon. If it will sell, they want to be the ones selling it, and they couldn't care less that it's a communist idea.

It's not that America's capitalists today are communists at heart. And it's certainly not that free enterprise is fundamentally rotten. It isn't. What's rotten is the breed of capitalists we have in America today. They didn't used to be such a rotten bunch. Henry Ford, one of America's great capitalists, was a man of principle who stood up to the Jews. And generally there was the conviction that success and wealth were achieved through hard work, self discipline, and strong principles. Of course, nearly all of our capitalists before the Second World War were fervent anti-communists, because they never did much care for the idea of sharing their wealth; they didn't care for the beehive principle of communism. But they also were not egalitarians. In fact, hardly anyone was, capitalist or not.

Fifty or 60 years ago we all would have laughed at the notion that women should serve in submarine crews or share foxholes with men in combat, notions with which today's big capitalists are perfectly happy. Men certainly didn't look down on their women, but we knew that men and women weren't the same. We understood that their natural roles in our society were not the same, but were complementary.

Of course, we wouldn't have laughed at the suggestion that Black men should be permitted to sleep with White women or that Black drill instructors should be permitted to give orders to White women trainees or that Hollywood films should portray White women and Black men in romantic or sexual relationships. We would have strung up the promoters of such destructive filth. And the big capitalists then didn't really disagree with us on these things. Certainly, they would not have suggested that someone who said he didn't like riding next to diseased queers or Black criminals on the subway needed a psychiatric examination.

What all of this leads us to is the conclusion that capitalists, like the rest of us, have declined morally during the 20th century. About all we can say in their favor today is that they are not

fundamentally malevolent, as the Clintonistas are. The big capitalists are not really seeking the destruction of our race or our civilization -- but they're perfectly willing to see it happen, if it will lead to greater profits for them in the short run. In that sense they're better than the communists and the Clintonistas. But that's not really saying much for them.

Capitalists, of course, like the rest of us, can be deceived. They can be brainwashed by Jewish propaganda. But that's not the primary reason most of them are behaving so badly these days. They are smarter than the average person -- at least, the big capitalists, the most successful capitalists, are smarter and more perceptive than the average couch potato. They're not as easily fooled. The ones I have known who go along with the Jews don't do so because they've been fooled. Actually, in private they're a pretty cynical bunch. What they lack is not intelligence, not understanding, but principles, a moral sense. Really, all they care about is themselves and their profits.

In a society without Jews, a society without the sort of destructive television propaganda that bombards us every day, big capitalists could play a constructive role. Aim them in the right direction, and their energy, ambition, and intelligence can accomplish a great deal. But the way they are aimed now, they aren't much better than the Clintonistas. In other words, George Bush, Jr., may not lead America to hell with quite the same speed and enthusiasm as Al Gore would, but under Bush hell will remain our ultimate destination just as surely.

We really need two things to restore America to health. We need to break the Jews' influence on the public -- we need to take all of their propaganda media away from them -- and we need to have principled leadership, which is something we haven't had for a long, long time. The reaction of the mass media to John Rocker's frank comments about New York shows us the first part of the problem. The decision of the baseball capitalists to order Rocker to have psychiatric testing shows us the second part.

Dealing with the first part of the problem is our easier task, though it is hard enough. Even now we are reaching a small but significant portion of White America. We aren't reaching the couch potatoes, of course; television is required for that. But, with your support, we are beginning to make a small difference in the thinking of independent-minded Americans. The leadership stratum is becoming aware that the feelings and thoughts we represent must be taken into account. As we keep on pushing, keep on reaching more and more Americans with our message, we will force at least some of America's non-Jewish leaders to begin making new calculations about what is in their best interests. And let us remember that that is all that matters to them: their own interests. They collaborate with the Jews now, but they will turn against the Jews without a moment's hesitation when they have been convinced that collaboration is no longer in their best interests. Understanding that certainly gives us encouragement to persevere.

Ultimately, however, we do need more. We do need to have principled leadership, moral leadership. That may require a fundamental restructuring of our society. In fact, I am convinced that it will. That's what the National Alliance is working for in the long run: not just getting rid of the Jews and their influence, but giving direction to our people under principled leadership. And you can help us with that difficult but essential task.

Reality Check

It's time for a reality check. One of the ways in which I try to keep up with what's going on in the world is watching a couple of televised news programs every day. For week after week I've been saturated with Elian Gonzales, as if the business of deciding whether or not the boy goes back to his father in Cuba or stays with other relatives in Miami is the most important thing happening in the world today.

Now, I can understand that at least part of the reason for this saturation coverage of the Elian Gonzales situation is based on the mentality of the average television news viewer. The couch potatoes probably have nothing better to do than worry about where Elian ends up. They'd rather get the latest installment in the Elian soap opera than know what's really happening in the world.

I hope, however, that you'll pardon me for suspecting that in addition to the strictly commercial desire on the part of CNN and other news presenters to cater to the feminine tastes of the couch potatoes by larding their news heavily with this "human interest" mush, there's an intentional effort by the media bosses to distract the viewers and keep them from thinking too much about the real world and the real issues. Give them a steady diet of ball games and Elian Gonzales updates, and they won't ask too many questions about the important things.

Contrast the Elian Gonzales coverage with news about what's happening in Serbia's Kosovo province. The latest news from there is the rape and murder of an 11-year-old Albanian girl by one of Madeleine Albright's occupation soldiers. That's a terrible thing, but it's hardly the most terrible thing that's been happening in Kosovo since Madeleine sent the troops in. There's virtually no mention on network television news programs in America about the ongoing ethnic cleansing of the Serbs by the Albanians under the cover of our occupation troops. Serb women are kidnapped, raped, and murdered every week by Albanians in Kosovo. There's a transparently deliberate effort on the part of the Albanians to terrorize the Serbs and drive them out of the province, with the help of Madeleine's troops. And we almost never hear about these anti-Serb activities from the mainstream media. It leads me to suspect, cynic that I am, that the news about the rape and murder of the Albanian girl by one of Albright's soldiers is being presented to us to allay our suspicions that what's happening in Kosovo province is being concealed from us. The media bosses can say, "Look, we told you about the murder of this Albanian girl, and it certainly wasn't in our interests to do so. It makes our fellow Jew Madeleine look bad. So you see, you can trust us. We tell you what's happening, whether it suits our own purpose or not."

But of course, as a rule they don't really tell us what's happening when it doesn't suit their purpose. And they do seem to be succeeding in keeping the couch potatoes distracted. What the Roman emperors learned 2,000 years ago about keeping the urban rabble from becoming restless by supplying them with lots of spectacles in the Colosseum still works. I get a lot of letters from listeners who are pretty good examples of this sort of thing: people who are so distracted by the unimportant things that they don't notice the important things. Many listeners tell me that I should comment on the efforts of the Blacks, Jews, and liberals to force the White citizens of South Carolina to abandon their flag. The Blacks and their boosters complain that the flag reminds them of the time in the not too distant past when Blacks in the United States were

plantation slaves. The Whites reply, "No, no," it's just a reminder of our Southern heritage. "The flag isn't a racist symbol," they say.

Well, of course, I sympathize with the desire of anyone to preserve his heritage or to fly the flag of his choice, but this Confederate flag issue is as much a distraction as the Elian Gonzales issue. It's simply not important. And I say that as a true son of the South. My great-great-grandfather on my mother's side of the family was Thomas Hill Watts, attorney general of the Confederacy under Jefferson Davis and later governor of Alabama. His photograph is on the $10 Confederate bill. He also had been a member of the council of secession which voted for secession from the Union, and then he served as a colonel in the Confederate Army, commanding the 17th Alabama Infantry Regiment in the bloody battle of Corinth, Mississippi. But whether or not his flag continues to fly from various public buildings in the South is completely inconsequential in the face of other things which are happening in the South every day. And you don't have to live in the South to know what those things are; they're happening all over America. One White man murdered by Blacks, one White woman raped by Blacks, one White child terrorized in a school restroom by Blacks, one politician in Washington allowed to go unhanged is a greater tragedy than taking down the Confederate flag from any statehouse.

You know, the various organizations which are busy defending the Confederate flag today always assert that the flag is not a racist symbol. But of course, it is and always has been. My great-great-grandfather, Governor Watts, never heard the word "racist." The Jews hadn't invented it as a term of opprobrium yet. But by every common standard in use today he was a racist. Certainly not all, but many of his fellow Southerners did not approve of the institution of slavery. They would have been happy to be able to outlaw the institution and to ship every Negro and every mulatto and every quadroon to Africa and set them free. But to a man they were racists, by today's media standards. They were racists because they recognized the simple fact of racial differences. Most of them had no animosity toward Blacks before the war: before the Blacks were turned loose to terrorize White Southerners. But if my great-great-grandfather or any other Southern gentleman had seen a Black male put his hands on a White woman or make a suggestive remark to a White woman, he would have drawn his sidearm and put a quick end to that Black without giving the matter a second thought. Of course, Northerners pretty well felt the same way about things. They were as much racists as the Southerners. There just weren't any Southern gentlemen in the North -- or many gentlemen of any sort -- to keep things in order.

If we could use a time machine and go back in time 140 or 150 years and take with us a VCR and a monitor and a few video cassettes of recent Hollywood films or television shows or even news programs with street scenes in Montgomery and Atlanta and Richmond today and play them for my great-great-grandfather and a hundred or so of his most influential friends and explain to them that this is what the Jews would be saturating the consciousness of White Americans with in the future . . . well, if we could do that, they simply wouldn't believe us. They wouldn't believe that their descendants could become so degraded in a mere four or five generations as to permit such things to happen: so degraded as to acquiesce in such things. But if we somehow could convince them that our videotapes weren't fraudulent, they would have understood that much more was at stake than political independence for the South. They would have understood that survival of the race was at stake, and they would have fought even harder and more valiantly than they did, because in those days there was no shame in fighting for one's

people, for one's race. Anyway, I bring this up just as a reminder that we aren't the only ones who have failed to focus on the really important issues at hand. Throughout history our people have been distracted by inconsequential issues and have neglected the crucial ones.

So what's more important today than the latest ball game and what happens to Elian Gonzales? Really, it's exactly what was important 140 years ago. My great-great-grandfather and the other leaders of the South should have been concerned first and foremost about the racial issue -- not about economic issues or political issues or anything else. There was a disagreement between the North and the South on the issue of slavery, of course, but there was plenty of common ground on the racial issue. Before the war neither Northerners nor Southerners wanted racial mixing. If it hadn't been for the economic aspects of slavery, an agreement very likely could have been reached to send all Blacks back to Africa. President Lincoln looked favorably on such a plan even after the war.

Without the slavery issue, the warmongers probably wouldn't have been able to get a war started. But Southerners who wanted to keep the institution of slavery for purely economic reasons put these economic reasons ahead of the racial interests of their people. They didn't understand the degree to which their racial interests were threatened. And so we had a bloody and destructive civil war, and even worse -- much worse -- we failed to solve the racial problem when it might have been solved with relatively little trauma.

So today we have a racial catastrophe in both the North and the South, and the Jews are pumping their lies and filth into all of us every day. And instead of focusing on these real problems, most of us let ourselves be distracted by utterly inconsequential issues such as Elian Gonzales and where the Confederate flag can be flown.

I'll go over that again: reality is that we are being pushed rapidly toward racial extinction. Reality is that the Jews are controlling the minds of a majority of our people for the specific purpose of keeping us headed toward extinction. Those are the real problems which we must deal with. Forget about Elian Gonzales and Fidel Castro and the Confederate flag. Forget about ball games and the economy and whether a Democratic crook or a Republican crook should be elected later this year. Think about racial survival and racial freedom; that's all that matters. Really, nothing else counts in the least.

That's why you hear some repetition if you listen to many of my broadcasts. I keep coming back to the important things over and over again. Of course, I do talk about many inconsequential things as well. I use them as illustrations, as examples, which help us understand better the important things. And I also talk about unimportant things because I must consider my audience. I must talk about the things the members of my audience believe to be important so that I can catch their interest and then lead them to the truly important things.

Here's an example which ties in again to the Civil War. A lot of men -- overaged kids, really -- like to play soldier. They like to reenact various historic battles, and Civil War battles are among their favorites. They like to get out on the battlefield and pretend that they are members of real military units of the past -- such as my great-great-grandfather's 17th Alabama Infantry Regiment -- and then they fire blanks at each other and maneuver around as they imagine it actually

happened. They pride themselves greatly on the authenticity of their uniforms and equipment. They will spend thousands of dollars for various bits and pieces of uniforms, and they will pore over old dispatches and memoirs to make sure that they've got all of the details right -- all of the details except one, that is: the mindset of the soldiers who actually fought the real battles. Talk to one of these Confederate make-believe soldiers sometime. The first thing he will assure you is that the fact he likes to play soldier in a Confederate uniform doesn't mean he is a racist. No, no, no! Far from it! In fact, he will try to persuade you that the real Confederate soldiers weren't racists either, but instead were models of Political Correctness. Fake ammunition and fake beliefs. No more integrity or honesty than most of the supporters of the Confederate flag. They cling to the trivial and deny the important.

I really have to hold my tongue when I talk with these people. But I do talk with them. An interest in history certainly is a healthier sign than no interest in history. So I talk with some of these make-believe soldiers about military history, and sometimes the conversation can be steered into more important matters.

I believe that one of our biggest problems today is that our comfort level does not match our situation. We are far, far more comfortable than we ought to be, considering our situation. As a race teetering on the brink of extinction, we should be naked, starving, freezing, and covered with painful sores from head to foot. We should be miserable, frightened, and desperate. Then perhaps we would be better able to understand what is important and what is not. But when we spend our time chatting on our cell phones while tooling around in our BMWs, we have a hard time keeping our priorities right.

Of course, back in the 1930s, during the Great Depression, many Americans were uncomfortable. They had lost their farms, their homes, their businesses. They couldn't feed their families. They stood in breadlines. They were cold and miserable. But they still let themselves be tricked into turning to Franklin Roosevelt and being led into the cruelest, bloodiest and most destructive war in the history of the world, a war to save communism and the Jews from the Germans. So what that tells us is that being uncomfortable is not in itself enough. We need to have leaders whose priorities are right, and those leaders need to have open lines of communication to the mass of people, and then the people need to become uncomfortable enough pay attention to what's happening. When the right message can be gotten to the people, that's when they need to be hit hard on the side of the head with a two-by-four to catch their attention.

Well, the discomfort is coming, believe me, and it's going to be a lot more painful than being hit with a two-by-four. That's good. That's necessary. But will we be ready to benefit from the discomfort? At the end of the Civil War my great-great-grandfather got a good dose of discomfort. He was kicked out of his job as governor by an enemy army, He was treated as a war criminal, because he had made the mistake of being on the losing side. His plantation was burned, along with a huge warehouse full of baled cotton, which represented most of his actual wealth. He was no longer a rich and powerful man, no longer a member of the Southern aristocracy. He was ripe for getting his thinking straightened out. But of course, it was too late for him to benefit from a new understanding. If he had understood before the war what he understood after the war, I am sure that he would have tried to persuade his fellow Southerners to

adopt a wiser course than secession. Or failing that, he would have fought with more desperation at the battle of Corinth and perhaps turned that into a Southern victory instead of a Southern defeat.

What happened to the South reminds me of what happened nearly 130 years later to the people of South Africa. In the 1970s and 1980s they were fat and happy. They had built a rich, White country in the southern part of the African continent. They had wonderfully productive farms, industries, mines. They had gleaming cities of glass and steel. And they had lots of cheap, Black labor, which was making the richest South Africans even richer. But even the ordinary South Africans with whom I spoke had Black gardeners and Black cooks and Black cleaning women and Black baby-sitters. And they weren't concerned at all about the future. Black terrorism was simply keeping them on their toes a bit, giving their superb armed forces a little realistic training. They even had nuclear weapons.

I told them, get rid of your Black workers. Do your own dirty work. Accept a lower standard of living for a while by depending entirely on the White labor force. Don't trust your Christian churches and Christian ministers: they will turn on you. And understand that it is not the Soviet Union which is your mortal enemy, but the United States. Communism has infected your Black masses, but White South Africans are in no danger of becoming infected by it. It is greedy capitalism, which puts profit and comfort ahead of race, which you must beware of. And above all, beware of the Jews.

And of course, they were sure that they knew better. They were offended by my warnings about their church. There was a special bond between church and people in South Africa, they assured me. The church supported *apartheid.* The Dutch Reformed Church would always stand by White South Africans. As for the Jews, they were God's Chosen People -- the Bible says so -- and besides their interests were the same as those of the Whites. The only Jews who were hostile to White South Africans were ones like Harry Oppenheimer, Helen Suzman, Joe Slovo, and a few other Jew communists, I was told. And as for getting rid of their Black workers, that was ridiculous. They could keep their Blacks under control, they assured me. Blacks are like children. They need the White man to tell them what to do. They know that they could never run the country by themselves. And so on.

So now the South Africans have lost their country. Their church betrayed them. Shortly before the vote to end White rule, the church had a revelation from on high and announced that it had been wrong in supporting *apartheid. Apartheid* was not the Christian way, the church announced. Today the Dutch Reformed Church even accepts Black members. The White South Africans were right about one thing, however. Blacks are like children, and they cannot run the country. That's why it is sinking rapidly into barbarism and anarchy under Black rule today.

The White South African population as a whole has undergone the equivalent of being whopped hard on the side of the head with a two-by-four. Their farmers are being murdered on a regular basis. Their women are being gang-raped by Blacks on an unprecedented scale, and a gang-rape by Blacks is almost equivalent to a death sentence, because of the prevalence of HIV infection among South African Blacks. Many White South Africans, who used to be assured of good employment and a high standard of living are now unemployed and destitute, without even

enough money to leave the country. The ones who still have good employment huddle in walled compounds patrolled by armed guards and ringed with razor wire. In some areas they will venture out only in convoys. Johannesburg, which used to be a clean, decent, and safe city, now has the highest murder rate in the world.

All of this has done wonders to make White South Africans receptive to truth and to open their eyes to reality. But, just as in the case of my great-great-grandfather and the other Southern gentlemen of his era, it's really too late for the truth to be helpful to them.

What about White Americans? When will they understand that what happens to Elian Gonzalez and to the Confederate flag and whether the Democrats or the Republicans win this year are totally and completely unimportant? When will they understand that the only important things now are the fact that America is being overrun by non-Whites and the fact that the Jews control the organs of public opinion?

I don't know whether it will be too late or not. About all we can do now is try to hit as many of them as we can on the side of the head with a two-by-four.

The Hurricane

In the flood of mail that I received in response to my broadcast two weeks ago about the deliberate lies and distortions of supposedly "educational" television documentaries, I was pleased to note that many of my listeners already are fully aware of this sort of mendacity and have been keeping their own notes. I pointed out in my broadcast two weeks ago that the people in Hollywood who make these television documentaries not only lie to us, but they also are very careless with their facts, and I gave some specific examples of incorrect dates used in a History Channel program that was supposed to inform us about the secret history of Nazis in America. Several listeners who saw that History Channel program wrote to me about other careless errors they noted in the program. For example, Timothy McVeigh, the convicted Oklahoma City bomber, was described in the program as a Nazi and as a former Marine. The claim about being a Nazi was a deliberate lie. The claim about being a Marine was a careless mistake: McVeigh was never a Marine; he was in the Army.

Listeners also told me about other Hollywood productions that they thought were especially brazen in their lies. Many mentioned films dealing with the Second World War and the so-called "Holocaust," films portraying the Jews as the ultimate victims of White wickedness. A problem with many of these films is that it's difficult for us to establish with certainty what's true and what's false. In the much ballyhooed *Schindler's List*, for example, we have the Jewish claim that the film is based on historical fact. It shows the German commandant of a labor camp shooting his Jewish workers with a hunting rifle from his balcony for sport as the workers unsuspectingly go about their jobs. Anyone familiar with the way Germans ran things during the war can be practically certain that such indiscipline and self-indulgence as shooting defense workers for sport -- even Jewish defense workers -- would have been unthinkable. But without specific dates and places and reliable testimony, it's difficult to prove beyond any doubt that the Jews who made this particular hate-propaganda film were lying.

One very recent Hollywood production mentioned by several listeners was *The Hurricane.* It deals with events that are much easier to check out, and so I decided to look into that one myself. Here's a brief history:

Rubin Carter was a small-time Black street thug in Paterson, New Jersey, in the 1950s and 1960s. He had a long record of arrests for assault, theft, and robbery. His first criminal conviction was at age 11, after he stabbed a man and stole his wallet and wristwatch. For that he was sent to reform school, but the experience didn't reform him. He continued with assaults and robberies after he was released. Later he spent four years in the penitentiary for a series of muggings. He also tried his hand at professional boxing, fighting under the ring name "Hurricane" Carter.

On the evening of June 16, 1966, the stepfather of one of Carter's friends was killed in a fight with a White man. Carter commiserated with his bereaved friend over drinks and decided to "get even" with Whites. A few minutes before 2:30 in the morning of June 17, Carter and another friend, John Artis, left the bar where they had been drinking and drove to a Paterson bar a few blocks away -- the Lafayette Grill -- known to have a policy of not serving Blacks. They parked

around the corner, walked into the bar with a pistol and a 12-gauge shotgun and opened fire on the bartender and his patrons, killing two White men and a White woman -- Jim Oliver, Bob Nauyoks, and Hazel Tanis--and shooting the eye out of a fourth White person, who survived the massacre. They then walked back to their car laughing and talking. A 23-year-old White woman, Patty Valentine, who had an apartment above the bar, was awakened by the sound of the gunfire. She looked out her window and saw Carter and his friend walk to their car and drive away. She called the police and gave them a description of the car.

Six minutes after the triple murder was reported, Paterson police spotted the getaway car and pulled it over. There was a third Black in the car with Carter and Artis, however, and the police, who were looking for a car with two Black men instead of three, did not detain them -- even though Carter was found lying down in the back seat in an effort to conceal himself. Twenty minutes later, after receiving a more detailed description of the getaway car from Miss Valentine, the police spotted the car again, pulled it over, and took Carter and Artis to the police station for questioning. Both Blacks were given polygraph -- that is, lie detector--tests. The police polygraph operator, Officer John McGuire, reported that Carter was "attempting deception to all the pertinent questions . . . [and] was involved in the crime." The police searched the getaway car and found a 12-gauge shotgun cartridge and a pistol cartridge of the same caliber used in the massacre at the Lafayette Grill, although in the half hour between the shootings and the second police stop of their car the Blacks had gotten rid of the shotgun and the pistol. Because the police recognized Carter as a well-known boxing figure, and because they did not have an eye-witness who could positively identify the killers, they turned Carter and Artis loose. Although Patty Valentine had gotten a clear view of the getaway car, she had not seen the faces of the two Blacks who got into the car.

Five months later an eye witness, Alfred Bello, finally testified that he had seen Rubin Carter and John Artis walk out of the Lafayette Grill with weapons in their hands immediately after the shootings. He had been afraid to come forward earlier for fear of retribution by Carter, he said. Carter and Artis were indicted, tried, convicted of murder, and sentenced to life in prison.

There the story would have ended, except that Carter, as a Black celebrity sports figure, had wealthy friends and a sympathetic ear in the Jewish media. The Jewish media bosses never are happy when a Black celebrity gets a lot of bad press, *á la* O.J. Simpson or Mike Tyson or "Hurricane" Carter. It contradicts the image of Blacks the media bosses have tried so hard to establish in the public mind. With a little help from his friends Carter got an autobiographical book published in 1974 proclaiming his innocence. He had been framed by racist cops and prosecutors, he said. Hollywood types immediately flocked to his defense. Jewish pop singer Robert Zimmerman, better known by his stage name "Bob Dylan," wrote a ballad asserting Carter's innocence. Six hundred thousand dollars was donated by celebrities to his defense fund. The New Jersey Supreme Court yielded to the media pressure and granted Carter and Artis a new trial. Both were convicted again. The New Jersey Supreme Court upheld the second conviction.

America's judicial system today, however, works on the principle -- one might say that it has been designed on the principle--that where there's enough money to pay the lawyers there's a way. Verily, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than it is to keep a rich man in prison, as we saw in the case of O.J. Simpson. Carter's lawyers got his case before a Jewish

Federal judge, H. Lee Sarokin, who, in November 1985, ruled that the prosecution had violated Carter's civil rights by arguing before the trial jury that he had been motivated by racial hatred in his murder of the three Whites in the Lafayette Grill. This argument might have prejudiced the White jurors against Carter, Sarokin said, and he ordered Carter released from prison.

It is interesting to compare Judge Sarokin's ruling in 1985 with the current Jewish campaign for more so-called "hate crime" legislation. The whole idea behind the Jewish "hate crime" campaign is to prejudice the entire judicial system against defendants who are not Politically Correct. Any evidence suggesting that a defendant has ideas or reads literature or listens to music or belongs to an organization that is not Politically Correct may be used not only to prejudice the jury against him but to increase the severity of his sentence if he is convicted. But 15 years ago a Jewish judge ruled that informing the jury that Carter was filled with racial hatred against Whites when he walked into the Lafayette Grill with a pistol and a shotgun seeking revenge for the death of his friend's stepfather had violated Carter's civil rights. The times do change, don't they?

However, the Jewish campaign to de-Aryanize America with the assistance of a mind-numbing flood of lies and anti-White hate propaganda hasn't changed, even if some of the tactics are different. Two months ago Hollywood released the film *The Hurricane*, supposedly a documentary film based on the real-life saga of Rubin "Hurricane" Carter. It was directed by one of Hollywood's greasiest kosher propagandists, the appropriately named Norman Jewison, and it has been receiving rave reviews in the mainstream media. It is so full of outrageous lies that it's hard to decide where to begin.

Well, let's start with the time right before the murders. There's no hint that Carter has a hate on for White people, no hint that he's looking for revenge against Whites. He's in a mellow mood, drinking in his favorite bar with friends at the time of the murders. Then, right after the murders, one of Carter's friends, John Artis, offers to drive him home. The Paterson police, who by this time are looking for the getaway car, stop the car carrying Carter, Artis, and another Black. The reason for the stop is presented by the film as simply another case of "driving while Black," the trendy way these days of explaining the disproportionately strong tendency of Blacks to get into legal trouble behind the wheel of an automobile. It's all because of the racist attitudes of White cops.

In the film, when Carter is taken to the police station for questioning, instead of flunking the lie-detector test he passes it with flying colors. But the racist White cops and the racist White prosecutors have it in for Carter because he's an "uppity nigger" who whips White boys in the ring and needs to be put in his place. With the help of a racist White jury he is unjustly convicted. His only offense is being a proud Black man, whose whole life is ruined by White racism.

Even the film's portrayal of Carter's loss of the middleweight championship fight in December 1964 to White boxer Joey Giardello is one of a Black man deprived of justice by White racism. The film shows Carter beating Giardello to a pulp but having the title denied to him by racist White judges. In fact, as nearly all the sports reporters who actually witnessed the fight agree, Giardello clearly whipped Carter, not the other way around, as the film falsely shows it, and the judges' decision was correct.

I have given just a few examples here, but I am not exaggerating when I say that every significant point made in *The Hurricane* is a blatant lie. But hey, the whole point of Jewison's film is to strike a blow against White racism, to make Whites feel guilty for existing and taking up space that by right belongs to the Blacks and the Browns and the Yellows of the world and to all of our other wonderful colored brothers, whom we have exploited and oppressed so shamefully. I mean, all's fair, including lying, in war, and what the Jews are doing to us with their hate-propaganda films is war: it's a war of racial annihilation -- a war of genocide -- they are waging against us, while we remain sitting on our hands, afraid even to acknowledge what is happening to us, lest we be denounced as "racists" or "anti-Semites."

I hate to suggest that you put more money into Hollywood's swollen coffers, but you really should see *The Hurricane* for yourself, read some of the reviews praising the film in Jewish media such as the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, and then check out the facts. I believe that many of you will be astounded by this example of just how brazenly the Jews lie. It's hard for us to imagine such shameless arrogance -- such *chutzpah*, as the Jews themselves proudly call it.

One is reminded of Adolf Hitler's warning in his book *Mein Kampf* about the Jews' use of this "big lie" propaganda technique. Hitler warned us that the Jews get away with telling such whoppers because the average Gentile cannot imagine anyone lying so brazenly. Of course, the Jews' reaction to Hitler's warning is just another example of their use of the "big lie" technique. They teach our children in the schools and announce to the couch potatoes through the mass media that Hitler invented the "big lie" technique and advocated its use in *Mein Kampf* rather than warning us about the Jews' use of the technique. They do this, knowing that they can get away with it because not one American in a hundred will actually check it out for himself and discover that they are lying.

Well, at least, the Jews' lies, when they are as blatant and as obvious as they are in *The Hurricane*, do provide a useful tool for me, letting me show you what they're up to. The unfortunate aspect of this is that with about 95 per cent of the White population consisting of lemmings, who are totally unmovable by truth or reason, what we can do with tools of this sort is limited. To lemmings the concept of truth is meaningless; all that's real to them is what the other lemmings are doing and saying. That's their whole universe. But, you know, there is that other four or five per cent out there that is reachable with the truth, when it is presented clearly and forcefully. And that's what I try to do: present relevant facts and ideas clearly and forcefully to those of my people who are interested in these things, who are moved by these things.

It's clear, I believe, that this whole issue of lying Jewish hate-propaganda is relevant to most of the problems we face today. It's not clear yet what effect my presentation of facts and ideas is having. How many of our people am I actually reaching? One per cent of the population? I don't know, but if I am reaching one per cent of the population, that's about 20 per cent of the independent thinkers. Perhaps that's not enough yet to make a major difference, but the number we are reaching is growing. I'm sure of that. And I have a feeling that when we are reaching two or three per cent of the whole population -- that's about half of the independent thinkers -- we will be able to make a difference.

Independent thinkers may not be in much demand in this era of Political Correctness, but they still do have some advantages over the lemmings. There are still some advantages to knowing what's true and what's false in the picture of the world presented to us by the mass media, for example. There's some advantage in knowing whether Timothy McVeigh was motivated to bomb the Federal Building in Oklahoma City by reading one of my novels, as the Jewish media bosses would have you believe, or by the Clinton government's murder of all those women and children in the Branch Davidian church in Waco. There's some advantage in realizing that Hollywood media bosses have produced a major motion picture that portrays as a hero a hate-motivated Black murderer of White people.

The real advantage comes, however, when the people who know these things -- the people who know that the media bosses lie about Timothy McVeigh's motivation and know that "Hurricane" Carter is a cold-blooded hate-murderer rather than a heroic victim of White racism -- put it all together, when they draw conclusions. The really important thing to understand is why the media bosses lie to us about Timothy McVeigh's motivation and why they pump out lying White-guilt propaganda such as *Schindler's List* and *The Hurricane.*

Putting it all together and drawing conclusions is harder than just understanding the relevant facts, however. It requires courage as well as the ability to think independently, and courageous people -- people who aren't afraid to come to Politically Incorrect conclusions -- are even scarcer than independent-minded people. If I have reached 20 per cent of the independent-minded people in America with a few facts, I have helped perhaps a quarter of those reach conclusions. What is that? Five per cent of the independent thinkers. One-quarter of one per cent of the general public. Not enough yet, but it is growing.

I'll tell you why I believe that it will continue to grow. It's based on my observations of the Jewish character. Here's what will happen. I will continue to expose Jewish lies and to help independent-minded Americans come to conclusions as to why the Jews tell these lies. And the Jews, instead of trying to clean up their act, will respond by telling even more outrageous lies. Instead of saying to each other, hey, fellows, they're onto us; we'd better be careful not to tell such whoppers -- instead of that they'll just tell more and bigger lies in an effort to drown us out. They can't help themselves. That's their nature. And the couch potatoes, of course, will believe every lie. But the independent-minded minority will find the lies harder and harder to swallow. And more and more of them will be forced to draw conclusions.

We cannot reform Hollywood as long as it is dominated by Jews, but we can provoke it a bit. We can persuade it to go to even greater extremes in its lying and thereby to become more susceptible to exposure. I'm sure you can remember when the Jews of Hollywood and Madison Avenue began pushing miscegenation in a big way perhaps a decade ago. Actually, they began rather cautiously right after the Second World War. They launched their Broadway musical *South Pacific* in 1949 to teach us how wicked it is to be opposed to interracial marriage, but they were careful not to push it too hard for the next couple of decades. But they did keep pushing it, becoming bolder and bolder even as the protests became louder. They followed a similar course with their advocacy of homosexuality. Every time someone tries to call them to account for their racially or socially destructive use of the mass media, they begin wailing about "anti-Semitism"

and then redouble their propaganda efforts. It'll be the same way with these lying hate-propaganda films they're turning out today, such as *The Hurricane.*

It's a real shame that all of this ultimately must lead to the destruction of our society and a horrible bloodbath. But that's the way it always has been when the Jews have really gotten their hooks into a society. Meanwhile, the more people we can get to confront the facts and draw conclusions from them, the better chance we have of salvaging something from the ruin the Jews are bringing on.

The Club

I've been following with interest the reaction of politicians and media spokesmen in Europe to recent developments in Austria. Basically, what has happened is that a man named Jörg Haider won enough votes in Austria's parliamentary elections last October so that his party, the Freedom Party of Austria, became the second strongest faction in the Austrian parliament. Last week members of the Freedom Party became ministers in a coalition government with the Austrian People's Party, which has the largest faction. That's the way the system is supposed to work in a democracy, right? So why are the Jews and their hangers-on around the world screeching and threatening and generally acting as if the sky were falling?

Actually, that's not the way the system is supposed to work. The way it's supposed to work is that the only people who get elected are those who have been given a stamp of approval by the Jews, those who have been certified as "Politically Correct." Really, it's worse than that: to have a major policy role in the U.S. government or the government of any major European country, any major White country, you're supposed to be a member of what amounts to a private club -- the Club -- in which you have been carefully checked out and determined to be "safe": which is to say, determined to be willing to take orders from the secret bosses of the New World Order. You can be a "conservative," *á la* Ronald Reagan or George Bush, and be admitted to membership in the Club, so long as the Club's bosses are sure you'll do what you're told to do, or you can be a flaming leftist, *á la* Bill Clinton or Al Gore. The one requirement is that you be corrupt, that you be a traitor to your people, that you sell your soul in return for the privilege of Club membership and the concomitant possibility of wealth and status and at least the semblance of power.

If you have been accepted into the Club, then you can run for public office, and the controlled media will treat you as a legitimate candidate. If you're not in the Club, you will be treated as a threat to public safety. You'll be treated as dangerous, irresponsible, and hateful. Which is to say, you'll get the treatment Jörg Haider has been getting for the past couple of years, the sort of treatment Patrick Buchanan gets whenever he makes a run for public office. In nearly all cases, this hysterically hostile treatment by the controlled media will frighten enough voters away from you to keep you from being elected. Only if you are a member of the Club and have sworn obedience to the Club's bosses, and they believe that you are in fact corrupt and that they own your soul, can you avoid this hysterical hostility.

Of course, this rule only applies to positions of real power. You can still be elected county dog catcher without having been a Rhodes scholar. In fact, you may even become president of Lower Slobbovia, if the New World Order bosses are too busy with matters elsewhere to control the elections in Lower Slobbovia. But if the president of Lower Slobbovia ever gets too uppity, then the Lower Slobbovians may find cruise missiles and smart bombs coming their way as part of some United Nations "humanitarian" mission, ostensibly to keep the Lower Slobbovians from ethnically cleansing the Upper Slobbovians, or whatever.

Or one may be elected governor of some remote, mountainous province in Austria, if the New World Order bosses are pretty sure they have the rest of Austria firmly under control. That's the way it was with Jörg Haider. Working through a small, conservative party -- the Freedom Party -

- he got himself elected governor of the province of Carinthia, or Kärnten, as the Austrians call it. That's a mountainous, out-of-the-way part of the country down against the border with Slovenia.

Even in such a seemingly harmless position, the Jews didn't like Haider, and they soon began raising the alarm against him. For one thing, Haider's father had been an SS soldier during the war, a member of Hitler's elite fighting force, and Haider recklessly made a public statement to the effect that the SS soldiers really weren't a bad bunch: "Our soldiers were not criminals. . . . They were decent people of good character," he said. That made the Jews go ballistic. Club members are under strict orders never to say anything that might be considered even remotely favorable to Hitler. It's OK to praise Stalin, whose regime murdered 30 million Russians and Ukrainians, because Stalin worked hand in glove with the Jews, but one must treat Hitler as worse than the devil himself, because Hitler is the one man who gave the Jews a real scare in this century.

Then Haider made other public statements: he pointed out that Hitler had had some very good economic policies and employment policies before and during the Second World War, and that the Austrians should consider adopting similar policies today. He also gave voice to the exasperation many Austrians and Germans feel about the Jews eternally having their hands out and demanding more money -- more "reparations" -- for their alleged losses during the war. He said that continued payments to Israel would be appropriate only if the Germans who had been driven out of their ancestral lands by the victorious democratic and communist allies after the war also were compensated. Twelve million German civilians were brutally expelled from territories the victorious conquerors decided should be given to Poland and Czechoslovakia, and nearly three million of them were murdered or died from exposure and starvation during the course of the expulsions. When Haider compared the suffering of these German expellees to those of Jewish forced laborers and concentration camp inmates, the Jews exploded with rage and hatred. They began screaming that Haider is a "Nazi."

But of course, Haider is nothing of the sort, unfortunately. He is only a conservative. Like Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker, however, he is a conservative with a habit of occasionally saying what is on his mind. And when the Jews began screaming at him and calling him a "Nazi," Haider, like Rocker, groveled and apologized. But he also became more and more popular with the Austrians. Despite all of the Jewish hate propaganda directed against him, Haider's Freedom Party continued winning more and more votes in Austria's national elections.

The Haider policy that has done most to make him popular with his fellow Austrians is his anti-immigration policy. The Jews and the other members of the Club have been pouring immigrants from the Third World into Austria since the 1960s, in line with their program to de-Europeanize Europe. Haider has campaigned against this policy, calling for an end to immigration and an end to special benefits for immigrants, and Austrians have responded by voting for him. Immigration from the non-White areas of the world is increasingly unpopular everywhere in Europe, but with Club members in the top governmental posts everywhere, this popular discontent has been ignored by governments and condemned by the media as "racism." In countries such as France, where the National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen has campaigned on anti-immigrant issues, the uncompromising hostility of the controlled media and a solid front among Club members in the

government have kept the nationalists under control. And that's also the way it has been nearly everywhere else, including the United States.

When Haider surprised everyone last October by winning enough votes for his Freedom Party to become the second-largest faction in Austria's parliament, the Jews and their servants everywhere unleashed a non-stop torrent of abuse on Haider and on Austria. "His party may be the second largest now," the Jews declared, "but Haider must have no role in the Austrian government. He must have no control over government policies. The government must remain entirely in the hands of people obedient to us. Otherwise we will punish Austria severely." Of course, the Jews didn't use exactly those words, but that's exactly what they meant.

Then, as it became clear a couple of weeks ago that Haider's Freedom Party would indeed have a major role in Austria's government, the shrillness of the anti-Austrian abuse increased still further. We had the fascinating spectacle of leading politicians everywhere -- France, Belgium, Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Scandinavia, Spain, Portugal -- demanding that the will of the Austrian people be ignored, that the results of Austria's democratic election be set aside: whatever was necessary to keep Haider's party out of the Austrian government. And these leading politicians everywhere are democrats, men supposedly devoted to the idea that the will of the majority is sacred. They also are all members of the Club; they are all men who have made a secret pact with the Jews, and that, really, is what counts. Democracy, the will of the people, majority rule: those are just words, just ideological flypaper for keeping the masses of voters confused.

This really is an important point, and I want to emphasize it. The Jews and their fellow Club members always push democracy. Democracy, they declare, is the only acceptable form of government anywhere, except in various little Third World bantustans, where it's OK to have a head-witchdoctor-for-life, or whatever, because there's no chance that such a system will catch on elsewhere. Everywhere in the White world, however, democracy is required. But the reason that the Jews love democracy so much is only because it is the easiest system for them to control. Whoever controls the media controls the majority of the votes. Democracy works just the way the Jews want it to work -- except when someone who isn't a member of the Club slips through a crack and gets elected, as in Austria. Then we get a chance to see what the Jews and their lackeys really think about democracy. To restate the obvious: what's important to the Jews and the other members of the Club is not democracy, but continued control by themselves. When democracy serves the purpose of keeping them in power, they are fervent democrats. But when democracy instead becomes a threat to continued Jewish rule, they are just as fervent anti-democrats.

So last week, as Haider's people entered the Austrian government and took over the key ministries of defense, justice, and finance -- and also the ministry of social security, which handles welfare payments and other special benefits to immigrants -- Israel's ambassador left in a huff, followed shortly by the ambassador of the ever-obedient United States, while the top politicians in other countries blustered and threatened economic sanctions, a severing of political contacts with countries belonging to the so-called European Union, exclusion from NATO participation, and so on. The media were full of dire warnings that allowing Austrian voters to run their own country poses a major threat to democracy everywhere.

Jews in Vienna used megaphones to whip up mobs of angry immigrants, who smashed store windows and overturned and burned police cars. More than 30 policemen were injured by the rioters. One Jew protester in Vienna, Paul Rubinstein, told a reporter: "This is no longer a Viennese problem or even an Austrian one, but a world one." There really seems to be no limit to Jewish impudence. Can you imagine a gang of Austrians going to Israel and stirring up a mob of Palestinians in Tel Aviv, say, to burn Jewish police cars and then making arrogant statements to the press about what would and what would not be tolerated in the makeup of the Jewish government? Mr. Rubinstein, of course, is right about one thing: what's happening now is a world problem. It's not just the Austrians who have a problem, but also the Russians and the Serbs and the Germans and the people in every country -- including America -- who want to regain their freedom and their national sovereignty.

It really is unfortunate that Jörg Haider isn't the "new Hitler" that the Jewish hate propaganda makes him out to be. His party is still increasing in popularity, primarily the result of Austrian resentment against the anti-Haider pressure being applied by Jews and other Club members. If new elections were held today, polls indicate, the Freedom Party would gain another 15 per cent of the vote and become the largest party in Austria. But as a conservative, Haider will compromise with his people's enemies. He will slow the rate of decline in Austria for a few years, but he will not make the fundamental changes in Austrian society needed for renewed health, nor will he ignite the revolution needed to cleanse Europe. It is notable, however, that most of the Freedom Party's support comes from young people, not elderly conservatives. It is conceivable that the party could evolve in a more radical direction, although that is not likely.

The two main benefits for the world in the recent success of the Freedom Party in Austria are, first, that this success certainly will encourage nationalists in other countries by demonstrating that the Club is not always able to have its way; and second, the Jewish reaction and the reaction of the other Club members to the Freedom Party's success provide for the world a clear demonstration of the totally corrupt nature of the clique which now rules the world: the New World Order clique. Watching all of these supposed "democrats" suddenly change their tune on command and begin denouncing the democratic process in Austria when it doesn't produce the results they want is a truly enlightening experience.

Now I want to give you a five-minute synopsis of the political history of our world. This synopsis will be greatly oversimplified, of course, and it certainly will be based on an incomplete knowledge of the facts. I don't have any secret pipeline to the truth. But I do observe what is happening in the world around me, and I do try to make sense of it. I do look for patterns. I do look for common threads. I do try to understand what's behind it all. And this is what I see: I see that for 10,000 years or so we pretty much ran our own affairs in Europe. Different groups of us did things in different ways. Some of us governed ourselves with a council of elders, a *gerousia;* others had a tribal chieftain; some of us had kings. At the dawn of history, aristocracy was the general rule for our people, but here and there we tried different things at different times. In Greece and in Rome monarchical aristocracy evolved into a sort of aristocratic democracy, where the nobles, the landowners, got together in a senate or a *boule* and voted on policies. Sometimes these aristocratic legislators became sloppy or lazy or careless, and they got too many people involved in the voting. Things became too democratic, and then either the people would

be conquered by their more fit neighbors, or a strong man, a dictator, a Caesar, would take charge and straighten things out for a while, and a republic would become an empire.

At any given time, some people liked the system, and some people didn't. No matter what the system, some of our people were happy, and some weren't. Sometimes things were stable for a long time, and sometimes we had much turmoil, with one war or revolution after another. But the important thing -- the most important thing -- is that we ran things ourselves. We conducted our own affairs, for better or for worse. And on the whole we did a better job of conducting our affairs than non-Europeans anywhere. We fought among ourselves almost continually, but we prospered nevertheless. We advanced. We made progress. Sometimes we had temporary setbacks, as when the Moors conquered Spain in the 8th century and the Mongols conquered Russia in the 13th century. But nearly always we whipped anybody who got in our way. We ruled the world, and ruled it as we pleased, at the beginning of the 20th century. We had many different sorts of government and leaders with different ideologies. We had many rivalries and conflicts among ourselves. But we Europeans, we White people, ran the show.

Some very unhealthy changes had occurred in the White world during the 19th century, however. During the Napoleonic Wars, in the first part of the 19th century, the Jews in western Europe were permitted to leave their ghettoes and were given civil rights. Until the 19th century wise rulers had protected their people from the Jews by keeping the Jews isolated. But in the 19th century they began infiltrating European political, cultural, and social institutions. They began agitating among the lowest European social classes, among the rabble and the resentful pseudo-intellectuals. One of them, Karl Marx, the father of communism, called for the communist overthrow of Gentile society. By the beginning of the 20th century, the Jews had organized two strong movements aimed at acquiring power for themselves: the communist movement, directed outward toward Gentile society. and the Zionist movement, directed inward.

Then came two ruinous, fratricidal wars, each more destructive than any previous war in the history of mankind, and in both of these wars the Jews played a major role behind the scenes. The first of these wars served not only to destroy the long-established social and political order in Europe, but to empower both Jewish movements, communism and Zionism. The behind-the-scenes dealing, in which the Jews promised British politicians to bring America into the First World War on the side of Britain in return for Palestine being given to the Jews, is especially illuminating. This undercover deal, between Britain's politicians and world Jewry, resulted in U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, a Club member who had campaigned on an anti-war platform, suddenly switching his position and demanding U.S. involvement in the war in Europe, even though no vital U.S. interests were served thereby. It made a world war out of the European war and prolonged it by two years, leaving the Russian monarchy so weakened that it could not resist a communist takeover.

The second war finished the job started by the first. With no vital American interests threatened, Club member Franklin Roosevelt again converted a European war into a world war, which rescued both communism and Jewish power in Europe from Hitler -- and finished the destruction of Europe's old power structures and institutions and values. It established the Club -- this kosherised old-boy fraternity of corrupt politicians -- as the hidden but nonetheless supreme political institution; it homogenized political structures and ideologies everywhere in the West,

making mass democracy and Political Correctness mandatory; and it elevated the Jews to the status of Those Who Can Do No Wrong. And that's the way it has been ever since, in Austria and elsewhere.

Elites vs. Masses

One of the most profoundly depressing experiences an American can subject himself to these days is watching the various presidential candidates campaigning on his television screen. My god, what a sorry spectacle! Bush and McCain, Gore and Bradley: these are the "leaders" approved for us by the media masters. These are the men they have said it's OK for us to vote for, the ones they have checked out and decided are safe. And every one of these approved candidates is a man who would be marched straight to the gallows and hanged on the first day of any general cleanup of America: every one of them. There is not an honest man or a patriot among them, not one who will stand up to the media bosses or even wants to stand up to them.

In Austria, where one politician who has not been approved by the media bosses somehow slipped through a crack and ended up with enough votes to gain substantial influence in the Austrian government, the Jews are organizing huge demonstrations of immigrants, communists, feminists, homosexuals, democrats, and the usual rabble. Freedom Party leader Jörg Haider has groveled and apologized to the Jews for saying some Politically Incorrect things in the past, but that's not enough for them. He wasn't approved, he wasn't certified kosher, and they want him out.

In America, on the other hand, all of the major-party candidates have been approved. What a depressing thought! Think how much better off the Austrians are than we are! Well, really, that's not much better, because Haider is nothing but a conservative. He may slow Austria's decline for a while, but he certainly won't clean his country up. Over here we have an approved conservative, a kosher conservative, in the person of George W. Bush, Jr., and three approved liberals, in the persons of John McCain, Al Gore, and Bill Bradley. What a choice!

To me the most depressing aspect of this situation is the way in which the American people have adapted to it. Now, it's true that in the last presidential election, in 1996, a majority -- 51 per cent -- of the eligible voters voted, in effect, for "none of the above," by choosing not to vote. I suppose that I ought to consider that a good sign, but, really, when the choice was between Bill Clinton and Viagra poster boy Bob Dole, who throughout his political life was a disgustingly subservient flunky of the Jews, like John McCain is today, you can hardly blame people for not bothering to go to the polls. What I'm afraid of is that the percentage of the electorate voting this year will bounce back up from its low point of 49 per cent in 1996. In other words, most Americans -- or at least, more than half of them -- still take the charade seriously. That's a shame, but not really surprising.

I always take what I see on the television screen with a grain of salt, but despite the spin applied to the news by the media bosses, there's usually some truth in what they show us. When they show us a sampling of public opinion, a series of little sidewalk interviews, they certainly are able to slant the impression they give us of public opinion by choosing in the editing room which interviews to keep and which to discard, but for the most part the people we see being interviewed after the editing is done are real people. Unlike the anchor person or the interviewer, they aren't paid actors. And so we must believe that there really are such idiots in our population: a lot of such idiots, in fact.

I'm using the word "idiot" loosely here, of course. Most interviewees aren't really stupid; they're just lemmings. They say what they believe is expected of them, what they believe other people would say in their place. Which is why these sidewalk interviews are such a useful tool for the media bosses. The lemmings who are watching the interviews on their screens take their cue from the lemmings who are being interviewed, and so any spin put on these interviews has a real effect on public opinion.

That doesn't really provide a complete explanation of the disaster that has befallen us, however. Lemminghood, I believe, is a hereditary condition. That is, one is either born a lemming or not, and not much can be done to change the condition after birth. But there are other elements of our society who aren't lemmings, but who nevertheless have contributed to the disaster. I was talking with a secret-police agent last week, a man I've spoken with on several occasions in the past. He's retiring now, after 32 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and so he shouldn't be under an obligation any longer to avoid saying anything Politically Incorrect. He's an intelligent man and not unlike many others in his line of work, I believe. I asked him again last week a question I've asked him on several previous occasions: How can he justify working for Bill Clinton? Doesn't he at least have some misgivings working for a government headed by Bill Clinton?

Well, I got the same answer I've gotten from him before. He's not working for Bill Clinton, he told me, or for Janet Reno. He's working to uphold the Constitution, he said. He believes in the system we have, he told me. He believes the system still works. And he said that with a straight face, as if he really believed it. And I think that in some sense, at some level, he does believe it. I don't think he's like the lemming, who foolishly and enthusiastically jumps aboard every trend that comes along. He simply avoids coming to inconvenient or uncomfortable conclusions. And there's probably a bit of authoritarianism mixed in there, as is the case with many career cops and military people: a tendency to assume that might is right.

I think that we see the same sort of mentality at work when military officers support Clinton administration policies on homosexuals and on women in combat. In the past they were unanimously opposed to these policies. But then the Jews demanded that homosexuals be accepted in the military and that women be permitted to be on submarine crews, and the political appointees in the Pentagon scrambled to issue new regulations in line with these demands, and the career military people begin readjusting their thinking to bring it into line. I think that they really justify to themselves their changed views on these matters. Not one in a hundred will do the honorable thing and resign in protest. Instead, they will conform their opinions to whatever is demanded of them -- just as the secret policeman I occasionally speak with, and his Constitution-supporting colleagues, will without hesitation violate every Constitutional right I have if orders come down from Washington to arrest me as an "enemy of democracy," or whatever.

You know, it's not too difficult for us to figure out what has happened to us in retrospect. It's not too difficult for us to understand the mechanics of the way in which the people who control the mass media are able to determine public policy by playing on the psychologies of the susceptible elements of the population. What is eerie to me is the way in which the Jews instinctively went for control of the media at a time when no one had the advantage of hindsight. How did they know, in the first quarter of the last century, when motion pictures were in their infancy and

television was only a dream in the minds of a few visionary engineers, such as Philo Farnsworth, that the key to the control of the world lay in Hollywood?

When I think about it, I'm inclined to believe that it was part instinct and part luck. Jews always have had a mercantile instinct. It's evolved with them in the course of thousands of years during which trade was their principal activity. And a good line of patter, the ability to get the rubes to line up and buy a ticket to the sideshow, is certainly an asset to the man who wants you to buy something from him. In other words, showmanship and salesmanship are compatible traits, and so the Jews may have been attracted to Hollywood -- and to other media -- primarily as a result of their mercantile tendencies, without a long-range plan for using the media to acquire complete domination of our society. Maybe. But it didn't take them very long to see that potential and then to take advantage of it.

As useful as it may be for us to understand how they managed to get the sack over our heads, the more urgent question now is: what are we going to do about it? How are we going to get the sack off? It's an urgent question, because our time is running out. The Jews are using their present advantage over us in an attempt to make it impossible for us to recover. They're keeping our borders open, flooding America with every sort of wretched refuse from the Third World they can coax into the country. They're pushing miscegenation with all of their media as hard as they can, trying to convince our oh-so-desperate-to-be-fashionable young women that bedding down with a Black or some other non-White is the most fashionable thing they can do -- and unfortunately, they're having a lot of success with this race-wrecking program. And they're absolutely determined to repeal the First and Second Amendments to our Constitution, so that I can't warn you about what's coming, and you can't defend yourself when it gets here.

Now, I receive many suggestions from listeners as to what we should do about all of this. Some people tell me that we need to buy a television network -- and I agree with that, but so far no one with this suggestion has sent me a check for $20 billion to make such a purchase possible. Other listeners have told me that we need to run candidates for public office and take the country back by winning the public offices now being held by the treasonous politicians of the Democratic and Republican Parties.

Actually, I believe that it's quite reasonable to run candidates for public office, to use the democratic process -- and any other process we can use for our purpose -- so long as we go about it realistically. That is, we mustn't fool ourselves into believing that we're actually going to succeed in taking back the country that way. The problem is that as long as most of the public consists of lemmings and television remains in the hands of the Jews, the public will vote for an approved candidate, a candidate who has secretly pledged his loyalty to the enemies of our people and who has been certified kosher. But election campaigns do provide a forum, they provide another means of communicating with the public. And they may be the best means for communicating with the most conventional and conservative sector of the public, with those who are authoritarians but not really lemmings, and who believe that everything must be done in accord with the system.

But we really don't have much time for trying things that may be useful in one way or another but that ultimately won't get the job done. We must do what we can do effectively -- and which

ultimately will be successful. So let me spell it out for you: America will not be taken back by people who believe Bill Clinton is an OK guy. It will not be taken back by people who believe that Bill Bradley or John McCain or George Bush or any other TV-approved politician ought to be in the White House instead of Bill Clinton. America will not be taken back by the lemmings. As long as those who are determined to destroy our race are able to control the thinking and behavior of the majority of voters, we must not waste our time and our resources on majority-based schemes. The masses of our people can have a part in taking back America only after the grip of our enemies on their minds has been broken. Until then we must look to the minority of our people able to think for themselves. We must have a plan based on elites, not on the masses.

Many of our people who think of themselves as patriots feel that we have been betrayed by our elites -- and in a sense we have. After the Second World War, when the Jews began pushing their various programs to multiculturalize America -- that is, to break the power of the White majority -- these programs impacted most heavily on the Whites at the bottom of the socioeconomic scale. The White professional and business classes, the Whites with more money and mobility, were better able to protect themselves. When government programs began destroying White neighborhoods and White schools, they could move to safer neighborhoods; they could send their children to private schools. Affirmative action was no threat to them, because Blacks couldn't handle the sort of work they did. The real traitors -- the Kennedys and their ilk -- lived in private compounds with armed guards and felt that they would be able to live well and be safe no matter what happened to everyone else.

And today we still have a high concentration of traitors among the wealthiest Whites. We have the disgusting spectacle of the richest White man in the world trying to buy favor with the Jews and the non-Whites by giving hundreds of millions of dollars to vaccinate Blacks in Africa and pay tuition for Blacks in America. But really, we have few White heroes in any class. The disgusting behavior of Bill Gates is more than matched by the disgusting behavior of the White workers who cheer for Black basketball players and let their daughters run with sub-humans, and by the mindless adoption by White yuppies of every Jew-promoted fashion, no matter how degenerate. And anyway, when I speak of White elites I am not thinking primarily of rich Whites. I am thinking of Whites able to think for themselves, regardless of income. Being rich doesn't automatically bestow the ability to think independently, but being able to think independently does give a person certain advantages in the struggle for survival.

And we should note that the struggle for survival has changed during the past 50 years. The lemmings believe that they are better off than before, because they can buy more shiny gadgets at the mall than they could 50 years ago. To them, this makes up for the prospect of mulatto grandchildren. But many thinking Whites in the professional class are beginning to understand that there are limits to what their money and mobility can get them in a society controlled by Jews. The flood of immigrants from Asia already has impacted on their career prospects the way affirmative action impacted on blue collar Whites a generation ago. Medical schools and graduate schools in America are packed with non-Whites from India and Pakistan and China and Korea and a dozen other countries. These Asians are just as alien as Blacks are, but they are vastly more able. They are able to compete with educated Whites for positions in the professions the way Blacks began competing for factory jobs and service-industry jobs with working-class Whites in the 1960s and 1970s.

What has happened in America in just the last decade has made a big difference for many White professionals, though certainly not for all. Many White professionals -- and would-be professionals, who now are obliged to settle for blue collar work, because there's no room for them in graduate school or medical school or other professional schools -- really have been hit hard. Many are confused by the change. Most haven't figured it out yet, but they are more open to the truth now than they have been at any time in the past. That's why my organization, the National Alliance, is more successful now in recruiting young university faculty members, young engineers, young physicians, young pharmacists, young biochemists, young computer scientists, even young lawyers, than ever before, despite the fact that the economy is keeping most people comfortable.

And, as I indicated a moment ago, it's not just the professionals to whom we must address ourselves. It is the elite minority of our people able to think for themselves, regardless of what they do for a living. The lemmings may not be bothered by the prospect of mulatto grandchildren, and perhaps Bill Gates isn't either, but among the thinking minority plenty of White people are bothered by that prospect.

We have two factors at work here. We have the material factor. We have the realization that life-style and security, that career opportunities, have been damaged by the multiculturalization of America, and that has made some of our independent-minded people receptive to the truth, who a decade ago would have preferred not to think about it. And we have the aesthetic factor, the spiritual factor. We have the realization that life has lost much of its meaning, much of its value, in a darkening world, regardless of material considerations. This realization has opened the minds of many people in the arts. The fact that resistance music is booming as never before is just one consequence of this.

Now, thinking people never will be able to outvote the lemmings. And a howling mob of the dispossessed outside the city gates, acting alone, never will take a strong citadel, but with allies inside to open the gates, the prospects for taking the citadel improve dramatically. We live today in a technocratic society. Money and the media and politics may seem all-powerful at first glance, but all of these elements of power are completely dependent on a technocratic elite, an elite that understands the mechanism that keeps the wheels turning and that has its hands on the levers that control the machine.

Furthermore, the mediacrats depend not only on the engineers and programmers who keep their machinery of illusion running, but also on a creative and artistic minority who create their illusions for them, and not all of these toilers in the illusion factory are Jews.

And so while our television screens are filled with images of the media-approved politicians strutting and smiling and kissing Black babies, we'll continue helping the independent-minded portion of the population understand what's happening. We'll continue building an organization based on that elite minority of the White population. And we'll continue building our media capabilities, our ability for communicating with everyone in the White population willing to listen. I'd be happy to have you join us in this effort.

Fear of the Smear

The enemies of America and of Europe -- the enemies of our people everywhere -- have two guiding principles, two imperatives. The first is to continue backing the racially destructive programs now in place while introducing newer and even more destructive programs through the media and through government legislation. The second imperative is to prevent or neutralize any effective opposition to their programs: that is, to make it impossible for our people to defend themselves.

For example, just two of the racially destructive programs they already have in place are, one, keeping our borders open to immigrants from the non-White areas of the world and, two, doing everything they can to encourage miscegenation. Their immigration program, aimed at flooding White areas with non-Whites, is backed primarily through the government. Their miscegenation program, aimed at increasing the degree of racial mongrelization, is backed primarily by their mass media -- although they also use their influence among the Christian clergy and in the educational establishment to enlist the aid of the churches and the schools in pushing the acceptance of miscegenation among their White victims.

A majority of the people they intend to destroy are kept hypnotized by the mass media and offer no resistance. An independent-minded minority, however, are not entirely happy about our enemies' plans and insist on speaking out and sometimes taking other measures against the programs intended to destroy them. These dissidents who speak against our enemies and their plans are described by the media as "haters," as "extremists." Or, if talk turns to action, the dissidents are denounced as "terrorists." In most cases fear of these labels, fear of being called a "hater," is sufficient to keep the dissidents quiet. After all, most independent-minded people, just like the lemmings, are social creatures. They desire the goodwill of their neighbors, They don't want to be hated or reviled or even feared. They have families and jobs. They don't want their colleagues or coworkers to consider them odd or dangerous. They don't want their friends and acquaintances among the lemmings to shun them.

The media bosses, who are foremost among the enemies of our people, thus have a very powerful weapon in their ability to label arbitrarily as "haters" any dissidents bold enough to speak out against them or their policies or even against the consequences of their policies. Thus, when Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker -- or perhaps I should say, former Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker -- spoke out a few weeks ago, he immediately was labeled a "hater" by virtually all of the mass media. His comments about what a multicultural pigsty New York City has become were denounced as "hate speech." The unanimity of the media reaction to Rocker's rather mild comments gives us a clue that these ritual denunciations are a matter of deliberate policy rather than merely spontaneous and individual expressions of disagreement by the media bosses.

In other words, when I or some other dissident says something the media bosses find disagreeable, the disagreeable comment is unanimously labeled "hate speech." It's never a matter of some of them agreeing with it and some disagreeing; they all denounce it as "hate." I don't have to screw up my face and scream, "I hate you," in order to be denounced as a "hater."

Almost anything I say is described in all of the mass media as "hate speech," simply because it is not Politically Correct, simply because it deviates from the party line. And believe me, there ***is*** a party line.

For example, my organization, the National Alliance, distributes a little index-card size sticker which has printed on it the words: "Earth's most endangered species: the White race -- help preserve it." That's all, except for our name and address.

And yet, every time the media comment on this sticker they use the word "hate." They call it a "hate sticker," "hate propaganda," and the like. They never comment on it without using the word "hate." My people distribute some of these stickers in an area, and a hysterical headline appears in the local newspaper: "Residents alarmed by hate literature distributed in city," or something similar.

Now, don't tell me that this is an independent and spontaneous reaction by the media bosses each time it happens. We've distributed several million of these stickers over the past decade, and I've seen this reaction hundreds of times, all over the country, and it happens according to plan. It is a deliberate stratagem, intended to intimidate people who might otherwise respond positively to the message on our sticker. And the fact that our enemies use their "hate" smear against this particular message confirms what I mentioned a moment ago about their genocidal aims. Their first imperative really is to destroy our race. They don't push for open borders because they love Black and Brown and Yellow immigrants. They do it because they want to destroy us. They don't try to persuade teenaged White girls that it's fashionable to date Blacks because they find the color combination aesthetically attractive. They do it because they want to destroy our people, our race, our civilization, our culture.

Now, if you think that I'm exaggerating about the reaction of the controlled media to my inoffensive, little stickers, just check it out for yourself. The National Alliance will send you a package of 100 of these stickers, postpaid, for six dollars. Get a package of them, stick them up around your community, and then take one to your local newspaper, or send it by mail to your local television station, say that you have seen them stuck on walls and bulletin boards and power poles, and ask what the sticker is about. If you speak with an individual reporter, he or she may not have anything specific to tell you, but if your question elicits a public response from the newspaper or the television station, it invariably will refer to the sticker using the word "hate": invariably it's a "hate sticker" with a "hate message."

I mean, really, there's nothing that any reasonable person could consider "hateful" about asking for help in preserving our race. The aim of those who label this message as "hate" is to smear, to intimidate; it is intended to silence dissenters, to stifle dissent. And it is an unfortunate fact that fear of the smear usually is effective. It made John Rocker grovel and apologize. It is fear of the smear that silences many people who otherwise would respond positively or sympathetically to the message on my stickers. They see one of the stickers, and they think, "Hey, that's right! The immigration situation is out of control. My race really is endangered. I would like to help preserve it. I'd like to contact the National Alliance and see what I can do to help. But if I do, some Politically Correct person may report me to the media, and they will denounce me as a 'hater.' So I'd better just keep my mouth shut and pretend that I never saw this sticker." That's

what happens all too often. People are intimidated by fear of the smear, and the media bosses planned it that way.

Someone sent me a copy of a television program that appeared last week on the Discovery Channel. It was a program about militias -- and in particular about a militia group in Missouri, the 51st Missouri Militia or something similar. Many of the militia members were interviewed, and many of them clearly share some of our concerns and opinions. The militia members all are concerned about the growing infringement of the government on citizens' rights. They all believe that it is right and proper for a free man to keep and bear arms. They all despise the Clinton government. They all deplore the murder of Randy Weaver's family on Ruby Ridge by the secret police in 1992, and they are appalled by Janet Reno's holocaust of innocent women and children in the Branch Davidian church at Waco in 1993.

But they are nevertheless intimidated by the media's power of the smear. They are scared to death of being called "haters." In the program I saw they repeatedly stressed that they are neither racists nor anti-Semites. The group was all White -- at least, every one of the dozens of members shown in the program was White -- but they apologized for this; they apologized and said that they were trying very hard to get Blacks interested in joining; they just hadn't had any success yet: disgusting, really. And they just love Jews. They claim to see no connection at all between Jews and the government's efforts to infringe their Second Amendment rights. They parrot the standard lie of a Second Amendment Judas organization, Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership, to the effect that the first thing Hitler did when he became chancellor of Germany in 1933 was round up all the guns. It's Nazis who are behind the gun-control movement, they claim, not Jews. And one of the leaders of the Missouri militia group stressed that membership in their militia is open to all religions and races. They welcome everyone -- except racists and anti-Semites. They will not tolerate Nazis in their militia. It is painfully clear that they hope their membership policies will curry favor with the media. They are afraid of the smear and believe that they can avoid being smeared by being anti-racist and pro-Jewish.

Fortunately, however, not everyone is so intimidated that he averts his eyes from one of our "endangered species" stickers and hurries away in fear, lest someone sees him reading it. We have raised a rather unmanly crop of men in this generation -- a crop appallingly deficient in civic courage -- but there are still a few real men left -- and a few proud White women too. The media bosses -- the people who want to destroy us -- are concerned about this. And they have a plan for silencing those who are not intimidated by the fear of the smear. What they intend to do is outlaw us -- or at least, make it illegal for us to say what we think. They are working hard on this on several fronts.

The concept of "hate crime" was introduced to the American public two decades ago by America's most powerful Jewish pressure group, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: the ADL. As is usually the case with Jewish plans, it was based on indirection and deceit. The first move was to persuade the politicians to enact legislation which would make any sort of vandalism directed at a church or other building used for religious purposes a new sort of crime, subject to more severe penalties than ordinary vandalism. A few people asked why we needed such a law, since vandalism already was against the law. Why did we need a special law defining vandalism against a church or synagogue as a more serious crime than ordinary vandalism?

Well, the politicians were not about to quibble over such matters and risk being seen as anti-religious, so the ADL's proposal quickly became law in several states. That was the first "hate crime" law.

The second move was a "model ethnic terrorism bill," which the ADL peddled to various state legislatures where they had special clout. It would define as a new criminal offense an act of terrorism directed toward any member of a religious or ethnic minority. An act of terrorism could be a physical assault, or it could be the mere scrawling of graffiti which might be intimidating to members of a religious or ethnic minority. The New Jersey state legislature was happy to enact the ADL's model ethnic terrorism bill into law. Again, some asked why the law was needed, but they were drowned out by the media, which were solidly in favor of such a law, and by the politicians, who were eager to comply.

The ADL now had its foot in the door, and with the aid of an unrelenting propaganda campaign by collaborators in the media began conditioning the public to accept the notion of "hate crime" as an especially despicable type of crime requiring new legislation and especially severe punishment. The novel thing about this notion is that a criminal prosecution can be based on the thoughts of the criminal rather than on his actions. This notion is abhorrent to Western ideas about justice, but in an increasingly multicultural America Western ideas and traditions carry less weight than in the past, and the notion of "hate crime" gained increasing public acceptance throughout the 1990s. "Hate crime" legislation already has been enacted in many states. So today, if I punch another White man in the nose, it's a simple case of assault, a misdemeanor. But if I punch a Jew or a Black or a homosexual in the nose, it may be a much more serious matter. It may be a felony, and I may be punished much more severely than I would be for punching a White man. It all depends upon what I was thinking before and at the time I threw the punch. And to determine what I was thinking the government may inquire into my associations, my political and religious affiliations, my reading habits, even the type of music I listen to. Prosecutors may subpoena my friends and grill them about my opinions on race, Jews, or homosexuality.

Other Jewish organizations have gotten on the "hate crime" bandwagon with the ADL, and they continue to push for even more "hate crime" legislation. We merely have to extrapolate the trend of the last decade to predict with confidence that the Jews will have state "hate crime" laws in every state as well as at the Federal level before the end of this decade. One expects the couch potatoes and lemmings to go along with whatever their television screens tell them. One expects this soulless, spineless crowd to swallow without protest whatever the Jews dish out. What is depressing to me is that the lawyers and judges and legislators -- the people who should have opposed this perversion of our judicial system, this degradation of our legal system, with every bit of strength and influence they have -- the lawyers have sat on their hands and kept their mouths shut from fear of the smear.

Well, that is far from the worst of it. The next phase -- and they're already well into this phase -- is to criminalize "hate speech." It's really not such a big step from the current "hate crime" laws, which base a man's punishment for an offense on the type of books he reads, to "hate speech" laws, which punish a man for what he says or writes. Today the government can upgrade a misdemeanor offense to a felony if a man expresses opinions which the ADL deems "hateful."

Tomorrow, we will jail a man simply for expressing those opinions. For the past few years they've been teaching the trendier law commentators to prattle about how free speech never was an absolute thing anyway, because we never have had the right to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater, and so we really shouldn't object to a few more little restrictions.

Now they're playing the global angle: America, they're telling us, is out of step with all of the more progressive countries of the world. Politically Incorrect speech already is criminalized in Canada, in the United Kingdom, in the Netherlands, in France, in Germany, and in most other White countries. The United States is lagging behind. We need to modernize our legal system in order to catch up with the rest of the world. And so on.

And you know, it's not just the Jews pushing this effort to scrap the First Amendment. They have enlisted their usual assortment of allies: not just Gentile politicians on the make, but also the same sort of riff-raff and resentful haters who make up the Clinton coalition, people who have a grudge against White, heterosexual society, people who are smoldering inside with resentment against real or imagined slights they have suffered at the hands of White men who were free to speak their minds. The radical feminists are right up there with the Jews at the forefront of this effort to muzzle those who don't agree with them.

More generally, the notion of not permitting people to write or say anything which may offend someone appeals to the feminine mentality, regardless of sex. Which is to say, there are all too many White men as well as women today who will agree with the media bosses that we really need to give up our right to offensive speech in order to ensure tranquility in this increasingly multicultural society, where so many people are so easily offended. These feminine thinkers will assure you that they're fully in favor of free speech; they're 100 per cent supporters of the First Amendment. The only kind of speech they want to criminalize is offensive speech. Now, that's not much worse than forbidding people to shout "fire!" in a crowded theater, is it? And we'll have so much more tranquility, we'll be able to consume in so much more comfort and safety, if people are not permitted to offend each other. It's worth it, isn't it?

And it will be so easy, because we already have experts who will tell us just what speech is offensive, just what sort of speech people need to be locked up for. Those nice Jewish boys at the Anti-Defamation League will do it for us, with the help of those nice Jewish boys at the Simon Wiesenthal Center and the Southern Poverty Law Center.

This whole business of preventing people from saying or writing "hateful" things has gained much urgency with the growth of the Internet. It used to be that people who wanted to say things the ADL considered offensive were limited to flyers and pamphlets, because other media were pretty well sewed up by people on the ADL's side: people in the same tribe. But the Internet has changed all of that, at least for the moment. Now a person doesn't have to be a billionaire, he doesn't have to have enough money to buy his own TV network, in order to be able to tell the whole world what's on his mind. The folks in the ADL consider that a very dangerous situation, and they're working overtime to protect us from it. They've already developed an ADL "hate filter," which they're busy persuading public schools and libraries to install on all of their computers. This "hate filter" prevents students or library users from reading anything at a site the ADL experts deem to be offensive. Isn't that nice of them?

Listen, we're out of time today. I'll talk more about this later, because it's an extremely important subject. Much more is at stake than the right of dissidents such as me to dissent. Our entire freedom is at stake and beyond that our racial survival. The nice Jewish boys at the ADL understand that, which is why they have a campaign against the Second Amendment in tandem with their campaign against the First Amendment. We'd better understand it too.

The Killing of Kayla

A number of listeners have told me that I really must comment on the series of horrible murders of White people by Blacks during the past two weeks. My initial response to these suggestions was negative. It is not the purpose of these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts to tell listeners what they already know. If the Jewish media report something well enough for people to get the essential facts of what happened, then I'm inclined to leave it alone.

In the case of these recent race murders, however, it is not entirely clear that the facts were presented adequately. Many people asked me whether or not the carjacker who dragged the six-year-old White boy to his death in Independence, Missouri, on February 22 is Black. They assumed that he is Black, because the murder occurred during a carjacking, which is an almost exclusively Black crime, and also because the murderer wasn't shown on television. Americans have learned from experience that when the media refuse to show them the face of a criminal, it usually is because he is not White. There were many pictures of the victim, little Jake Robel, on television, but none of his murderer.

Well, of course, the assumption was correct. Although most of the national media managed to avoid revealing the race of the murderer, several local newspapers in Missouri carried pictures of him. He was 34-year-old Kim Davis, of Kansas City, a Black criminal who looked as if he'd just been pulled down from a tree in Africa. He was hanging around a sandwich shop parking lot in Independence waiting for an opportunity to steal a car. When little Jake's mother drove up and got out of her car, leaving her six-year-old son in the back seat, the Black seized the chance. He shoved Jake out onto the pavement but left the White child entangled in his seatbelt. As the Black drove off, Jake's mother was trying frantically to free her son from his seatbelt and was screaming at the Black to stop, but he ignored her and roared out of the parking lot behind the wheel of her car, with the child bouncing and scraping along the pavement. He dragged the child for more than four miles, at speeds up to 80 miles an hour, before White drivers were able to block the stolen car, pull the Black out, tie him up, and sit on him until the police arrived. Of course, it was far too late to do anything for the child, except cover his torn body with a blanket.

Police, of course, marked and photographed spots along the route of the dragging where there were pools of little Jake's blood and pieces of his flesh, so that the photographs could be used later as evidence in the Black's trial. Do you remember when three young White men dragged a convicted Black criminal to his death in Jasper, Texas, two years ago? I'm sure that you do, because the media bosses made it a point not to let you forget. Over and over and over again we saw on our television screens those little circles the police had marked along the road where they had found some of the victim's blood. Now, I will promise you that you never will see the spots the police in Missouri marked where little Jake Robel's blood was found. Those bloody spots won't be shown, nor will the Black murderer's face be shown, because the media bosses want you to forget about the murder of little Jake Robel as quickly as possible.

At least, little Jake's dragging received some news coverage for a day or two. That's more than two White women who were dragged to their deaths in carjackings got. Just a week earlier, on February 14, 41-year-old Sandra Roberts was dragged to death in Kansas City. I'll bet you

haven't heard a word about that, and you won't hear about it, for the usual reason. Then there was the murder of Patricia Stansfield in August 1998. The 46-year-old White woman was dragged two miles to her death along a road in Streator, Illinois, by a Black who was stealing her car. After the Black killer, Christopher Coleman, had dragged Patricia for two miles while she screamed for mercy, he eventually stopped, cut her dead body loose, and left her in a roadside ditch before continuing on with her car. And if you didn't hear about this killing from me, you didn't hear about it. The media bosses imposed a total news embargo on the Black-on-White Stansfield dragging, which occurred just after the White-on-Black dragging in Jasper, Texas. They didn't want news about Patricia Stansfield's murder to detract from their massive publicity about the Jasper dragging.

The murder of little Kayla Rolland in Michigan last week received more news coverage than the dragging of Jake Robel, but there was the usual media reluctance to let us know that the killer who shot the six-year-old White girl to death in her first-grade classroom was Black. Most television viewers had to infer that he was Black by learning from news reports that he had been living in a crack house and that he had used a pistol that had been stolen from a local business by one of his adult relatives. If we were lucky we caught a brief glimpse of one of his very Black relatives being led into a courtroom in chains, although we never got to see the killer himself. If we were diligent readers of news reports on the Internet we might have learned that he already had been suspended from school three times -- in the first grade -- once for stabbing a classmate. We might also learn that he had attacked little Kayla on the school playground the day before, and that when he pulled out a pistol and shot her in the neck he told her, "I hate you." None of the news reports that I was able to find, however, came right out and said that he was Black and habitually acted in a way so many other young Blacks do in racially integrated schools, where they cause problems far out of proportion to their numbers. None of the news commentators asked why something hadn't been done to protect little Kayla from this juvenile monster with a record of assaults after his display of hostility and aggression against her the day before. They seemed much more concerned with explaining away the killer's behavior and treating him as a victim of society.

About the only recent Black-on-White killings that have received news coverage that even mentioned the racial element were the murders of three White men in Pittsburgh last week by a Black killer who became enraged when a White repair crew failed to repair the door on his subsidized apartment fast enough to suit him and who told everyone who would listen that he hated Whites and wanted to kill all White people. It was pretty hard for the media to keep the racial angle out of that story. I have a prediction to make, however: the media will let this story die a lot quicker than they let die a couple of other stories about racial killings that come to mind: the story of Buford Furrow, for example, who wounded several Jews and killed one Filipino in Los Angeles last year, or the story of Benjamin Smith, who killed one Korean and one Black in Illinois.

In fact, the Furrow and Smith stories really haven't been allowed to die yet. They remain grist for Hollywood's White-guilt mill. And I'm sure that you're familiar with the technique used by the media bosses for keeping such stories alive. They use the old Watergate technique, the Chinese water-drop technique, in which every day they breathlessly dribble out some new tidbit connected with the story, or if they don't have any new tidbit, they just rehash all of the old

tidbits. One way or another they keep the story in the public consciousness long enough for it to sink in. After the story leaves the front pages, they remind the public about it with television documentaries every month or so. In the past year there already have been several television specials featuring Buford Furrow and Benjamin Smith. I'm quite sure that during the next couple of years we'll see dozens more television specials based on the escapades of Furrow and Smith.

I'll also predict that we won't see any television specials about last week's murder of three White men in Pittsburgh by a hate-crazed Black killer -- not even one -- because they want us to forget about that as quickly as possible. We also will not see Mr. Clinton coming on television and giving us all a little sermon about hate in connection with last week's Pittsburgh murders, the way he did in connection with both the Furrow and Smith incidents. What we did get to see on television after the murder of little Kayla Rolland, however, was Mr. Clinton pushing hard for more gun control laws -- especially a law requiring trigger locks on guns in order to keep kids from using them. Are we supposed to believe that such a law would have kept six-year-old Kayla from being murdered by her Black classmate? Are we supposed to believe that Black crack dealers will run out and buy trigger locks for all their guns if Mr. Clinton and his anti-gun backers succeed in having such a law passed? What we need is minority control, not gun control.

And that brings us to the subject I really want to talk about today. You know, I could go on and on about Black-on-White crime and the reluctance of the controlled news media to report it, because it doesn't fit their agenda of making White Americans feel guilty, of keeping White Americans morally disarmed and off balance. I mentioned three terrible crimes against White people which occurred within the past two and a half weeks, but these Black-on-White crimes are not the point. In a sense they aren't even important. In a sense I welcome such crimes. I welcome them because they remind us of a much bigger problem we have, and that is the destruction of our society, the destruction of our civilization, the destruction of our race by those who have deliberately brought about the conditions in America where six-year-old White girls are murdered in their first-grade classrooms by subhuman animals; conditions where White women and children are dragged to their deaths by subhuman animals bent on stealing a car with total disregard for the lives of anyone who gets in their way; conditions where a subhuman animal flies into a rage because White workers aren't fast enough in repairing the door to his rent-subsidized apartment, which he himself kicked in when he lost his key, and then begins murdering White people, whom he blames for all his own inadequacies.

What's important is that these conditions have been imposed on us deliberately, and we're all obliged to live under them, and they're getting worse, and eventually they will destroy our people. That's what's important. And if it takes the shooting of little Kayla Rolland in her classroom in Michigan to make us think about that, then she died for a good cause. If it takes the dragging to death of little Jake Robel along a highway in Missouri to distract us from our ball games for a few minutes and give just a few of us a chance to see the big picture, then it is worth it.

I know that sounds terrible and heartless to people who are constitutionally incapable of seeing the big picture, to people who are incapable of thinking about anything except in individual and personal terms. All they can think about is poor little Kayla, poor little Jake, the poor fellows who were murdered by a hate-crazed Black in Pittsburgh. What we must think about instead of

what happened to little Kayla is that other little White girls like Kayla all over America, in most of the schools in America, are exposed every day to Blacks like the one who murdered Kayla; that evil people in Washington and Hollywood and New York have deliberately imposed on our country policies which make it impossible for little White girls like Kayla to escape being exposed to Blacks.

Of course, most little White girls like Kayla don't get shot to death by six-year-old primates who have been declared equals and given seats in their classrooms by evil men in Washington who know better. Many more are raped than are shot. Even more are lured into the hip-hop life-style, into the jungle culture of rap and filth and drugs promoted by the Hollywood and new York Jews who control the entertainment media to which millions of little White girls like Kayla become addicted, because it is fashionable to be addicted. And 30 or 40 years from now all little White girls like Kayla -- every little White girl in America -- will be obliged to live in a society in which there is no protection at all because Whites will be a minority: a society in which interracial marriage will be the norm, encouraged by Hollywood even more than it is today. That's what the Jews of Hollywood and New York and the treacherous politicians of Washington who serve them are planning for America. That's why they always overemphasize the rare White-on-Black crime stories and minimize the Black-on-White crime stories. And that's why any incident, no matter how horrible or painful, that makes us think about the future, that alerts us to what is in store for us, should be welcome.

When I see the Hollywood Jews presenting an interracial couple on television in an attempt to persuade young White girls that dating Blacks is fashionable and is something they ought to try themselves, I'm angrier than when I read about the murder of a little White girl by a Black classmate. In the long run it's the interracial sex that is more destructive. And it is the evil men who have deliberately imposed on America the policies which brought about little Kayla's murder who are more reprehensible, more deserving of hanging, than the juvenile primate who shot her.

As early as the 1920s the Jews of America were openly and aggressively promoting their program for multiculturalizing us, for breaking up our homogeneous White society and making us instead into a cosmopolitan hash of various racial minorities that they could more easily penetrate and control. I said "as early as the 1920s;" actually, this behavior on the part of the Jews of working to destroy the solidarity and homogeneity of a society they intend to penetrate and control is thousands of years old. It's in their genes. But in America by the 1920s it was open and very obvious. America was at that time a mixture of Celtic, Germanic, Slavic, and Mediterranean peoples, part Protestant and part Catholic, but all Europeans, all Whites. The freed Black slaves and their descendants had their own separate society. The Indians lived on reservations. It was a White country, and nearly everyone but the Jews assumed it would stay that way. We wanted it to stay that way.

Most of our people never dreamed that anyone would want to force White Americans to accept their former African slaves as "equals" and encourage our daughters to bed down with these "equals." We never dreamed that anyone was scheming to change our immigration laws so that they could block the flow of our people from Europe and instead bring in millions of Chinese and Vietnamese and Pakistanis and Haitians and Mexican mestizos and Soviet Jews and use

them to destroy our cities and our neighborhoods and our schools and organize them into voting blocks for the purpose of disempowering and dispossessing us. We didn't dream that such a thing could happen or that anyone would want it to happen.

We knew that Jews usually were up to no good, and we had signs at the doors of many of our better hotels and restaurants and business establishments: "No Jews Admitted." But most of us never dreamed that this clever but despicable minority would succeed in turning our society upside down, in capturing control of our government, in destroying our institutions, in suppressing our traditions and our values and our standards of behavior, and in making a multicultural pigsty of our country. We never dreamed that the day would come when White parents would be forced by law to send their six-year-old daughters to school with little Black monsters descended from African slaves. And of course, in the 1920s we never dreamed of television and of the destructive power of a Jew-controlled Hollywood.

To be sure, some of our people did try to warn us. In the 1920s the Iron Curtain of Political Correctness had not yet descended on our universities, and many historians, biologists, anthropologists, and other scholars were not afraid to write frankly about racial matters and Jewish matters. Unfortunately, it was all done very politely, in a very gentlemanly manner, and the average White voter never looked up from his funny papers. The Jews, on the other hand, were organizing and propagandizing at all levels, with 3000 years of practice behind them. They were recruiting the more venal and unscrupulous elements among the Christian clergy; the most resentful, neurotic, and ambitious elements among the academics; the most empty-headed and trendy of the would-be "intellectuals." They infiltrated our universities and took over whole departments. They bought our politicians by the hundreds. And of course, they were buying up the mass media as fast as they could elbow their Gentile competitors out of the way.

The "culture war" of the 1920s and 1930s was short and decisive. We never even took our gloves off, and they whipped us good. Then they were able to lie us into the Second World War, and after that our goose was cooked. They used the dislocations associated with the war to introduce far-reaching changes into our society, and within 15 years after the war they had our whole society in turmoil. And today White children and White women are dragged to death behind cars being stolen by Blacks, and the media keep it hushed up while saturating us with images of a few Whites committing crimes against non-Whites. And six-year-old White girls are murdered in their classrooms by little Black monsters who are treated as victims of a White-racist society.

And all the while they hammer into us day and night with their media the defeatist notion that the multiculturalism they have imposed on us is here to stay, that there's nothing we can do about it, and so we'd better get used to it. They believe that they've got us beaten down to the point now where nothing will make us rebel.

Well, listen Jewboys! You're dead wrong. Just let a few more of our women and children get butchered by your multicultural pets, and you'll see what we can do about it. The war isn't over, and this time we'll fight with our gloves off. Payback day is coming. We'll start with the traitors among our own people, with the politicians and the journalists. But we will get around to you. Believe me, we will!

The Health of the Nation

A physician who wants to ascertain the health of a person checks his weight and blood pressure, listens to his heartbeat and breathing, examines his skin, and so on. The physician knows what signs to look for, what measurements to make in order to decide whether his patient is healthy or ill. He knows what signs are important and which have no fundamental significance.

If we want to determine the health of a nation, we likewise look for signs and make measurements. And of course, it's necessary to understand which signs are the important ones. Most Americans today seem to believe that the only important signs are economic signs. They believe that if the stock market is going up, unemployment is low, and people are spending lots of money, everything is rosy. Which is to say, if they are economically comfortable, if they can buy the things they want, they are inclined to believe that the nation is healthy.

Of course, they do worry a little about the schools: about the continual lowering of standards, about the substitution of more and more Mickey Mouse courses in the place of history and mathematics and grammar. They have an occasional flash of worry that we may be raising a less competent generation than the one before. But, hey, the economy is okay, so don't worry. They believe that we can spend more money on the schools, and that will make up for the lower standards and the watered down curriculum.

They may become a little depressed when they look at the array of candidates running for public office. The polls show that approximately half the electorate is willing to vote for a loyal member of the gang that gave us the Bill and Monica show and, last year, willfully slaughtered White women and children in Belgrade for no good reason. And the other candidate really is not much better. He also would have unleashed the cruise missiles on the women and children of Belgrade in order to teach that guy Slobodan a lesson in dee-mo-cra-cee, rather than risk the wrath of Madeleine and her tribesmen, who had demanded the war against Serbia. Well, contemplating the candidates is depressing, but the malls are still full of shiny stuff waiting to be bought, and the limit hasn't been reached on the credit card yet, so the country must still be healthy.

The average citizen certainly has misgivings when he reflects on the increasing darkening of America's racial complexion: when he notes, as Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker did, that fewer and fewer of the people he sees and hears on the sidewalks of our cities speak English or look like the sort of people he grew up with. But all of the media bosses and the politicians and even his priest or minister assure him that more diversity is good for America, that it strengthens our economy. So the country must be healthier than ever. Right?

No, not right. Judging the health of a nation by how much shiny junk is for sale in the shopping malls and how much the average citizen can charge on his credit card is like judging the health of a man on the basis of whether or not his shoes are shined and his fingernails are clean.

There are several things that are important to the health of a nation, and these things have relatively little to do with shopping malls and credit cards. Natural resources are important, of

course. A country rich in minerals and land and timber and fresh water is better off than one with fewer natural resources -- other things being equal. Of course, it is seldom that other things are equal. The countries of Black Africa have enormously rich natural resources, but health-wise they are all basket cases. Without the boost given to them by Europeans during the colonial period, their people still would be eating each other. Some of them still are, in fact. And since the Europeans gave up on their colonies, the Africans have been sliding back down into the jungle. They are unable to take care of themselves. Whenever a natural disaster occurs, as with the flooding in Mozambique recently, they are dependent on help from Whites.

Japan, on the other hand, is very poor in natural resources but nevertheless is infinitely healthier than any Black country. The Japanese never ask for outside help from anyone. They take care of themselves. And despite their lack of minerals they are enormously wealthy. So what's the secret? Why is Japan so much healthier, so much more fit, than Mozambique, despite having so much less land and resources? Well, of course, you already know the answer. It's the difference in the quality of the people.

For every nation, the one essential determinant of national health is the quality of the people who make up that nation: their genetic quality -- which is to say, their racial quality -- and their moral quality. Everything else, including the state of the economy, ultimately depends on these two elements. A nation whose population is intelligent, creative, resourceful, energetic, and able to solve problems and plan ahead, ultimately will be a healthier nation than one whose people are dull, lazy, and able to think only about the present, regardless of mineral wealth or other advantages. Genes are the determining element.

And a nation whose people are disciplined, racially conscious, and imbued with a strong sense of responsibility will be healthier than a nation whose people have the same genes but who are accustomed to permissiveness and self-indulgence and to thinking only about themselves, who do not feel any sense of belonging to their race or any sense of responsibility to it. When genes are equal, morality is the determining element.

Now, with that introduction, let's talk about the immigration situation in this country. Let's talk about it in a specific and personal way. Roger Barnett is a rancher in Arizona. He has a cattle ranch in Cochise County, in southeastern Arizona, near the town of Douglas, which is right on the Mexican border. Last month, on the afternoon of February 19, driving in his pickup truck along U.S. Highway 80 east of Douglas, he pulled alongside a van carrying 10 Mexicans. With horn honking and lights flashing, Barnett forced the van to stop. Determining that all 10 occupants of the van were illegal aliens, Barnett and his brother performed citizen's arrests of the Mexicans and escorted the van to the Border Patrol station in Douglas, where they turned the Mexicans over to the Border Patrol for deportation.

Now, Roger Barnett is not a policeman, and he's not a Border Patrol agent. He's just a rancher, a private citizen. He'd much rather be tending to his cattle than rounding up illegal aliens. Yet in the last two years he estimates that he's arrested more than 1,000 -- more than 1,000 -- illegal aliens on or near his ranch. That's getting close to two a day, and it doesn't leave him much time for ranching. He's not paid to apprehend illegal aliens, but he does it because the Border Patrol is, in effect, paid not to do it. And he does it because the Mexicans are ruining his ranch.

Heading north across his land, they leave a trail of trash and filth and destroyed vegetation behind them. Where they camp the ground is littered with debris and human feces. They cut down Barnett's trees for firewood to build campfires. Empty plastic bottles, discarded diapers, and other trash are everywhere, posing a hazard to his cows. The cows will eat plastic trash, and it jams up their digestive tract and kills them.

It's not just a few Mexicans sneaking across the border. It's a non-stop flood, an invasion by a huge army. And the Border Patrol, under orders from the Clinton administration, deliberately lets the invaders come across the border, only pretending to try to stop them by arresting a few each day. Those few who are apprehended never are punished or imprisoned; they are simply sent back across the border to try again. When Barnett arrested the 10 illegals in the van on February 19, the Mexican consul in Douglas, Miguel Escobar Valdez, tried to have him prosecuted for assault and unlawful imprisonment. A lot of other people also were wringing their hands and moaning about Barnett: "taking the law into his own hands."

Local liberals and church spokesmen were complaining that he had "intimidated" the illegal aliens and "violated their civil rights." The local prosecuting attorney, Chris Roll, said:

"This is conduct we all wish wasn't happening and do not condone, yet we cannot go forward unless there is sufficient evidence of a crime for a jury to convict."

What that means in plain language is that the prosecutor would love to lock Barnett up for trying to keep the illegals away from his ranch, but he knows that he couldn't get a local jury to convict him for anything because all of the other ranchers and businessmen and homeowners in the area sympathize with Barnett, even if they don't have enough courage to do the same thing themselves. The liberals are hoping that one of Barnett's arrests of illegals will end up in a shooting. Then they will yell for Janet Reno, and Barnett will be prosecuted for a "hate crime."

You know, this goes far beyond the usual liberal bias in favor of the criminal and against anyone who gets tough with a criminal. The law is clear. The illegal aliens are breaking U.S. law simply by entering our country, completely aside from the laws they break after they are in the country, by trespassing on Barnett's ranch and destroying his property. The U.S. Border Patrol is charged with keeping them out and with arresting them if they get in. But the U.S. Border Patrol is under the jurisdiction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service is headed by a woman named Doris Meissner, who, even if she weren't a Jewess, would be carrying out the policy of the Clinton administration, which is to let anyone into the country who will strengthen the feminist, Jewish, homosexual, racial minority, welfare coalition against the normal, healthy, self-supporting, heterosexual White men and women who used to be America.

You might think the Republicans would raise hell about this policy, but they're afraid to. In the first place, they're afraid of being called "racists" by the media -- and they're afraid that the Mexicans who're legally in the country will vote against them if they're seen as anti-immigrant. Of course, nearly all of those votes go to the Democrats anyway, but the Republicans believe that the Mexicans will continue swarming into the country because they think that Americans just aren't tough-minded enough to support the firm policies required to halt the flood, and so instead

of trying to keep them out the Republicans are trying to out-Democrat the Democrats in being nice to them.

The fact is that the government could halt all illegal immigration immediately, and I mean today, if it wanted to, simply by announcing that anyone attempting to cross the border illegally would be shot on sight and then demonstrating that we meant it. That would do it. We could spend the next three months building an adequate set of fences, installing intrusion sensors, and so on. But just shooting a few hundred illegals the first day would be enough to stop the flood. It wouldn't require any more resources than the Border Patrol is using now. All of the excuses we hear about the government not being able to afford enough Border Patrol agents to patrol the border, and that it's impossible to keep the Mexicans from climbing the fences we build or cutting through them or burrowing under them, are simply lies. We could stop them all in a day with almost no effort.

Of course, the liberals and the Jews in the media and the Christian churches would wail long and loud if the government actually got serious about protecting our borders. The government would have to be prepared to deal with them. But of course, the government isn't about to begin protecting our borders.

Our real problem is that we don't have enough Roger Barnetts. And we don't have enough people who really understand how bad the problem is. The ranchers along the border understand. They see the size of the flood, and they also see the appalling lack of human quality among those who make up the flood. In the rest of the country, the perception is not as clear -- but it is becoming clearer as the mestizos continue pouring in. Communities that ten years ago had only a relatively small Mexican problem -- and that 20 years ago had no Mexicans at all -- are finding themselves overwhelmed by the Mexican invasion today, and these communities being overrun by mestizos are not just along the border: they are all over the country. The big agribusiness tycoons are importing them by the hundreds of thousands for farm labor, for work in poultry plants, and for other low-wage work, and the Clinton government is pretending not to notice. One of the worst offenders is Bill Clinton's bosom buddy and financial supporter, Arkansas chicken-processing billionaire Donald Tyson, of Tyson Foods.

As I said, the mestizo problem is spreading all over the country. Last month my organization, the National Alliance, organized a public demonstration in Siler City, North Carolina, to protest the government's refusal to arrest and deport illegal aliens. Ten years ago Siler City, a little town of about 6,000 residents, was almost entirely White. Today it is 40 per cent Mexican, because two poultry processing plants in the town have been bringing mestizo workers in, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service has done nothing to stop them. The government ignores its own laws, and because of this the mestizo population of the state of North Carolina has doubled in the past decade.

And let me tell you, the people do not like this. In communities such as Siler City, which have been especially badly impacted by the mestizo invasion, the people are angry. They don't like it that the schools, which were built with their taxes, and used to be clean and safe and White, now are overrun with Mexicans. They don't like it that the drug problem and the gang problem and the crime problem and a dozen other big problems which came along with the Mexicans have

made their town a far less pleasant place to live. Like John Rocker, they prefer their neighbors to be White and to speak English. Of course, the agribusiness tycoons -- the Donald Tysons -- don't really care what they prefer. And clearly, the government doesn't either.

When the National Alliance was demonstrating in Siler City last month, the White citizens were on our side, and the media, the politicians, and the preachers were on the Mexican side. The media are on the Mexican side because multiculturalizing the country -- destroying the White majority -- is a deliberate policy with the media bosses. The politicians are on the Mexican side because the agribusiness tycoons and the media bosses are. The agribusiness people slip them money, the way Donald Tyson used to slip money to Bill Clinton in Arkansas, and they know that if the media bosses turn against them they'll never be allowed to win another election. Furthermore, they don't think the White citizens have the will to stop the invasion. The preachers are on the Mexican side because to them a Brown soul is as good as a White one. The churches had a few counter-demonstrators in Siler City carrying signs with slogans such as, "God sees no borders" and "The only race is the human race."

Now, to return to the subject of national health: the mestizo invasion of the United States clearly is making a profound impact on the genetic constitution of our population. Our inability to stop this invasion is a clear indicator that our moral health already has suffered a profound impact. We need a million Roger Barnetts, and we have only a handful. The rest of the people who agree with him are too intimidated by the media to speak out. No, it's worse than that: they are too cowardly to speak out.

Silicon Valley may be keeping the economy zooming along for now, but that is only a superficial sign of health, a misleading sign. America is like a man whose body is riddled with cancer, but who still manages to keep his shoes shined and his fingernails clean. Genetically, our health is declining fast. The government's Census Bureau estimates that somewhere between 30 and 50 years from now the mestizos and the Blacks together will outnumber the Whites. That doesn't bother the preachers, of course. And it doesn't bother the agribusiness tycoons, who figure that the cost of labor should be lower than ever. And it doesn't bother the politicians, so long as they still can count on their place at the public trough. And it pleases mightily the Jewish media bosses and their liberal camp followers, who have been striving for that goal all along.

But having their grandchildren growing up in a country where Blacks and mestizos will outnumber them, a country with the sort of society that Blacks and mestizos will transform our society into -- a society of barrios and drugs and brutality and all-pervading corruption -- that should concern decent, intelligent White people. And it does concern them, when they're not too busy using their credit cards at the shopping mall or watching the ball game on TV. I mean they know that is what is in store for America. They know that we will have a society which is a cross between that in Zambia and that in Nicaragua, the sort of society that Blacks and mestizos always create. The Census Bureau has announced it. The Jews and liberals are gloating in anticipation.

The fact that they know what is being done to America, they know what is ahead for their grandchildren, and they haven't risen up in righteous fury and hanged every politician and every

media boss and every agribusiness tycoon is medical proof that morally the country already is dead and beginning to stink.

Can a nation which is morally dead save itself from dying genetically as well? Are there still enough Roger Barnetts among us to turn the tide? Well, if I believed that it couldn't be done, I wouldn't be talking with you today. But I would appreciate some help. So would Mr. Barnett.

Returning Fire

The question on the mind of every patriot, of every concerned American, is, "What should we do to oppose most effectively the enemies of our people? By what methods should we fight the media bosses, the politicians, the liberals, and the others who are destroying our society, our civilization, and our race?"

I was on a Christian radio talk show a few days ago, and the consensus seemed to be that we should read our Bibles and pray. I really don't believe that's going to get the job done.

When I talk with conservatives, most of what I hear is about voting: about electing the right politicians to the Congress and the White House. Some of them favor the Republicans, and some favor a third party. And I should tell you that I have about as much confidence in that approach as I do in praying. If we had a proportional representation system in this country, like they have in many European countries, so that we might hope to elect just a few responsible people to the Congress and have a voice there, then I suppose I would have just a little more patience with conservatives. But as long as we're stuck with the two-party shell game in this country, voting will no more get the job done than praying.

When I talk with some of my young radical friends, especially those of the skinhead persuasion, they're inclined toward bombing, burning, slaying, and pillaging. They would like to lay waste to this whole evil thing that our society has become today. Some of their music certainly reflects that attitude, and I'm inclined to believe that their music is a frank expression of what they're feeling. And really, when I examine my own feelings, they're the same. This society calls out to be destroyed as much as Sodom or Gomorrah ever did.

Whenever I see that smiling, lying piece of filth we have in the White House come on my television screen and remind us all that he's still there, still President, still commander in chief of our armed forces -- and worse than that, still accepted by most Americans as their President -- then I must ask myself how reasonable men can believe that the same system that put Bill Clinton into the White House -- that the system that got us into this cesspool -- can get us out again. I mean, approximately half of the electorate seems to be enthusiastic about having as their next President a man who has been a faithful helper of the current piece of filth. And as for the Republicans, all I really see is a difference in degree, not in kind. The Republicans appeal to a slightly more successful stratum of the population, a slightly more sophisticated stratum, and so they themselves are obliged to be slightly less obvious in their crookedness and treason. But really, are there ten righteous men in the whole, rotten system to justify trying to preserve it? I think not.

I had to visit New York City on Wednesday and Thursday of this week to do a Mike Wallace interview for *60 Minutes II.* And God, you know, I felt just like John Rocker did when he surveyed Times Square: zoo city. The New York Jews call it "diversity," and they love it. I call it ugliness and degeneracy incarnate, and I hate it. My gut feeling was that the whole city ought to be leveled to the ground and then plowed with salt. When I see one of the women of my people -- a White woman -- walking along a New York sidewalk arm in arm with some dusky denizen of

the African jungle, because she has been taught that fashion by the New York lords of the television screen, I feel a rage inside myself that is difficult to suppress. Why should I not be able to do what is right and natural and kill those who commit such an abomination as well as those who teach them to commit such abominations? I feel it my duty as an upright man of my race to do everything in my power to stamp out those who defile my people. I feel it my duty to set an example for others.

And it makes me feel sick when I must suppress this rage. But you know, that is what I ask the young people to do when they listen to their fighting music. I tell them that they need self-discipline: that it is fine to listen to people singing about slaughtering the enemies of our people, because it helps to build consciousness and determination, but they must control their rage and not let it become self-destructive. They must not turn to vandalism or hooliganism or mindless, drunken brawling and end up in prison, but instead they must harden themselves and train themselves for the time when their rage can be used constructively.

So, what about the rest of us? What should we be doing now?

In trying to answer that question we must be constantly aware of the truly bizarre situation we're in today. It's surreal. A war of annihilation is being waged against us. It's taking a terrible toll, doing enormous damage to us, and yet most of us go about our daily business as if nothing unusual were happening. Our cities are being invaded and taken over. Our suburbs are being invaded. Our schools have been made into jungles.

Here are a few statistics, which you can check for yourself in almost any good almanac: in 1950 90 per cent of the population of the United States was White. Most of the other 10 per cent was Black, and they kept to themselves; we didn't have to look at them. Today Whites are down to just over 70 per cent. It's actually much worse than that, since the total population of the country has nearly doubled during the past 50 years, up from 151 million in 1950 to more than 280 million today, including illegal aliens. That means that we have more than five times as many non-Whites in the country as we had 50 years ago and three times as many non-Whites relative to our own numbers. Furthermore, we're having them all rubbed in our faces; they don't keep to themselves in their part of town, in their schools, like they used to.

We certainly notice these things, even though they have taken place over a period of several decades. They affect our daily lives.

And you know, this invasion of our living space by non-White minorities isn't something that just happened, like global warming. It has been engineered by those whose aim is to wipe out our people, to destroy our race. Our enemies are so close to their goal now and so certain that they will achieve it that they are boasting openly that within the next few decades they will have the White race in America reduced to minority status; then they can finish us off by means of the democratic process. Bill Clinton has made this boast a number of times during the past few years when speaking to Jewish or liberal audiences, and he always gets a lot of applause. Some of those who applaud are just being trendy, just going along with the fashion of hating White people and worshipping the idea of equality and multiculturalism, but others are active-duty members of the enemy army.

What these enemies are doing to us is as much a hostile action as if they were firing artillery projectiles across our borders and dropping bombs on our cities. We should be actively defending ourselves. We should be shooting back. We should be going from door to door with a list of names and slaying those who have engineered this assault on our people. And really, it is an engineered assault: the change in our immigration laws to bring in millions of non-Whites from around the world while cutting off the immigration of Whites from Europe; the refusal to round up and deport illegal immigrants except on a token scale; the forced integration of Whites with non-Whites in schools, neighborhoods, and work places; the encouragement of miscegenation by the controlled mass media. Those things are all deliberate. They all have been planned.

And we know who the engineers are. They have not engineered this war against our people without revealing their hands. They are, first and foremost, the media bosses and the other leaders of the Jews. The Jews were the prime movers behind the changes in our immigration laws, they were the most powerful backers of all of the so-called civil-rights laws that have destroyed our schools and neighborhoods; and, most importantly, they are the producers and disseminators of the poisonous propaganda of equality and racial mixing coming from Hollywood and New York that keeps our people softened up and unresisting. And the Jews have picked up an army of Gentile camp followers: politicians, preachers and church leaders, feminists and homosexuals, members of the liberal educational establishment.

The politicians are simply amoral opportunists, who will dance to whatever tune is being played by the controlled media at the moment. And that's all that any of them are, at least in the political mainstream. Whenever one who isn't simply an amoral opportunist shows up on the sidelines and tries to participate, he gets the Pat Buchanan and Jörg Haider treatment.

The preachers and church leaders see an advantage for themselves in a dumbed-down population, a more credulous and superstitious population, and they are just about as opportunistic as the politicians. Christian leadership really has gone downhill fast during the past few centuries and especially during the 20th century. Bob Jones University used to prohibit miscegenation, and that really was its one claim to righteousness, but look how quickly it caved in and abandoned that claim a couple of weeks ago just to avoid media criticism. Compare that spineless and opportunistic behavior with the principled stand made by Martin Luther 480 years earlier. He was ready and willing to be burned at the stake over far less fundamental doctrinal matters.

The feminists and the homosexuals have turned against their own people and become partisans of the Jews because they see that as the better chance for hanging on to the unnatural advantages they now have. They're afraid that if White men ever regain control of the situation they'll be forced to go back into the kitchen -- or the closet, as the case may be.

And as for the liberals, many of them are simply opportunists like the politicians. They are ideological chameleons, without any real morality, without souls. They are for whatever is Politically Correct at the moment and against whatever is not. It is Political Correctness itself which is important to them, rather than any specific doctrine. As for the rest of the liberals, the

ones who really believe the lunatic doctrines of equality and diversity and multiculturalism which they endorse, they're simply crazy and ought to be put down like the sick puppies they are.

Anyway, that's the situation with which we're faced. It's a more dangerous situation, a more threatening situation, than any we have faced in the past, including invasions by Moors and Mongols and Turks. We knew how to fight back against those other invaders, and we did. You saw a Turk, you either killed him or he killed you.

There are three big differences between our earlier wars for survival and the war we're engaged in today. First, the earlier wars had an element of suddenness in them which is lacking in today's war. When a band of Mongol horsemen suddenly appeared on the horizon, and you could see the smoke of burning villages behind them, you didn't go back to your ball game or wait around to see what would happen next.

Second, the degree of treason among our people is vastly higher than it ever has been before. When the Moors invaded the Iberian peninsula in the eighth century, the people who secretly opened the city gates to them were Jews, but our own people were solidly united against the enemy. When the Mongols invaded Russia and when the Turks were laying siege to Constantinople, there probably were a few traitors among our people who were working secretly for the enemy, but the number certainly was very small. Today, our whole society is riddled with traitors from top to bottom. In particular, the entire political power structure and much of the rest of the leadership of our society is in the enemy camp. Kill an enemy soldier, and your own police will grab you and lock you up. As I said, it's a bizarre sort of war.

The third big difference is the role of the mass media. This is the first real race war in which we've been involved in which there have been any mass media, and they are nearly all in the hands of the enemy. The enemy uses the mass media in two ways. He uses them to control the outcome of the democratic political process: it is through his media that the candidates and issues are presented to the public. Thus the politicians automatically fall into his pocket. And he uses the media to confuse the public and paralyze its will to resist.

Everything that happens in the world is shown to the public through the distorting lens of television. The Jewish media bosses are able to put their spin on every issue and on the explanation of every development or event. If the Jews decide that we need to starve another million Iraqi children to death with our blockade of Iraq, so that that country will not be able to pose any threat to Israel in the future, Michael Eisner's ABC television news programs will explain why the maintenance of the blockade is necessary for the comfort and security of couch potatoes all over America. If the Serbs persist in their determination to reclaim their sovereign territory now occupied by Madeleine Albright's NATO soldiers -- if the Serbs continue to complain that those soldiers are protecting the KLA murder squads which are ethnically cleansing Serbia's Kosovo province of its remaining Serbs -- then Sumner Redstone can have his CBS television commentators explain why another humanitarian bombing of Belgrade is the right thing for our government to undertake. That will be enough to keep the couch potatoes placidly watching their ball games.

The media, unfortunately, are engaged in activities which are much more destructive than just keeping the public confused about what's happening, however. They take a proactive role in destroying the will of the public to resist, in persuading large segments of the public to cross over to their side. They subvert some, and they intimidate others. It is the Jewish media that have persuaded White children by the millions to imitate the dress, speech, and manners of Blacks and to listen to the morally and culturally destructive music of Blacks, even to chant anti-White ditties along with their favorite Black rap artists -- and that also have conditioned White adults to spend hundreds of hours every year cheering the antics of Black basketball players, to regard the more skillful Black ball players as celebrities, as heroes, as role models. The mass media of news and entertainment in the hands of the Jews give them a bigger military advantage over us than a thousand armored divisions on the ground and a fleet of ten thousand B2 bombers in the air, fully loaded with nuclear bombs: a formidable force indeed.

Now, because the media are the enemy's most powerful weapon, I have taken the simpleminded approach of trying to fight back by building our own media. I don't know that what I'm doing will be enough, but I do know that without a voice that can reach all of our people, inform all of our people, and inspire some of our people, we are lost. If the voices of the enemy are the only voices our people hear, then we are lost.

One can see the proof of this in a thousand ways. Consider just the immigration problem, for example: Mexican immigrants are imported by the thousands into a formerly White area to work in a poultry plant or to do farm labor. The local White people become upset when their taxes go up, their schools begin filling up with young Mexicans, and their women aren't safe on the streets any longer. At this point the politicians and the preachers and the social workers begin assuring the people that having the Mexicans in their area is all for the better; that it will help the economy, that it will add "diversity" to their schools, and more "diversity" is always a wonderful thing; that we are a nation of immigrants, and there always are a few little problems of readjustment when a new wave of immigrants arrives, and so we should just be more patient and more tolerant. Et cetera. And besides, it's inevitable, there's nothing you can do about it, and if you don't like it you're a racist or a "hate criminal."

This is the message in all of the enemy media: in the newspapers, on the radio, on local television. And when that's all the people hear, they become discouraged. They don't fight back. They don't start shooting politicians and preachers and breaking the necks of social workers and running the Mexicans back toward the border, because they know that the enemy's police and troops would arrive to protect the Mexicans and arrest the Americans. So they give up and resign themselves to the enemy takeover of their communities, their schools, their economy. That's the way it is in most places in America today. But in a few places we are beginning to have our own voice. In a few places my organization, the National Alliance, has been able to contradict the enemy: when a White community in North Carolina was overwhelmed by Mexicans, we were able to organize public protests and let the people know that they don't have to resign themselves to the invasion, that they can fight back; when Bill Clinton's friend and supporter Donald Tyson brought tens of thousands of Mexicans into White areas of Arkansas to work in his Tyson Foods poultry plants, we were able to put up enough stickers and distribute enough leaflets at least to let the local people hear an opposing voice, to let them know that there is another view besides that of the politicians and preachers and social workers.

What we are able to do now in countering the massive firepower of the enemy's media isn't much, of course. It's like using a BB gun to return the fire of a missile cruiser. But our voice is growing louder and reaching more people. Three or four months from now it perhaps will be equivalent to a .22 caliber rifle. And one of these days we'll blast that missile cruiser right out of the water. Meanwhile, it wouldn't be a bad thing for a lot of other people to get out their BB guns and help us return fire.

The Wages of Selfishness

When I began to think about today's program, I had the notion that I would talk with you about something positive and optimistic for a change, instead of telling you about still more instances of media cover-up of Black-on-White hate crimes or about the Clinton government's crooked shenanigans or about the Jews' efforts to corrupt our society even further and take away even more of our freedom. Unfortunately, I couldn't think of anything really positive to tell you about.

I mean, when you see everything around you coming to pieces, when you see your whole society going down the drain, when you're having your face rubbed every day in the prospect of imminent racial extinction, when you see Bill Clinton's grinning mug on every television news program, it's pretty difficult -- and unrealistic, I believe -- to be optimistic. But then I remembered a book I had read while flying back from an interview in New York last week. It's a book someone had sent me, and its title had grabbed my attention, and so although I ordinarily never have time to read books these days I grabbed it and took it with me when I headed for the airport to go to New York last week, and on the way back I actually read it. The book is titled *The Rise of Selfishness in America,* and its author is a fellow named James Collier, who has written some 50 other books about our society.

So here's the optimistic angle to today's program: Collier is a flaming liberal, but he nevertheless has come to many of the same conclusions I have. The man cherishes the ideas of democracy and equality, and he has a lot of other really foolish notions as well, but he has examined the world around him and understands that it is coming apart. He understands that America is in a state of terminal decline and is headed toward a disaster from which it probably will not recover. And he assigns most of the blame for this impending disaster to the transition during the last century from a community-oriented citizenry to a self-oriented citizenry.

He certainly looks at the world differently than I do. He focuses on different things and describes things differently. He manages to avoid mentioning the Jews, for example, even when writing about the destructive role of television in our lives. But he nevertheless reaches many of the same conclusions I have reached. I doubt that it would have been possible for a liberal to have written such a book 20 years ago. I think it must have been very difficult for a liberal even in 1991, when *The Rise of Selfishness* was written, to take off his rose-colored spectacles and decide that all of the wonderful, "progressive" programs being pushed by the government and the media were not really producing progress.

I remember that during the 1960s and the 1970s, when the Jews were in the process of turning American society upside down, all of the liberals I knew were deliriously happy about the changes. Even today most liberals look back on that period as a time of wonderful social progress. But Collier has taken a closer look than most liberals have at the implications of the changes of the 1960s and 1970s. Anyway, the fact that even a few liberals are beginning to understand that many of the liberal programs of the last century have had profoundly damaging consequences is encouraging to me. I think that what has happened is that these few liberals finally have realized that they are in the same boat with the rest of us, and that when the boat

sinks as a result of all those holes they've been so industriously boring in the hull, they're going to drown along with the rest of us.

Among other things, Collier contrasts the Victorian ethos -- that is, the ideas, attitudes, and ideals which characterized American society during roughly the latter half of the 19th century -- with the ethos of the latter half of the 20th century, and especially of the last quarter of the 20th century. I should confess that the word "Victorian" used to have a negative connotation for me, primarily because I have associated Victorianism with prudery and hypocrisy. I always have appreciated female beauty and female company, and the refusal of the Victorians to deal in a forthright manner with the sexual side of life seemed unnatural and unhealthy to me. Collier correctly points out, however, that there was far more to the Victorian ethos than prudery.

The Victorians had roots; they had obligations; they had responsibilities. The essence of Victorianism was self-discipline and responsibility. Every man had a responsibility to his wife and children, to his forebears, to his community, to his nation, and to his race, and he was expected to take all of these responsibilities seriously and to put them ahead of his personal self-interest. Having a strong sense of national and racial identity in a much more homogeneous America helped a man accept his responsibilities, but self-discipline was necessary too. Parents raised their children with this in mind, not hesitating to apply external discipline, including corporal punishment, when needed

Thrift was a virtue, and waste a sin. People paid first for what they wanted to buy, not later. There were no credit cards. A man chronically in debt was a man whose honor was in jeopardy. Temperance and self-restraint also were virtues. A man constitutionally unable or unwilling to postpone self-gratification was held in low esteem.

Of course, during most of the Victorian period there were virtually no Jews in America. It wasn't until the huge flood of Jews began arriving from eastern Europe in the last two decades of the 19th century that the Victorian ethos began eroding. Collier doesn't attribute the change to Jews, of course; he simply points out that the immigrants at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century began changing the attitudes and ideals of Americans. Increasing industrialization and urbanization also undermined Victorian virtues.

The author traces changing attitudes and behavior in America all the way up to a decade ago, making copious use of statistics and sociological studies to document his observations. What he presents to us is a gradual loosening of social bonds, a gradual abandonment of responsibilities, a gradual increase in permissiveness and loss of self-discipline through the first two thirds of the 20th century, followed by a rapid acceleration of these tendencies during the 1970s. Although I might question some of Collier's statistics and the objectivity of some of the studies he cites, I find myself in general agreement with his observations. It was because I had made roughly the same observations during the 1960s and early 1970s that I wrote my novel *The Turner Diaries* in 1975, projecting in fictional form where I saw these tendencies leading 20 years in the future.

In the 1970s, of course, the liberals as a whole scoffed at my predictions. In their view, the revolutionary changes taking place in America were all positive developments, and I suspect that Collier was among them at that time. Now, as I mentioned earlier, Collier and a few other

liberals have swung around, as the realization has hit them that they also are going down with the boat, and soon.

I even agree in part with Collier's analysis of the causes of the American disaster. Specifically, he cites the rise in prosperity after the Second World War, which gave Americans more leisure time and more disposable income than they ever had had before: gains which most Americans did not use wisely. He also cites the advent of television in the 1950s, but he focuses entirely on television advertising, with its propaganda in favor of ever-increasing consumption. He also attributes part of the change to the influence of the hippies: the so-called "counterculture movement," with its ideal of total self-indulgence: "If it feels good, do it." Finally, he blames Americans' loss of respect for their government in the 1970s: the consequence of the unpopular Vietnam war and of the Watergate scandal.

And certainly, all of these things played a role, but the dynamics of the revolution of the 1960s and 1970s actually were a bit different than Collier sees them. Like Collier I experienced that revolution at first hand, but I was not hampered in my view of things by liberal blinders. Yes, the Madison Avenue propaganda of consumerism played a role in leading Americans to be more self-indulgent, but so did the Hollywood propaganda of television entertainment. The spend-and-consume propaganda was driven by the greed of businessmen, but the Hollywood propaganda that saturated TV entertainment was driven by darker motives.

And the values of the hippies did penetrate the larger society, but only because the Jewish media deliberately facilitated that penetration. As Collier correctly points out, the counterculture movement never involved more than a tiny portion of the young people of that era. The reason it was able to influence mainstream society was because the media Jews were sympathetic to the counterculture Jews, who occupied most of the leadership positions in the counterculture movement, and also because introducing hippie values into the mainstream served the racially destructive purpose of the media Jews.

Jerry Rubin, probably the best known hippie publicist, laid out all of the mindlessly destructive hippie worldview in his 1970 book *Do It!* The book is a real piece of filth that could have been produced only by a Jew. It glorifies the Black Panthers, the Viet Cong, the killing of White policemen, indiscriminate sex, the use of every illegal drug known to man, and the total abandonment of all self-discipline and restraint. It even recommends to young Americans that they kill their parents if their parents stand in the way of their doing whatever they want to do. Such a book would have circulated only in the hippie underground and would have had no influence at all on most young people -- except that it was published by Simon & Schuster, one of the largest mainstream publishers in New York, which was able to put hundreds of thousands of copies of Rubin's book on college campuses all over America. Simon & Schuster is owned by Sumner Redstone's Viacom Corporation, the same Jewish media conglomerate which owns MTV and CBS. Hippie values didn't just diffuse into mainstream America by osmosis; they were pumped in deliberately by the most powerful opinion-molding apparatus the world ever has known.

The Vietnam war and the Watergate scandal of the second Nixon administration provide an even better illustration of the fact that the change in American values and attitudes which occurred

during the 1960s and 1970s didn't just happen, as part of some natural historical development. The change was engineered; it was contrived; it was planned and cold-bloodedly implemented. And as in the case of the infusion of hippie values the Jew-controlled mass media were the instrument by which this was accomplished.

Collier certainly is correct that the Vietnam war was an unpopular war and that a great decline in respect for the U.S. government occurred during the latter part of the war, but he's wrong about the causal relationship between these two things. Collier writes:

". . . [A]fter the Tet offensive of January 1968 it became obvious to the majority of Americans that Presidents, generals -- the government -- had been lying about the conduct of the war. The general public was also coming to believe that it was a bad war -- an unjustifiable one being fought in the wrong way."

Well, that certainly was the liberal view of the war at the time, but the general public certainly didn't "come to believe that it was a bad war." The general public never "comes to believe" anything on its own. The general public doesn't have the wits for that. Every idea in the mind of the general public is put there by the controlled mass media. Certainly, my idea of the Vietnam war at the time was that it was good for testing new weapons and military tactics, but not much else. But the hundreds of thousands of university students who were bused to Washington to march down Pennsylvania Avenue and chant for the Viet Cong were taught that the war was "bad" because it was being fought against little Brown people by White imperialists. Liberals like Collier on university campuses all over America were helping the Jewish media teach them that.

But what made the war really unpopular with the general public was that the government clearly wasn't trying to win it. And also the fact that at a time when the government was drafting young Americans for the war, and the Viet Cong were killing them at the rate of about a hundred a day, the government was providing police protection for massive demonstrations in Washington in favor of the Viet Cong. The government knew who was organizing these demonstrations, but it did nothing to stop them. It was really demoralizing to Americans who had family members killed or wounded by the Viet Cong to see these hundreds of thousands of young Bill Clintons chanting and marching in Washington with Viet Cong flags while the politicians went about their business as usual.

To me this whole performance seemed insane. It seemed like a calculated way to destroy respect for the government and for authority. Eventually I realized that's exactly what it was. The people in the White House would have loved to extricate themselves from Vietnam, but they were scared to death of the media. Whenever they used tactics that really hurt the enemy, the Jewish media would scream bloody murder, and the White House would back off. Washington was fighting the war with one hand tied behind its back -- deliberately. Liberals, in the government and out, were talking openly about the desirability of not winning a military victory in Vietnam. They had this wacky feminist-liberal idea that we had to talk the Viet Cong into some sort of negotiated compromise settlement, instead of just pulling out all of the stops and killing all of them -- and their supporters in Hanoi and in New York and in Hollywood.

The military leaders understood that the Vietnam war was easily winnable, and they were very frustrated because they weren't permitted to win it. They also understood who was keeping them from winning it. Only a few of them, however, had the courage to speak out in this regard. General William Westmoreland, the top military commander in the war, regarded the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* as a Fifth Column which operated more effectively against America's forces than a hundred enemy divisions on the battlefield. By the time the war finally was over, everyone was disgusted with the government, but that wasn't because, as Collier put it, the public "came to believe that it was a bad war." It was because we all were fed up with the embarrassing spectacle that the media and the spineless gang of politicians in Washington were making of what could have been a short, hot, and successful war against the communists in Vietnam.

The Watergate scandal also undermined public respect for the government and for authority, but again, that was primarily because the media manipulated the scandal to that end. Richard Nixon was an unlovable, indecisive sort of person, but the things he did in connection with the Watergate investigation that were actually criminal or harmful to the country pale to insignificance beside the criminal acts of his predecessor Lyndon Johnson or those of the current occupant of the White House. So some low-level Republican gumshoes decide to bug the Democratic Party offices: is that more scandalous than a Democratic gumshoe in the White House being caught with a big stack of confidential FBI files on Republicans that he shouldn't have had?

The difference is that the Jewish media bosses made the conscious decision to brew a giant scandal out of the Watergate affair and to use the scandal to weaken the bonds of American society. And they did that by keeping the story on the front burner month after month, dribbling out tiny morsels of new information each day, and gradually building a huge mountain out of a molehill. Watergate was the Elian Gonzales story of 1973, except that the motive behind Watergate was to bring down the government, while in the Elian Gonzales case it is merely to keep the more sentimental and simpleminded couch potatoes engaged.

Anyway, it is not surprising that where many of the developments leading to the revolution of the 1960s and 1970s are concerned, Collier, because of his liberal bias, just doesn't get it. In particular, he doesn't get anything about Jewish scheming or the downside of "diversity." But to return to the positive side of this broadcast, he does understand that the consequences of that revolution are double-plus ungood for all of us. For a liberal, that is a remarkable achievement.

The most dangerous consequence Collier sees in the transition from a community-oriented population to a wholly self-centered population that has taken place in the last century is the destruction of the family. He looks at the trends -- children growing up without fathers, working mothers putting consumerism ahead of proper parenting -- and he is clearly worried:

". . . [W]e have seen in America an abandonment of parental responsibility which is unmatched in human history."

He also notes the growing disregard for laws and the growing contempt for authority that have sprung from the trend to more and more selfishness. But still, it is the destruction of the family about that he is most concerned. He writes:

"Increasingly younger people reject marriage, divorce easily, abandon their children, have fewer friends and see less of them. . . . How do we explain this? In part it may have to do with the intense involvement with the media, which provide a substitute for human interaction. . . . But at bottom, it seems to me, the increasing fragmentation of the American people is a consequence of the long-term turning inward to the self as the primary concern of life."

What Collier has to say about the American family makes an irreparable break between him and the feminists, who have played a major role in the deliberate destruction of the family and constitute a very important part of the coalition that is destroying our people. I mean, how can the feminists forgive him when he concludes that, despite all its faults, Victorian society was a healthier and more fit society than ours today. So let us be thankful, at least, for the break between a few liberals and virtually all feminists.

Zimbabwe: Liberal Consequences

Today let's talk about liberalism. Let's look at what this disease of the soul is doing to one group of our people. Let's look at the consequences of liberalism in a country in the southeastern part of the continent of Africa, a country that until 20 years ago was known as Rhodesia and today is called Zimbabwe.

The reason Rhodesia is called Zimbabwe today is that in 1979 the Rhodesians, under intense diplomatic and economic pressure brought to bear against them by liberals in America and Europe -- and to be completely honest about it, showing some symptoms of the disease themselves -- decided to let Blacks vote for the next government of Rhodesia. Since there were at that time six million Blacks living in Rhodesia and only 275,000 White Rhodesians, this was in effect a decision by the Rhodesians to commit collective suicide. Some of them realized that fact at the time, but most didn't, because, as I just mentioned, they were showing some early symptoms of liberalism. Today most of the few Rhodesians who are left realize that they made a fatal mistake 21 years ago. But before we get to the Rhodesian situation today, let's just remember a little history.

Early in the 19th century people from the British Isles first began farming and mining operations in the part of Africa north of the Limpopo River and south of the Zambesi River: an area that later became Rhodesia. Murderous forays by Blacks were a problem during the 19th century, even though they more often were intent on murdering and eating each other than on killing the White settlers, but eventually the Whites taught the Blacks to behave themselves. By the beginning of the 20th century the Rhodesian highlands were being farmed on a significant scale by White settlers.

The Rhodesian highlands, with their almost European climate and fertile soil, weren't of much interest to the jungle-acclimated Blacks, but the Whites found the area ideal, and in the period between the two World Wars they built a thriving country, not only with farming and mining, but also with gleaming cities and a number of industries. After the Second World War, many veterans from England migrated to Rhodesia. The Rhodesian population was certainly a cut above that in Europe: taller, fairer, leaner, more enterprising and energetic on the average. Look at photographs taken in Salisbury or on Rhodesian farms. The Rhodesian women especially were tall and blond and beautiful. Rhodesia was a good place to live, a good place to raise White children.

But of course, there was a worm in the apple. A wave of liberalism was sweeping over Europe after the war. Liberalism had defeated fascism. The corpses of millions of liberalism's opponents were rotting in mass graves all over Europe, after they had been machine-gunned, hanged, starved to death at the end of the war. Other millions of the opponents of liberalism were being worked to death in slave-labor camps behind the Iron Curtain. Liberalism was triumphant. And even in happy, sunny Rhodesia the malignant influence of liberalism made itself felt. The liberals in Europe were screaming about the evils of White colonialism and White imperialism. The White man was oppressing and exploiting the Brown man in India and the Black man in Africa, and it had to be stopped. After all, we were all equal. Race was an inconsequential detail, only a

matter of skin color and nothing else. To think otherwise was to be a "fascist," a "racist." A horribly bloody war had just been fought in order to exterminate the "fascists" and the "racists." It was intolerable that we should permit "racist" policies to govern our colonies in Africa. The Blacks must be given the vote. We must step down and hand everything over to our Black "equals."

This insanity even had its proponents in Rhodesia, especially in the Christian churches there. Most Rhodesians at that time were in no mood for giving their country away, despite all of the liberal propaganda. After all, it was ***their*** country. They and their ancestors had built it. Despite the influx of immigrants still arriving from England, most Rhodesians had been born in Rhodesia and had lived there all their lives. And they knew what the Blacks were like. They knew that the differences between Whites and Blacks involved infinitely more than skin color. Furthermore, they knew that they were not oppressing the Blacks, who actually were much better off since the arrival of Whites. The Blacks greatly preferred an occasional lashing by a White farmer when they didn't work hard enough to being eaten by their fellow Blacks when they lost a tribal war.

At least, that was the case with most of the Blacks in Rhodesia, where they worked primarily as farm laborers. But there was some resentment, some envy of the White man. And there were Whites, infected by the disease of liberalism, who were eager to fuel that resentment and turn that envy into active hatred. Some of these infected Whites were in the media. Even more of them were in the Christian churches. One of the principal activities of the Christian churches in Rhodesia was educating Blacks. They set up mission schools throughout the country, where they not only provided free medical care for the Blacks and taught them how to read and write, but also pumped into them the propaganda of equality and of hatred of their White employers. They preached a theology of revolution. Every single Black terrorist leader who later emerged when warfare between Blacks and Whites broke out in Rhodesia -- every one -- was trained in a Christian mission school. That includes the current Black dictator of Rhodesia -- excuse me, Zimbabwe -- former terrorist leader, now president, Robert Gabriel Mugabe. It also includes the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, who in 1979 was the head of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), one of the principal terrorist groups. And it includes Bishop Abel Muzorewa, the first Black to be maximum leader of Rhodesia after the Whites abdicated.

When Black terrorists became active on a significant scale during the 1960s, the Rhodesians fought back hard. While other European colonies in Africa were abandoned, the Rhodesians, along with the South Africans, were determined to defend their land and their homes. And of course, the liberals in Europe and in America were solidly on the side of the Black terrorists. The liberals cheered whenever the Blacks murdered a White farm family or set off a terrorist bomb in Salisbury. And when the terrorists murdered or mutilated the Black workers of a White farmer, the liberals were silent. They hadn't really wanted that, but after all, you can't make an omelet without breaking a few eggs.

An ironic point is that Rhodesia's Christian missions frequently also were targets. The White farmers learned quickly how to deal with terrorists. Their farms were heavily armed, and they set up a very effective mutual defense and alarm network. When they caught a live terrorist, they hanged him. The Rhodesian Army had the best anti-terrorist fighters in the world. Tracking, catching, and killing Black terrorists became a sport at which they excelled. In their frustration,

the Blacks turned on the Christian missions that had trained them. The missions were unarmed and often were in remote areas and so were easy targets. The Blacks would gang-rape the White nuns and nurses and then cut their throats. They would slit open the bellies of the White infants and children and pull out their entrails. They would impale the priests on stakes and gouge out their eyes. The liberals back in America would smirk. They would much rather it had been a White farm family than the White staff of a Christian mission station -- but at least the victims were White.

The Rhodesians as a whole were coping pretty well with Black terrorism, so the liberals began applying economic terrorism. Rhodesia was placed under embargo by the United Nations. The intention was to starve the Rhodesian "racists" into submission, to cut off the supplies they needed to defend themselves from the Black terrorists. Well, the embargo was ineffective, because the Rhodesians got whatever they needed from the South Africans, just across the Limpopo River to the south. This infuriated the liberals. Christian church groups in America raised money for the Black terrorists in Rhodesia so that they could buy more effective weapons. Whenever the Rhodesians hanged a group of terrorists, church groups and other liberal groups in America would hold candlelight vigils, which seems to be one of the favorite things liberals do.

The Jewish media were the liberals' most effective weapon against Rhodesia, however. The media in America whipped up a frenzy of bloodthirsty hatred against the Rhodesians. They had students demonstrating on university campuses. They invited terrorist leaders to speak to student groups, and they helped to raise funds for the terrorists. The destruction of White Rhodesia was one of the top-priority projects of American liberals during the 1970s. But the White Rhodesians weren't especially worried. They had declared their independence from Britain in 1965 when the liberals in Britain tried to impose Black rule on them, and as long as they could trade their farm products and their minerals to South Africa in return for military helicopters and petroleum products, they knew they could fight Black terrorism indefinitely.

So the liberals stepped up the economic pressure against South Africa. And the South Africans, I am embarrassed to say, eventually gave in. They cut off their trade with Rhodesia, leaving the Rhodesians isolated. And I cannot blame this bit of treachery entirely on the liberals. In part it was due to selfishness and stupid shortsightedness on the part of non-liberal South Africans. South African businessmen and politicians thought that if they threw the Rhodesians to the wolves they could relieve some of the economic pressure the liberals were putting on South Africa.

Even without South Africa's help, the Rhodesians could deal with the terrorists. But liberalism also had infected many Rhodesians and weakened both their self-confidence and their judgment. They decided in 1979 that living under a Black government wouldn't be so bad after all. Blacks were human beings too, they thought. Surely the Blacks would understand that their own welfare depended on the Whites. The Whites made up only 4.5 per cent of the population, but they produced 92 per cent of Rhodesia's agricultural output. Black farmers engaged only in subsistence farming, and their own families consumed nearly everything they produced. Without the White farmers and their large, efficient farms, everything would sink back into the jungle. So with all sorts of agreements and safeguards and assurances from the British government and the United Nations, the Rhodesians turned their government over to the Black majority, thinking that

then the world would love them, their standard of living would go up because the embargo would be lifted, and everything would be peaceful and prosperous again.

Well, it didn't take long for cold, hard reality to assert itself. The first thing that happened was the change in the name of their country from Rhodesia to Zimbabwe. Their capital city had its name changed from Salisbury to Harare. And their democratic government, with all its checks and balances to assure the safety of the White minority quickly reverted to the norm for Black Africa: a one-party dictatorship, with an increasingly unstable and unpredictable Black dictator. Robert Mugabe's party controls 147 of the 150 seats in Zimbabwe's parliament. There are Black opposition groups in Zimbabwe, but when they try to have public meetings or election rallies, they are set upon by armed thugs from Mugabe's party, and their leaders tend to disappear or have fatal accidents.

During a peaceful march in Harare on the first of this month by 3,000 members of an opposition group, including 200 Whites, Mugabe supporters armed with clubs and machetes attacked the marchers while Black police watched without interfering. The attackers singled out the Whites in the procession. I'll read you a few lines from an eyewitness report. I quote:

"As the police stepped hastily aside, they charged. Demonstrators fled in panic as stones were hurled toward them. Crouching in a doorway, I saw an ordinary shopping street overrun by anarchy. Thugs raced along pavements beating bystanders to the ground and snatching handbags. . . . Shops hastily barricaded entrances, leaving desperate people trapped in the street. A white man in his fifties was hit by stones and fell to the ground. His companion, a white woman in her forties, was toppled beside him. Seconds later three youths attacked them with clubs, and blood spattered across the pavement where they lay."

In front of me I have dozens of other eyewitness reports of beatings, slashings, and stabbings of Whites who participated in this peaceful protest against the Mugabe government two weeks ago. I doubt that you read any of these reports in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.* They really don't like to report such news.

Much of the recent turmoil in Zimbabwe is related to Mugabe's threats during the past year to take the farms away from the White farmers and give them to his Black followers. Last week, on April 6, he finally announced that he will confiscate White farms without compensation. Even before the announcement, Black gangs already had invaded more than 800 White farms and had become illegal squatters, and Mugabe had refused to intervene.

There are only 75,000 Whites left in Zimbabwe today. Of the 275,000 Rhodesians in the country in 1979 at the advent of Black rule, 200,000 already have left. The ones who remain own some 4,500 farms, which still produce more than 90 per cent of Zimbabwe's agricultural output. Mugabe is basing his popularity with Blacks on a promise to take the farms away from Whites and redistribute the land to Blacks.

Referring to his refusal to remove the illegal squatters from the White farms, Mugabe announced last week, and I quote: "We will not remove the people from the farms. We are going to share the farms. We are all equal. We all have to share equally."

The remaining Whites in Zimbabwe are desperate. Their farms are all they have. When those are taken most of them will have nothing left and nowhere to go. A minority of them with British passports can go to Britain, but everything they own, everything they spent their lives building, will remain behind.

Now, here's the punch line to this story: it isn't a story in America. The Jewish mass media over here have been far too busy giving us the latest updates on Elian Gonzales to tell us about what's happening in Zimbabwe. Four days ago, on Tuesday night of this week, I saw a one-minute snippet about the dispossession of the White farmers of Zimbabwe on CNN Headline News. I don't expect to see much more. So far as the Jewish media bosses are concerned it's not important news. The victims are our people, not Jews or Blacks or other non-Whites, and so there's no need to make a fuss about it. And the liberals, of course, aren't interested.

They were very interested back in the 1970s, when they were busy destroying Rhodesia. But now that the work of destruction is done they have completely lost interest. They don't care. Their latest project is to persuade the International Monetary Fund that it must not be so stingy in giving our money to African countries that need it. They're demonstrating in the streets of Washington right now in a campaign to get more money for supporting bankrupt countries -- countries like Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe. Since the Whites, who were the principal employers of Black workers in Zimbabwe, began leaving a few years ago, the unemployment rate in Zimbabwe has reached 50 per cent. Now the annual inflation rate also has reached 50 per cent. When Mugabe begins grabbing more White farms, as he announced last week that he would, there will be a total collapse of the economy. On top of that, one in every five Blacks in Zimbabwe is infected with HIV.

Yes, indeed, a new generation of very earnest college girls and long-haired freaks and hymn-singing Christians soon will have a wonderful, new cause to devote themselves to: providing money and food and medical aid to the starving, AIDS-wasted Blacks of Zimbabwe. They will be demonstrating just as self-righteously for this cause as the previous generation demonstrated for Black rule in Rhodesia.

You know, I started out today to talk about the disease of liberalism. What I've talked about so far is just one of the consequences of liberalism, one of the effects of this disease of the soul. The very earnest college girls and the long-haired freaks and the hymn-singing Christians who were so proud of themselves when they succeeded in destroying Rhodesia are just an effect of liberalism also. They aren't liberals. They don't have an ideology. They just want to be fashionable. They will take up any cause, with the utmost earnestness, so long as it is fashionable. They don't have the wits to understand the disastrous consequences of their misdirected earnestness. And they really don't care.

I used to want to kill all of these people. I wanted to round up every earnest college girl and long-haired freak and every hand-clapping hymn-singer who had demonstrated for Black rule in Rhodesia, or for a boycott of South Africa, or for Black voting rights in the South, or what have you, make them dig an enormous burial pit, and then machine-gun all of them. I wanted to obtain all of the old membership lists of the organizations to which these people had belonged, so that they could all be rounded up and done away with. They have done so much damage in this

world, and then walked away from it without the least regret for what they've done, without the least understanding of the harm they've caused, that it seemed to me that the proper thing to do was just kill them all.

Well, I understand now that that's not really necessary. There are just too many trendy idiots in the world. They are not even inherently evil. They lack the ability to distinguish good from evil. They have no more inherent morality than animals do. They have no souls. They have only the ability to recognize what is trendy at the moment. The people who need to be killed are the ones who set the destructive trends for the idiots. They are the real liberals, the ones who are really sick and need to be put down.

I'll talk more about them later. But for now I must tell you, I am really heartbroken when I contemplate what the destructive idiots they manipulate have done to the White people of Rhodesia, who were among the finest of our people and who at this moment are facing a very grim future indeed.

Horror in Rhodesia

Last week we talked about the plight of the farmers of Rhodesia, now known as "Zimbabwe." Last week I reported to you that more than 800 White farms had been invaded and illegally taken over by Black squatters, with the blessing of the government of Black dictator Robert Mugabe. This week the number of White farm families pushed off their land by Black gangs has risen to more than 1,100, and the violence of the farm seizures is growing. Before, the Blacks used knives and clubs. Now they're using firearms.

I also reported to you last week that I had seen on CNN Headline News a one-minute news segment about the dispossession of Rhodesian farmers. That was on Tuesday of last week. Then on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week I saw additional one-minute segments. Brief news segments also have begun appearing on other channels -- but they're all brief and all low key, all understated and unemotional, conveying no sense of urgency or tragedy. I guess that the excuse of the media people for the sparse news about Rhodesia is that the saturation news coverage of the Elian Gonzalez soap opera is keeping all of the journalists too busy for anything else.

It's not that news isn't available. There are journalists stationed in Salisbury, now known as "Harare." They file reports on the Internet every day. Anyone interested can read dozens of current, detailed reports about events in Rhodesia. Most of these reports are very urgent, very tragic, very gripping: quite different from the very brief and bland reports now beginning to appear on network news programs. One gets the distinct impression that the media bosses don't want the real news from Rhodesia to show up where the couch potatoes might stumble across it. That sort of news wouldn't be good for race relations in America, would it? It might alarm White Americans. It might make some of them think about what's in store for America if the present process of multiculturalization continues.

Well, let me try to stimulate some thinking. I'll read to you from one of these reports on the Internet. This is about what happened on Wednesday of last week at the Lonely Park Farm, 20 miles east of Salisbury. The Lonely Park Farm belongs to Paul and Liz Retzlaff. During the day a truckload of Blacks stopped at the driveway to their farm and attacked one of their Black farm workers, who was mowing the grass with a sickle. They took his sickle away from him and then hacked him up with it. Later in the day about 70 Blacks gathered outside the gate of the farm and began chanting and shouting threats. The Retzlaffs called the police, but the police refused to come. In Rhodesia these days, the police are all Black. Their boss, Robert Mugabe, won't let the police interfere in these attacks on White farms.

Rhodesian farmers have erected high-voltage electric fences and gates around their farmhouses since the trouble with the Blacks began, and usually that's enough to keep the Blacks out. At the Lonely Park Farm it wasn't enough. After dark the Blacks drank and chanted until they had worked up their courage, and then they crashed through the electrified gate with a truck. The Retzlaffs heard them howling for blood as they came up the driveway toward the house. In the darkness, they fled to an adjacent cottage and barricaded themselves inside. Liz Retzlaff reported: "When you hear them coming your stomach just goes into a knot, and you feel defenseless." She and her husband and son crouched behind the cottage door and listened to the

rampaging Blacks wrecking their house, smashing windows, breaking furniture, stealing everything they could carry away.

In the darkness they used a shortwave radio in the cottage to call their neighbors for help. Then the Blacks stormed toward the cottage, howling war cries and brandishing axes, knives, clubs, and iron bars. They were smashing down the door to the cottage, when they heard the Retzlaffs' neighbors arriving by truck. Even as the Black mob fled into the night they opened fire with assault rifles on the rescuers.

Now the Retzlaffs are cleaning up the broken glass and smashed furniture and attempting to repair their wrecked home. And they are living in terror, afraid to sleep at night, never knowing when another mob of Blacks will attack -- and also knowing that they can expect no protection at all from the police. Furthermore, if they defend themselves forcefully and kill their attackers, then the police will come -- to arrest them. But the Retzlaffs have nowhere else to go, and they don't know what they can do except rebuild and hang on. Paul Retzlaff told a reporter:

We were born and bred here. My grandchildren are fifth-generation Zimbabweans. Of course, we aren't going to leave. We started with nothing, and we built this farm. There's no way we can just abandon it.

Imagine yourself in the Retzlaffs' situation. Imagine the hopelessness, the despair.

Of course, in the end they will be forced to abandon their farm, or they will be murdered. Things will not get better in Zimbabwe; they only can become worse. It's not just that the Black dictator of Zimbabwe has promised his followers that he will give the farms of the Whites to them and will be in serious trouble if he doesn't keep his promise. It's that a process of general deterioration began when the White Rhodesians turned the country they built over to Black rule in 1979, and that process is accelerating. It will not be stopped. Unemployment is up and rising; inflation is up and rising; crime is up and rising; the HIV infection rate among Blacks is 20 per cent and rising; production is down and falling. As conditions in Zimbabwe become worse, the Blacks will blame the Whites for it, just as in America they blame Whites for all of their problems, and the demand for confiscation of White property will grow. Mugabe understands that as more Whites are driven out, the economy will collapse, but he is to a certain extent a captive of his own policies. If he tries to pull back from the brink, other Blacks, who have even less concern for the long-term consequences of continuing the seizure of White farms, will force the issue.

A Black who is now one of Mugabe's supporters, but who could become a rival, is Chenjerai Hunzvi. He heads the largest group of former Black terrorists, the National Liberation War Veterans Association, and he is pushing hard for a full-scale ethnic cleansing of Zimbabwe. Every time he speaks to the press, he calls for speeding up the process of confiscation of land from the White farmers. "The land has been left in their hands too long," he told reporters in Salisbury last week.

This sort of encouragement from their leaders, together with the lack of any restraint applied by Britain or the United Nations, has encouraged the Black mobs who are seizing the White farms.

Last weekend they murdered a White farmer just 50 miles from the Retzlaff farm. Black squatters invaded the farm of David Stevens, 75 miles east of Salisbury. They abducted Stevens -- a father of four, including two-year-old twins -- and five of his neighbors who had come to his rescue when he radioed for help. Stevens, considered a flaming liberal by his neighbors, had been determined to maintain good race relations with his Black workers. He always distributed ten per cent of the gross earnings of his farm to his Black workers, over and above their salaries, and he took a personal interest in their problems.

When a mob of Mugabe supporters -- so-called "war veterans" -- showed up at his farm last Saturday and began attacking his Black workers with machetes, Stevens tried to protect them. He tried to reason with the mob. Just as his neighbors drove up to help him, the Blacks handcuffed Stevens and threw him into the back of his own car and drove off with him. Thirty other "veterans" followed in a bus belonging to a Christian missionary station. The Christian missionaries in Rhodesia generally have sided with the Blacks against the Whites.

Stevens' neighbors followed in their own car, until the Blacks in the mission bus began shooting at them. Then the White farmers sought refuge in a police station. The Blacks followed them into the police station and seized them, while the Black policemen in the station refused to intervene in any way. The Blacks then drove Stevens and his neighbors, all handcuffed, into the bush and began beating and torturing them. The bones in their hands were broken with iron rods. Their bodies were whipped with automotive fan belts. Their feet were burned with cigarettes. They were beaten savagely with clubs. Then the Blacks stood David Stevens beside the road and killed him with shotgun blasts to his head and back. One of the neighbors, John Osborne, who was abducted and tortured with him described the ordeal from his hospital bed. All of his neighbors are convinced that Stevens was singled out for killing, not despite his good relations with his Black workers, but ***because*** of them. Thank God for that! After the killing, the Black mob returned to Stevens' farm and wrecked his farm house and burned the homes of his Black workers. Three days later -- that's last Tuesday -- another White farmer, cattle rancher Martin Olds, was murdered on his farm near Bulawayo.

And of course, you haven't heard about any of this, beyond a dispassionate news report here and there that another White farmer has been killed -- a report without details, without anything to make it seem real -- because, remember, the media bosses are too busy with Elian Gonzalez to spend much time on faraway Rhodesia.

As economic conditions continue to worsen, the pressure for seizing even more White farms will increase, and the more White farms seized, the worse economic conditions will become. The first thing the Blacks do when they take over a White farm is "Africanize" it. Even though the White Rhodesians have had Black workers on their farms for more than a century, the Blacks seem to have learned nothing from the experience. They are not able or willing to change from the Black way of farming to the White way. The Black way is a very primitive style of subsistence farming. When a mob of Blacks take over a White farm, they wreck the farm house, subdivide what was an efficient farm into inefficient plots, and then quickly run it into the ground. They fail to maintain the farm machinery properly, and it soon stops working. They eat the breeding stock. They wear out the land.

Grazley Farm, 130 miles from Salisbury, once was the most productive dairy farm in Rhodesia. Its owner, Ben Harding, employed 100 Black workers on his 2400 acres. When the Blacks seized Grazley Farm the first thing they did was slaughter the most productive dairy cow on the farm. They ate her for their Christmas feast. Then they tore up the irrigation system to make kitchen implements. Today weeds grow up through the ruins of the farm house, and the burned-out wrecks of cars litter what was once the garden. Twenty Blacks scratch out a bare living amid the dereliction and decay. Surrounding them are tracts of untended, weed-grown land and vandalized storehouses reduced to empty shells.

Despite the brave words of the Retzlaffs and other White farmers who express their determination to stay on their farms, most of them can see the writing on the wall. About 20,000 of the 75,000 Whites remaining in Rhodesia are entitled to claim British citizenship, and thousands of them are rushing now to renew their passports. The problem is that the British government doesn't want them. If they move to Britain, they are hardly likely to be supporters of the Blair government. Instead they undoubtedly will be staunch opponents of all of Tony Blair's very progressive programs for integrating the United Kingdom into the New World Order.

It's not that Blair and his government don't want more immigrants. Oh, my goodness, no! They love immigrants! It's just that the Rhodesian farmers are the wrong color. Some of them, having been exposed for so long to the racial realities of Africa, may even be racists! Therefore, the Blair government is not at all happy about the prospect of their coming to Britain. And as for the 55,000 or so White Rhodesians who are not entitled to British passports, don't even mention them! There's no chance at all that they will be allowed into Britain, even as refugees. Where will they go? Well, that's not Tony Blair's problem, is it? It's their problem. Tony Blair doesn't want to hear about it.

And for the most part the controlled media in Britain are helping him not hear about it by not reporting on events in Zimbabwe any more than they absolutely must. Britain's mincing, prancing, smirking little prime minister, who was one of the most bloodthirsty advocates of the bombing of Belgrade in protest against Serbia's program of ethnic cleansing in its Kosovo province, is absolutely determined to ignore the ethnic cleansing now occurring in Rhodesia. When the Serbs were putting down a terrorist insurrection by the KLA in Kosovo province a year ago, Tony Blair was filled with righteous indignation. The little man's eyes flashed as he announced to the world that ethnic cleansing would not be tolerated.

And it's just about the same story in the United States. Do you remember the preaching that Mr. Clinton and his kosher crew in Washington gave to us about Serbia last year? Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic was painted as a monster, a war criminal, for unleashing his army and his police on the KLA and giving rough treatment to Albanians in Kosovo suspected of collaborating with the KLA. Have you heard Mr. Clinton say anything harsh about Robert Mugabe? Have you heard the little Jewish troll in charge of his State Department, Madeleine Albright, speak out against the ethnic cleansing going on in Zimbabwe? Have you heard her call for Mugabe to be tried as a war criminal?

Of course, not. And it's quite plain that the refusal of Western governments to criticize him has emboldened Mugabe. He sees the silence of Blair and Clinton as a green light to do whatever he

wants to do to the White minority in Zimbabwe. The day after the murder of David Stevens and the beating and torture of his neighbors, Mugabe announced publicly, specifically in response to complaints from other Whites about his government's failure to take action against the murderers:

We warned the White farmers. We cannot protect you if you provoke the war veterans. You must expect the consequences.

Now, if that is not a call to further ethnic cleansing by his followers, I don't know what is. And so far neither Mr. Blair nor Mr. Clinton has said a word. Mrs. Albright has not waddled in front of the cameras and announced that the civilized world will not tolerate any more ethnic cleansing.

I should tell you now that I have nothing against ethnic cleansing in principle. It is a natural sort of thing that serves a useful purpose. I am looking forward to a massive and thorough ethnic cleansing of America and of Europe. I am planning for it; I am working toward it. I dream about it. And it is a fact that neither Mr. Blair nor Mr. Clinton has anything against ethnic cleansing in principle either. The two differences between them and me in this matter are, first, that I will tell you honestly what I think about it, whereas they will not; and, second, I am in favor of ethnic cleansing only when it is in the interest of my people, when it serves to protect or to purify them, and against it when it harms my people, whereas Mr. Clinton and Mr. Blair are for or against it according to whether or not it serves the interest of the people who pay them and protect them and keep them in office. In this regard they do not differ at all from their predecessors in office during the last great wave of ethnic cleansing that affected our people: namely, that which took place in Europe 55 years ago.

Franklin Roosevelt in the United States and Winston Churchill in Britain both pretended horror and outrage that the German people should dare to attempt to ethnically cleanse Germany of its Jewish infestation. But they themselves drafted postwar plans for ethnically cleansing large parts of Europe of Germans. Roosevelt went to his reward in hell before the plans could be carried out, but his successor, Harry Truman, cheerfully implemented them. The Jew-serving politicians of Britain and America also were not at all put off when their patrons implemented what amounted to a massive ethnic cleansing program in reverse in Poland, slaughtering 25,000 of Poland's intellectual, social, and military elite in order to punish Poland for its traditional opposition to Jewish subversion and also to make that country more amenable to Marxist rule. The British and American politicians simply winked, blamed it on the Germans, and remained allies of those who had done the slaughtering.

The ethnic cleansing of the White farmers in Rhodesia doesn't really serve the purpose of the Jews or of the politicians in Britain and America. They already had destroyed Rhodesia effectively in 1979, and Mugabe is simply making it more obvious. The killing and dispossession of White farmers going on now is more of a nuisance and embarrassment to the Jews and politicians than anything else. They would prefer that it proceed quietly, without attracting public notice. For us it is another major disaster in a long series of major disasters. The Rhodesians represent the best elements of our race.

We really should learn something from the difference in the way the media -- which is to say, the Jews -- have responded to the ethnic cleansing going on in Rhodesia today and to the ethnic cleansing in Serbia a year ago. The Jews really were determined to wreck Serbia, to force the Serbs into line, to make them accept the New World Order. And so they reported the cleansing of Kosovo with emotion, with detail designed to rouse the emotions of viewers against the Serbs. I'm sure that you remember that; it was only a year ago. Compare that with the coverage of the murder and expropriation of White farmers by mobs of Black savages in Rhodesia today. The difference is like that between day and night. And really, Elian Gonzalez has nothing to do with it. The difference is in the attitudes of the media bosses, of the Jews. They don't want us to get excited about the Rhodesian farmers. It doesn't serve their interests for us to get excited and agitated about Whites being murdered by Blacks. To the contrary, it might interfere with their racial plan for America.

If ever there was a compelling reason for us to take back our mass media, if ever there was a compelling reason for us to do whatever is necessary to get our mass media out of the hands of the Jews, the ethnic cleansing in Rhodesia is it. If you have any sense of racial consciousness, any sense of outrage over what is happening now in Rhodesia, join me in this effort.

To Be, or Not to Be

I've spoken about the murderous racial attacks against the farmers in Rhodesia during the previous two broadcasts, but the situation there continues to worsen, and I'm obliged to speak about it again today, because the mass media in America continue largely to avoid the subject. In addition to the invasion of White farms by armed Black gangs and the murder of White farmers, the Black supporters of dictator Robert Mugabe have turned to a new terror tactic against Whites: the gang rape of White women.

Eleven days ago, on April 18, a Black gang burst into the home of a White family just outside Salisbury, now called "Harare." They seized 28-year-old Brendan Jowett and repeatedly smashed him in the head and face with a brick, until he lost consciousness. They dragged his 25-year-old wife Tonia into a bedroom and gang-raped her. Then they found Tonia's 18-year-old sister, Laura Wiggins, hiding in a cupboard. They dragged her out and raped her repeatedly.

Then the Blacks poured furniture polish, which they believed was fuel oil, over their victims and attempted to set them afire, first with matches and then with a burning log from the fireplace, but the furniture polish would not burn. Finally the Blacks stole everything they could carry away and fled. On the same day another White farmer and his wife had gasoline poured on them, but when the Blacks were ready to burn their victims they discovered that they had forgotten to bring matches. The farmer and his wife got away with a brutal beating and the wrecking and looting of their home. White Rhodesians should at least be thankful for the ineptitude of the Blacks.

In the face of the overwhelming numerical advantage held by the Blacks, Black ineptitude is not enough to save the Whites of Rhodesia from their enemies, unfortunately. As I reported last Saturday, on Tuesday of last week, a Black mob murdered Martin Olds on his farm near Bulawayo, Rhodesia's second-largest city. The 43-year-old White farmer knew that Black mobs were operating in his area, and he had sent his wife Kathy and his two children, 17-year-old Martine and 14-year-old Angus, to stay with friends in the city. Olds was a former member of the Grey Scouts, Rhodesia's elite anti-terrorist unit, before his country surrendered itself to Black rule in 1979. His neighbors considered him completely fearless. Ten years ago, when a friend had been seized by a crocodile, Olds had leaped from his boat and wrestled the crocodile in order to free his friend.

Olds was alone on his 12,000-acre cattle farm when a mob of 70 armed Blacks attacked his farmhouse early Tuesday morning. He telephoned the police station, which was less than ten minutes away, but the Black police didn't show up until five hours later, after he was dead and the attackers were gone. Olds defended himself with a shotgun and a hunting rifle, and he wounded several of his attackers. He himself was hit by several bullets, and the bone in one leg was shattered. He bandaged and splinted his leg and continued defending himself until he lost consciousness. Then the Blacks swarmed over him and beat him to death with clubs.

As the news of the gang rapes and of the murder of Martin Olds spread, many White farm families abandoned their homes and fled to the cities. Black gangs then were free to wreck and loot their homes without any resistance. One thing the Black gangs always do is kill any pets the

Whites leave behind when they flee. Two days after the Olds murder, on Thursday of last week, an Associated Press TV News camera crew happened to be present when a mob of 200 Blacks rampaged through a White farm near the town of Arcturus, 35 miles northeast of Salisbury. The farm belongs to Alan Windram, but Windram and his family already had fled. The Blacks found Windram's six dogs and beat and stoned them to death while the Associated Press crew filmed the incident. The Blacks were hooting, jumping around, and gesticulating in their typical manner while they killed the dogs, obviously enjoying themselves immensely. Then the Blacks wrecked Windram's farmhouse and burned the homes of at least 30 of his workers. All of this was recorded by the Associated Press camera crew, but believe me, it'll be a cold day in hell before you see any of it on network television in America. It makes Blacks look bad. It might make some animal lovers like Blacks less.

Coincidentally, at the same time Martin Olds was being murdered on April 18, squads of Black police were raiding other White farms in the same area and seizing firearms from White farmers, leaving them defenseless. And also on that day, which happened to be the anniversary of the surrender of White Rhodesia to the Blacks, Britain's Queen Elizabeth sent a message of congratulation and goodwill to Robert Mugabe. And the Queen expressed not a word of concern or disapproval about Mugabe's genocidal policy toward Rhodesia's White farmers. The British government, of course, has been on the wrong side of the Black campaign against Whites in Africa ever since being on the wrong side of the Second World War.

Oh, yes: the British government did make one additional statement about Rhodesia on April 18. Tony Blair's Foreign Office announced that no special considerations would be given to White Rhodesians seeking asylum in Britain from the ethnic cleansing now going on in Rhodesia, or "Zimbabwe," as Blair and company prefer to call it. They will not be permitted into Britain unless they can prove that they will be able to support themselves. As I mentioned last week, Tony Blair is not eager to have an influx of White immigrants who almost certainly will not vote for his party. Black Rhodesians, yes; White Rhodesians, no.

But there is one resident of Rhodesia, neither White nor Black, who always will find a cordial welcome in Tony Blair's Britain. That is a 54-year-old man named Nicholas Hoogstraten. Hoogstraten is a billionaire landowner in Rhodesia. He began buying land there in 1963 and now owns nine large farms and cattle ranches totaling more than a million acres. He also is a long-time financial backer of Robert Mugabe and his Zimbabwe African National Union-Popular Front, or ZANU-PF for short. He began backing Mugabe in the 1960s and continued backing him all during the time ZANU was waging a terrorist war against Rhodesia's White population. He still backs Mugabe financially, and in an interview with a major British newspaper, the *Guardian,* which appeared in the April 21 issue of that newspaper, he disparaged Rhodesia's White farmers and blamed the country's present turmoil entirely on them. He told the *Guardian:*

This has all been stirred up by White disenfranchised trash who still think it's Rhodesia. I have some good White friends in Zimbabwe, but these Rhodies, as we call them, are disgusting people. They want to ruin the country. They treat the Blacks worse than Blacks are treated in America. I've had no problem with indigenizing my properties.

What he meant by that last statement is that when he buys a farm from a White family fleeing the country to get away from the Black terrorists that he supports, he fires the White managers and foremen and hires Blacks belonging to Mugabe's party to take their place. He told the *Guardian* that he expects that this practice, plus his continued support for Mugabe, will ensure that his properties will remain safe from the marauding mobs of squatters who have been wrecking and taking over White farms.

Last Friday's *Guardian* also provides a number of other fascinating details about Hoogstraten. For example, he went to prison briefly in the 1960s after he threw a hand grenade at the home of a business rival. One detail the *Guardian* neglected to mention, however, is that Hoogstraten is a Jew.

His family, after being expelled from Spain at the end of the 15th century, settled in the Netherlands, which accounts for his Dutch-sounding name. During the 17th and 18th centuries his family was among the Netherlands' most active dealers in Black slaves, shipping hundreds of thousands of them from the west coast of Africa to the New World. He is a kike's kike. Not only does he refer to the men and women who built Rhodesia as "White trash," but he refers to Gentile women as "chattels" -- that's the word this unbelievably arrogant Hebrew actually used in his *Guardian* interview -- and bragged to the newspaper that he keeps his mansions in Brighton, in Cannes, in Monte Carlo, in Maryland, in Florida, and in Rhodesia stocked with White women for his pleasure.

Imagine how pleased with himself Hoogstraten must be. He goes to Rhodesia in 1963 as a 17-year-old with the money his ancestors made selling Black flesh; he sizes up the conflict between the White Rhodesians and the Black terrorists and bets that the terrorists will win because the Whites are too soft and too Christian to beat them; he secretly makes contact with the terrorists and begins financing Mugabe; and at the same time he begins buying up White farm land. When the Whites finally cave in and give up, the price of land in Rhodesia drops sharply and Hoogstraten is able to buy much more of it. Now he is forcing the price of land even lower by continuing to support Mugabe's terrorist tactics and expects soon to be in a position to buy as much additional land as he wants at fire-sale prices.

That is really Tony Blair's kind of Jew. How the trendy liberals of Britain must admire him! As for me, Hoogstraten's really exceptional behavior -- living among Rhodesia's Whites and pretending to be one of them while secretly financing the Black terrorist gangs who were killing White farmers and their wives and children, all so that he would be better positioned to grab their land -- is just one more bit of evidence that Jews indeed are not like us. It is difficult even to believe that they belong to the same species.

Even without the malign influence of Hoogstraten and his ilk, the Rhodesians had serious problems in the 1960s and 1970s, and because they are problems that also afflict us in America and our kinsmen in Europe today, they deserve our attention. In the face of a Black terrorist war against them in the 1960s and 1970s, the Rhodesians were presented with the need to make a hard decision: either to yield their country to the Blacks or to put an end to the threat. They evaded this decision and tried to choose a middle course, and they fell between two stools.

In the 1950s Rhodesia was a prosperous, White country, and it was a very pleasant place to live. The Rhodesians had worked hard and well to build their country and to develop their farms. They were a nation of strong men and beautiful women. They played as hard as they worked. Rhodesia was the jewel in the crown of the British Empire. When the rot back in London led the British government to begin dismantling its empire and turning its colonies over to the local savages, the Rhodesians declared their independence and made an effort to preserve the country where they had been born and bred. But the rot had infected the Rhodesians as well.

It was easy enough for them to see the trend of things in the world. The forces of liberalism and egalitarianism had won the bloodiest and most destructive war in the history of the world. The best people all over Europe had been hunted down and butchered, and the worst people were ruling. Democracy and equality were triumphant, and their minions were eager to spread their plague to the whole world -- or at least, to the whole White world. Though infected with the same madness raging in Europe, the Rhodesians naturally enough were not eager to commit suicide. They refused to turn their country over to the gangs of Black terrorists that were beginning to become active with the support of predatory Jews such as Hoogstraten -- and also with the support of the Christian churches, in which the madness seems to have taken hold with special virulence.

But the problem extended beyond the Jews and the Christian clerics. It was in the Rhodesian people themselves. During the war they also had supported enthusiastically the forces of darkness and democracy. It was not so easy after the war to realize that they had made a terrible mistake, and that the master they had served during the war was preparing to devour them, just as it had devoured the Germans and the Poles and the Hungarians and the Ukrainians and the Russians and the Latvians and many another nation of their kinsmen in Europe. And I'm not talking now only about Soviet Communism. I'm talking about the more general sickness, the more general madness, of which communism is merely an extreme manifestation.

As I said, it was easy enough for the Rhodesians to see the trend of things, to see the push for more equality and more democracy everywhere, and the more thoughtful Rhodesians certainly could extrapolate the trend and realize that it would mean the death of their country. But already caught up in it as they were, they could not bring themselves simply to reject it altogether and to reorient themselves in a better and healthier direction. They could not simply say, "Whoa! We see now where this madness of equality and democracy is heading. We can see that it means yielding ourselves to Black rule and watching everything that we have built be destroyed. We refuse to take that course. We reject equality and democracy. We recognize every institution and every group and every individual trying to push us along that course as our enemy, and we will oppose our enemies with all of our strength of body and mind and spirit." That was what they should have said, but they didn't. The rot was already in their own souls.

To be, or not to be: that was the question faced by the Rhodesians, and they did not have the strength of character to choose to be and then to accept all of the implications of that choice. They did not want not to be, but they could not accept what the choice to be entailed, and so now they will perish. The country they and their forefathers worked and sacrificed for will fall into the hands of creatures such as Hoogstraten and Mugabe, who chose to be, and who accepted all of the implications of that choice.

What are the implications of choosing to be instead of not to be, of choosing life instead of death? The Rhodesians should have assessed their situation realistically when their problem became apparent, around 1955 or so, and they should have accepted the fact that they could not continue existing as a ruling minority over a Black majority when the rest of the world was hell-bent for equality and democracy. They did not have the option that has worked so well for the Jews nearly everywhere of disguising themselves and blending in with the majority population. They could not pretend to be Shonas or Zulus or what have you, as Hoogstraten had pretended to be a White Rhodesian, while maintaining a secret unity among themselves and also maintaining their control and ownership of the country. It wasn't just that the very obvious racial differences would have kept them from blending in and convincing anyone that they were Blacks, the way Hoogstraten had been able to blend in and convince everyone that he was a Rhodesian; they also couldn't squat in their filth and scratch their fleas and eat insects -- or each other, in order to persuade the world that they really were equal to the Blacks.

Since they couldn't blend in, they might have tried another Jewish tactic: control the opposition. If loyal, healthy Rhodesians had owned the big newspapers back in Britain and had gotten their people into the controlling positions in the BBC -- and also in Hollywood, since the output of Hollywood poisons the whole White world, and not just America -- if White Rhodesians had been able to control the media in Britain and America, and therefore control the British government and British public opinion, they could have continued in the more or less quiet possession of their country indefinitely. They could have suppressed the deranged clerics, and they could have used any Black terrorist groups that sprang up for weekend target practice. But that option really wasn't open to them either. They ***didn't*** control the media. The Jews did, and the Jews weren't about to let go. The Rhodesians simply didn't have the resources or the time to take the media away from the Jews, even if they had had the will.

The one option open to them was to get rid of the Blacks. The only reason there was a Black majority in Rhodesia was that the Whites who had come to Rhodesia before them had made the country fertile and prosperous and able to support a much larger population. There had been only 100,000 Blacks in the whole area when the Whites began farming in Rhodesia. And of course, the Whites utilized the Blacks for labor. They thought that it was more economically sound than exterminating or expelling them. And in the short run it was, but now the long run is catching up with them. In America in the 17th and 18th centuries it seemed economically sound to buy Black slaves from Mr. Hoogstraten's ancestors to work the land in the southern colonies, but now the long run has caught up with White Americans also.

It would have been very difficult, very costly, very painful, for the Rhodesians to extricate themselves from their mess in 1950. It would have required determination and intelligence and subterfuge, but it could have been done -- if they had had the will to do it. They might even have done it in 1960. But in neither 1950 nor 1960 did they have the will. The Christians among them would have been horrified by the thought of getting rid of the Blacks, of either eradicating them or driving them out, just as the Christians in America today cannot cope with the demands of racial survival in this world.

But it wasn't just the Christian inability to make hard decisions. Greed and plain, old-fashioned stupidity played major roles as well. The big commercial farmers were interested in current

profits above all. They weren't willing to give up their Black workers. They weren't willing to do the expensive things needed to replace the Black workers, such as offering free land or very cheap land to White workers in Europe or America or South Africa, if they would come to Rhodesia. The big commercial farmers thought themselves indispensable. They could not imagine the Blacks would be so foolish as to kill the goose that was laying the golden eggs. They were willing to sacrifice the interests of their fellow Whites in order to hold onto their own advantages.

And as I just said there also was much stupidity. Even today there are White Rhodesians who believe that the problem is just Robert Mugabe. If another Black, a more reasonable Black, would take his place, then things would be all right in Rhodesia again, they believe.

Well, as I said, the Rhodesians could not accept the hard requirements of choosing life in this hard and unforgiving world, and so now they will perish. Let us in America ponder that, and let at least some of us learn from it.

Storm, Break Loose!

Let's talk more today about a question that listeners have raised repeatedly: What can I do for my people? What can I do to fight my people's enemies?

If you've been listening to these *American Dissident Voices* programs for a while, you know that more than anything else I have urged people to stop being spectators and become participants in the historical process. If you don't like what's being done to our society, to our world, then get off the sidelines and get out on the field. Don't just sit there and complain quietly to your friends. Do something!

The fact that not as many people as I would like have responded to this urging is not entirely due to cowardice or laziness. Most Americans are very much constrained by their need to earn a living. Relatively few have complete freedom of action. If they are to join the fight they need specific and practical suggestions about what they can do -- and still earn a living. So today I want to make one or two such suggestions.

First, I want to warn everyone as strongly as possible: whatever you do, be certain that it is legal. There is very little in the way of illegal activity that is likely to be productive at this time anyway. Believe me, I understand the frustration, especially in our young men, when we see what's happening around us and feel an almost irresistible urge to strike back. But for now, let's stay away from the bombs and machine guns. There's much else that must be done first. We don't need those things quite yet. Conditions are not such that we can use those weapons effectively, so let's just forget about them for the time being. If you want to collect weapons or to practice with weapons, keep your weapons legal. There are plenty of legal things that can be done now that are effective, and very few illegal things. And when we make a decision about what to do, it should be based on considerations of effectiveness, not on how big a splash it'll make on the evening news.

As I said a moment ago, the biggest constraint on most of our people is their need to earn a living. Anyone who is employed by a company that is determined to stay on the good side of the government and the media is in an especially delicate position. Even those of our people who are in business for themselves often are dependent on good relations with the public and can be driven into bankruptcy if attacked by the media. The first thing for every person to do is make a realistic evaluation of his situation. If you're a policeman or an employee of a big insurance company, then there may be a concerted effort to have you fired if you say or do anything Politically Incorrect. You may get the John Rocker treatment by the media.

Of course, you may have the law on your side. You may be able to sue your employer if he tries to fire you. The way the judicial system works in this country, however, that may be a frustrating and disappointing endeavor. It is set up to favor the litigant who has the most money to spend on lawyers, not the litigant who's in the right. You may want to go ahead and sue anyway, but most people would prefer not to be obliged to take that course.

So, the thing to do is either arrange to have an income that can't be threatened by the self-appointed guardians of Political Correctness, in which case you can do whatever you want to do, or you can remain under the thumb of the system and act with circumspection. But regardless of which choice you make, the important thing is to act.

I've been looking for ways to facilitate the first choice: giving people who want to be activists an opportunity to do so by making it possible for them to support themselves independently of the system. Here's a specific example: I recently bought a couple of record companies that specialize in what is known as "resistance music." That's music that has a pro-White or pro-European-American message -- or an anti-system message. It's been essentially "underground" music for a long time, composed and performed and distributed by amateurs on a part-time basis. The Jewish media bosses would like to keep it that way, but my aim is to professionalize it and mainstream it. I want to distribute enough of it so that the people who compose it and perform it can become professionals, can actually make a living at it. I believe that there's a huge, untapped market for resistance music. Most Americans have never heard any resistance music. They've heard it denounced as "hate music" by the Jewish media, but they've not actually heard it performed. I believe that many White Americans will like it when they hear it. If you'd like to hear some of it yourself, go to my web site at resistance.com.

Anyway, if I'm successful in mainstreaming resistance music, it has the potential for becoming a substantial industry employing at least a few thousand people. And that's just one example of what I have in mind. As discontent with the government in America grows, as discontent with uncontrolled immigration and other government policies grows, as discontent with the bias and lies of the controlled media grows, there will be many other opportunities for new industries that are independent of the system. And if these new industries have a policy of employing people who are willing to be activists in the cause of freeing America and preserving the future of White Americans, they can open up possibilities for many other people. And I hardly need to tell you, I'm not the only one who can do this sort of thing. In fact, I've never thought of myself as a businessman or an entrepreneur. If I can do it, anybody can do it. A lot of you ought to be thinking along these lines. If you believe that you were cut out to be an entrepreneur, then be an entrepreneur for a worthwhile cause, and help free others to do what they ought to do.

That's one side of the coin. The other side -- and at this time it's the more important side -- is what you can do, with circumspection, right where you are. And let me tell you, there's no one, and I mean, no one, who can't take some effective action on behalf of our people, no matter how sensitive his position. I don't care whether you work inside the White House with a Top Secret security clearance, or you're on the staff of the rottenest politician in the Congress, or even if you're the token Gentile in some Jewish law firm: if you're really concerned about your people, about your race, you can take effective action without your family ending up starving on the street. All you really need, in addition to average intelligence and an average amount of initiative, is to have your priorities right -- to understand that there is nothing more important than the future of our people, nothing -- and to feel a sense of personal responsibility for what is happening to our world, to our civilization, to our race.

Now a few specific suggestions: I believe that the most important thing for responsible people to do is to speak out, to stop being silent. Many of our people are afraid that if they let it be known

what they are thinking, their lives will be ruined. In most cases that isn't true. What each of us must do is evaluate his own situation realistically, to think about only the real dangers and not the imaginary dangers, and then to speak out just as strongly as he can in his circumstances. In order to survive it is not necessary, in most cases, to persuade everyone around us that we are Politically Correct. We can say things that are not Politically Correct and still survive. We always should use good judgment, of course, and consider the effect of our words on others. But when we believe that we are right, we must not let ourselves be intimidated into silence. It is our responsibility to push the envelope, to take a chance on saying too much rather than saying too little.

And taking a chance does not mean talking just to your personal friends who already agree with you. It does not mean raging anonymously in some Internet discussion group. It means standing up and saying to the public: "This is my name. This is what I believe."

I'll read you a letter that was published just a few days ago in the Russellville, Arkansas, *Courier*, the local newspaper there. The writer of the letter, Billy Roper, is a personal friend of mine and a member of my organization, the National Alliance. He also is a high school history teacher in Russellville. He wrote his letter in response to an editorial by the typically liberal editor of the newspaper. The liberal editor had criticized Atlanta Braves pitcher John Rocker for expressing his distaste for the "diversity" of New York City. In response Billy Roper wrote:

In his editorial of March 4, the editor writes that John Rocker should read Jewess Emma Lazarus' paean to the colonization of America by the Third World: 'send me your tired, your poor, your wretched refuse' yearning for their first welfare check. In reality the United States was founded by White men for the express purpose of securing the blessings of liberty for themselves and their offspring, not the offspring of Africa or Asia or Mexico. What Mr. Rocker failed to realize but the editor clearly illustrates is that Whites are not allowed to criticize the new multicultural wonderland of diversity so long as Ms. Lazarus' tribe dominates the mass media and government of this country. Instead, Whites are ordered to be tolerant of the fact that, as President Clinton bragged in his recent State of the Union address, we will be a minority in this country within a generation.

The country is being turned over to those who never could have created it. Is an America which is more like Mexico or Ethiopia a better America? Is an America where those who created this country have become a minority a worthy destiny? Is John Rocker the only American who is upset by the fact that the United States is becoming just another Third World cesspool?

Not by a long shot. We have enough tired and enough poor and enough wretched refuse already. It's time to tear down Emma Lazarus' sign and put up a fence instead.

Well, that was my friend Billy Roper's letter, which was printed in the Russellville *Courier* last month. He could have said a lot more, of course. He could have expressed himself much more strongly. But in view of the very general, mainstream, brainwashed nature of his audience, he chose his words pretty well -- well enough, anyway, to provide encouragement to many other White men and women who believe as we do but who have been too timid to speak out. The editor of the Russellville *Courier* hated him for it, of course, and responded to Billy's letter with

a snide remark. All of the other liberals who read the *Courier* also hated him for expressing himself as he did. These days a man cannot act honorably and responsibly without being hated for it. Any man who is not hated is a shirker; he's not doing what he should be doing.

Anyway, the important thing is that my friend Billy Roper expressed himself -- he spoke out -- and he's still a high school history teacher, still earning a living. The people who would like to see Billy unemployed, who would like to see him fired from his teaching position, are themselves afraid of exposing their beliefs to the public. What they believe is that anyone who is Politically Incorrect should be cast into the outer darkness, should be shunned, should starve. They are intolerant, narrow-minded, bigoted, vicious, hateful people. And they are cowards. They attack only in gangs. They expose themselves only when they are sure that they will have overwhelming support. And they understand that many ordinary citizens in Arkansas don't believe that a history teacher should be fired for writing a letter to a newspaper saying the things Billy said in his letter. And they know that Billy is a fighter, that he won't go quietly, and so they leave him alone.

What Billy Roper did is what thousands of other high school teachers also can do and should do. It's what thousands of attorneys and businessmen and factory workers and clerical workers and engineers can and should be doing. And they can do this without destroying their lives or their careers or their families if they use reasonably good judgment. And you know, when you speak out, it doesn't have to be in the form of a letter to your newspaper. There are thousands of ways of speaking out.

The next time you go to a PTA meeting, don't just sit there with your mouth shut because you're sure that no one else will agree with you. Speak out, and speak out strongly on the school policies you disagree with, or make suggestions for new policies you believe the school needs. And sure, some Politically Correct lemming will disagree with you and will criticize you for not being Politically Correct yourself. They are bold because they have become accustomed to speaking out without opposition. Put up a little real opposition, and they will run for cover. And don't be afraid to use your head and to plan your opposition like a military tactician. Get together with four or five other people who share your views and have them go to the meeting with you. Plan what each of you will say. Provide the liberals with some organized and determined opposition. It'll be a new experience for them.

If you're a little shy about speaking in public, just get a small group of people together and have them listen to one of these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts in your living room. That's a very effective way of helping to spread the word. There are millions of our people in America who agree with us -- or who are ready to agree, if we help them organize their thoughts. They share our feelings, share our disgust and our horror at what is being done to our world, but they just haven't thought it all out and reached any conclusions about what they should do. They haven't put it all together yet. Their biggest obstacle is that they believe they're all alone. They've been so intimidated and beaten down by the controlled media that they are sure no one else shares their feelings. So they try to suppress their feelings and just blend in. They need to be told that they're not alone.

There's a storm getting ready to break loose in America. America's internal enemies have managed to keep the lid on this storm for a long time. They have managed to keep the millions of people who don't agree with them or who are agreeing with them now only because they are confused and misled -- they have managed to keep these millions of White Americans silent and disorganized and demoralized only because they control the mass media. They have managed to maintain an illusion of unanimous agreement with their policies through their media control. But the illusion is wearing thin. The Jews are flooding America with non-White immigrants from Mexico and the Caribbean and Asia and trying to maintain the illusion that most White Americans agree with this policy, that it would be un-Christian or racist to disagree.

Actually, they're doing a pretty good job of maintaining that illusion. They are succeeding in keeping most White Americans quiet about the immigration disaster, afraid to complain about it. They use their control of television effectively. But that doesn't mean that most White Americans are happy about the destruction of their country just because they're staying quiet. And it's not just the flood of immigrants that has White Americans seething quietly. The Jews and their allies have been bragging about how their media propaganda has gotten more Americans to accept racial intermarriage, and how the rate of miscegenation has climbed dramatically as a result. That's true enough. But for every couch potato who has let himself be persuaded that it's all right for his grandchildren to be mulattos, there is a White American who is angry enough to do some serious killing of the people putting out that poisonous propaganda.

And that's not all, by any means. The storm is brewing. The pressure is building. The Jews and the politicians may believe that they can keep the lid on. They may believe that by getting laws in the United States like they already have in Canada and Britain and many other countries, making it illegal to write or say anything Politically Incorrect -- that is, anything that they can label as "hate speech" -- they can delay the storm until it is too late for us to save ourselves. They may be right, but I don't think so. I think that storm will come soon enough to allow our people to redeem ourselves. I also think that when it comes it will be violent enough to blow every last member of their tribe to hell -- and also everyone who has collaborated with them. At least, I hope so.

But you know we mustn't base our future on hope alone. We must act as well. We must do whatever we can to keep the pressure building. That's why it's important for all of us to speak out. We don't want just a blind, undirected storm. We want a purposeful storm. We must help our people understand what is being done to them and who is doing it and why. And we must give them a target for their rage. Above all, we must give them courage and hope now: hope that it is possible after all for our people to survive and the courage to do whatever is necessary to make that possibility become reality.

And it's not really so difficult for us to do that. All that we really have to do is speak out, to let others know that they are not alone and then to help them straighten out their thoughts. We need to show them just a little bit of courage, to let them know that they too can speak out without being punished for it. We need more people to write forceful but intelligent letters to their local newspapers, more people to bring their friends and neighbors and colleagues into their living rooms to listen to one of these broadcasts. And gradually the understanding will dawn in the minds of that portion of our people that is still healthy, that portion which still is uncorrupted,

that we are stronger than all of our enemies. And then the storm -- the great, cleansing storm -- will break loose.

Shielding Evil

The horror in Rhodesia continues -- the ethnic cleansing, the murder and rape and dispossession of the Whites there by the Blacks -- and the media here continue to ignore what is happening there or to downplay it drastically, showing only happy mobs of Blacks chanting and dancing as they demand that more White farms be turned over to them. Certainly, I'll be talking about Rhodesia more in the future. Today, however, let's back off a little and look at some other things that are happening in our world that may not seem to have much to do with the genocide of our people in Rhodesia but that nevertheless can help us understand better why that genocide is happening and why the mass media here are ignoring it.

Let's begin today with a law suit that recently ended in a British court in London. It was a libel suit that the noted British historian and writer David Irving had brought against a Jewess, Deborah Lipstadt, who had written a book calling Irving a "Holocaust denier" and implying that he is neither an objective historian nor a truthful writer. Lipstadt's book, published in 1994, is *Denying the Holocaust: the Growing Assault on Truth and Memory.* Irving's position is that he is not a "Holocaust denier"; he is a "Holocaust" examiner. He is an objective historian who examines historical evidence and attempts to reach correct historical conclusions from that evidence. And, Irving said, the Jewess, Lipstadt, had damaged his professional reputation by falsely claiming otherwise. So he sued her for libel.

Now, I personally never have been involved in any sort of litigation in a British court, but I have observed the British courts in action, and it seems to me that they are approximately as corrupt as American courts. On that basis I certainly never would have sought justice in a British court. But Irving is a man of courage and conviction, and he did -- and the Jews around the world reacted with outrage. They reacted to his libel suit against Deborah Lipstadt as if he were suing each of them personally, as if each of them were being threatened personally by his effort to obtain a declaration from the court that the Jewess had libeled him by calling him a "Holocaust denier."

Let's try to understand the way in which the Jews use that term. Just from the customary meaning of the words, we would expect a "Holocaust denier" to be a person who claims that there was no "Holocaust": that all of the Jews' claims of being persecuted and killed by the Germans during the Second World War are lies. In other words, a "Holocaust denier" would seem to be a person who claims that no Jews were persecuted or killed. Well, there are such people. There are genuine "Holocaust deniers," and I have met one or two of them. But there aren't many of them. Their position is untenable. Jews were killed during the war. I've spoken with German soldiers who killed some of them. In Poland and Russia and the Baltic states, Jews made up substantial majorities of the Communist Party apparatus, including the secret police. They had committed horrible atrocities against the non-Jewish populations among whom they lived and were bitterly hated for it. And they were sympathetic to the Soviet side throughout the war, serving as spies, saboteurs, and anti-German partisans. The Germans often rounded up Jews as hostages when the *Wehrmacht* moved into a new territory in the east. Then when a German soldier or official was assassinated, a group of these Jewish hostages would be shot. Furthermore, every Red Army unit had a political commissar attached to it; his job was to watch for any signs of Political Incorrectness among the troops. A very high percentage of these political commissars were Jews,

and the practice of many German commanders was to separate these communist commissars from captured Soviet troops and shoot them. As I said, I've spoken with former German soldiers who did some of the shooting and with others who witnessed the shooting of Jews.

And many Jews were rounded up, deported, and packed into concentration camps or forced-labor camps during the war, and many of these concentration-camp inmates died from disease and malnutrition in the camps, especially toward the end of the war, when it became very difficult for the besieged Germans to continue providing adequate sanitation and nutrition to the prisoners. It's difficult to estimate how many Jews lost their lives during the war as a result of German policies against them: perhaps half a million, perhaps a million, maybe even more. It's also difficult to estimate how many non-Jews -- Poles, Balts, Russians, Ukrainians, Croats, Germans -- lost their lives during and especially after the war as a result of the policies of the Jews or the Jews' allies against them: there were at least five million of these non-Jewish victims, perhaps as many as ten million.

Anyway, neither David Irving nor I am a "Holocaust denier," in the common-sense meaning of the term. But that's not the way the Jews use the term. To them the "Holocaust" is not simply the persecution or killing of the Jews during the war. It is a body of dogma consisting of thousands of specific claims, which non-Jews are required to swallow whole, without question or quibble. To the Jews a "Holocaust denier" is any non-Jew who has even one question or quibble about any of these claims. If one points out, for example, that the stories the Jews were circulating for many years after the war about dead Jews being skinned to make lampshades and about the bodies of gassed Jews being converted into soap are lies with no basis in fact whatsoever, one is called a "Holocaust denier." That's the way the Jews use the term, and it's also the way the people in their employ, such as journalists, use the term. A single quibble about fake lampshade photographs or whatever, and one is a "Holocaust denier." That certainly is cute of them to have their own definition of the term, but not to share that definition with the general public. When they accuse someone like Irving of being a "Holocaust denier," they want the lemmings to believe that he's some sort of flat-earth crackpot who believes he can walk on water and who really claims that there were no concentration camps, that no Jews at all were killed during the war, and so on. They want to destroy his credibility.

And so when Deborah Lipstadt, who is a professor of the very trendy and Politically Correct new academic discipline known as "Holocaust studies" at Atlanta's Emory University, called Irving a "Holocaust denier" he sued her for trying to damage his credibility as a historian, and the Jews of the world went berserk. At any given moment there are dozens of libel suits in progress in the courts, and very few of them attract any attention, but the Jews regarded Irving's suit against Lipstadt as a mortal threat. Mobs of shrieking Jews gathered outside the London courthouse, screaming death threats at Irving and throwing things at him each time he showed up for a hearing in connection with his suit: really remarkable behavior.

That reminds me of the sort of reaction that I often get from Jews. I was being interviewed on a New York radio talk show two weeks ago, the Alan Colmes Show, and a Jew who identified himself as "Bernie" called in from Brooklyn and was foaming with hatred as he announced how much he wanted to kill me. I thought about Brooklyn Bernie's reaction to me and the reaction of the Jews to Irving's law suit, and I contrasted this with the behavior of other people toward the

Jews. I never have seen a Pole or a Latvian or a German or a Russian shrieking at a Jew in public that he wants to kill Jews because of what Jews or Jewish policies have done to his people. The Poles, for example, have suffered much more at the hands of the Jewish communists than the Jews suffered at the hands of the Germans. In 1940 Jewish communists tried to decapitate Poland. They rounded up as many of Poland's military officers and her writers and professors and scientists and poets and other intellectuals and leaders as they could and murdered them. Many of the victims were buried in the Katyn forest, and their graves were discovered later by the German Army, but other mass graves of Polish leaders still are being discovered in Russia today.

And what do you see today? Do you see Poles becoming hysterical in public and screaming at the Jews for being anti-Polish? No, what you see instead is Jews making a circus about how anti-Semitic the Poles are! What you see are delegations of Jews from the United States going to Poland and demanding loudly and arrogantly that Polish Catholics remove crucifixes from areas near places that the Jews have declared to be "Holocaust" memorials!

Sometimes it's difficult to decide how much of this Jewish behavior is calculated theatrical display designed to impress the lemmings and how much of it is based on a genuine conviction that Jews are entitled to do whatever they want to the Gentiles, and the Gentiles aren't entitled to defend themselves. If one sees the Jews outside the London court shrieking their hatred at David Irving or listens to Brooklyn Bernie on the radio in New York mouthing his hatred of me, one cannot help but remember that the Romans 2,000 years ago regarded the Jews as the most hate-filled race in their empire. But we also must remember that the Jews are in fact a theatrical people, whose whole existence has been based on illusion and deception.

In the case of David Irving's libel suit against Deborah Lipstadt, they really were worried that if the court decided that he wasn't a "Holocaust denier" for pointing out that some of the specific "Holocaust" claims are bogus, then their whole body of "Holocaust" mythology, of "Holocaust" dogma would come unraveled. If historians are permitted to examine and investigate the "Holocaust" piece by piece, instead of being required to swallow it whole, then it not only loses much of its substance as the bogus components are removed, it also loses its mythical quality; it loses its ability to inspire awe in the lemmings. And to the Jews this is extremely important. The "Holocaust" is a shield they use to cover many things, and it is an effective shield only when it is able to inspire awe.

Well, they really need not have worried about David Irving's libel suit. They had a Politically Correct judge who ruled against Irving and then went out of his way to denounce Irving on his own as a "Holocaust denier." And that really should not have surprised Irving. Two groups of people in our society who can be counted on absolutely to do the bidding of the Jews are journalists and politicians, and the unfortunate fact is that judges these days are more often than not politicians: soulless men on the make, without scruple or principle.

What really caught my attention about the Irving case was the reaction by the Jews to their victory. It was obscene. They were crowing about their own righteousness and spewing hatred at the defeated Irving. It reminded me of the way the communists in Italy -- many of whom also were Jews -- dealt with the defeated Benito Mussolini at the end of the Second World War. Not

only did they murder him after he had surrendered, but then they murdered his mistress, Claretta Petacci, they kicked and stoned the bodies until the faces were unrecognizable, they danced around the bodies in glee, they urinated on them, and then they put the bodies on public display, hanging them upside down by their feet, so that Claretta's dress fell down around her shoulders.

The Simon Wiesenthal center in Los Angeles issued a statement crowing that the libel verdict was:

a victory of history over hate. . . . David Irving's career as a historian is over. . . . He will be relegated to the garbage heap of history's haters.

And virtually every major newspaper in America crowed along with the Wiesenthal Center. Mortimer Zuckerman's New York *Daily News* called the verdict "a powerful setback to the Holocaust denial movement" and editorialized:

By rejecting a libel suit brought by crackpot historian David Irving -- who denies the extent of the Holocaust -- Britain's High Court has sent a strong condemnation of those who try to rewrite history.

No reasonable person who has read one of Irving's meticulously researched and carefully written histories of the events of the Second World War would describe him as a "crackpot." And I think that not even the few thoughtful people remaining in our thoroughly corrupt judicial system or in Britain's equally corrupt judicial system believe that the proper role of the courts is to condemn those scholars who try to give us a more nearly correct understanding of the past.

The *New York Times* quoted Lipstadt's Jewish lawyer, Anthony Julius, who said:

It's important to secure definitive rulings against Holocaust deniers, to send them back into the anti-Semitic ghetto from which they came.

The *New York Post* referred in an editorial to Irving's "sinister campaign of Holocaust denial" and stated:

We don't expect David Irving to be silenced by Justice Grey's verdict, but hopefully it will cause those legitimate historians who have credited his crackpot theories to think twice before using him as a source of information.

Of course, the historians considered "legitimate" by the Jews and their lackeys in the media and the courts are those who already are so corrupt that they wouldn't even consider questioning any aspect of the "Holocaust" story, not even those already completely exposed as bogus, such as the claim that the Germans converted the corpses of dead Jews into soap and lampshades.

I said a minute ago that the reason the Jews become so nervous and defensive when anyone begins asking questions about any detail of the "Holocaust" is that they use it as a shield. They also make an enormous amount of money from the "Holocaust" story. But mainly it is a shield to cover some very questionable activities of theirs. Consider the state of Israel, for example. While

we bomb other countries to rubble that are suspected of attempting to develop nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons -- Iraq for example -- we completely ignore Israel's development of a huge arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. While we impose a starvation blockade on Iraq, we actually facilitate Israel's use of military technology stolen from us to build doomsday weapons. We pretend not to notice when Israel thumbs its nose at the rules that apply to everyone else.

Why is that? Why do the ordinary rules of behavior not apply to Israel? Well, of course, it is the "Holocaust." Any criticism of Israel, any questioning of Israel, immediately brings the accusation of "anti-Semitism" and images of heaps of dead Jews, fake lampshades, gas chambers, crematoria, and so on. That's why Israel's arrogant, strutting, toad-like little prime minister, Ehud Barak, was among those Jews crowing about the Irving verdict last month. When the verdict was announced Barak told the *New York Times* about the importance of the "Holocaust" to Jews, and he concluded his statement by alluding to Israel's illegal arsenal of weapons of mass destruction when he boasted about his country's military strength, which, he said, is great enough now so that, "no one in the world will dare rise against the Jewish nation."

And the American taxpayers are still paying billions of dollars every year to maintain the Jewish nation's illegal arsenal, so that Barak can make that boast.

Of course, Israel's illegal weapons program isn't the only thing shielded by the "Holocaust." Have you seen some of the filth coming from Hollywood recently? Hollywood has launched a crash program to make sex between Whites and Blacks fashionable. And because Hollywood is Jewish from top to bottom, that means that it's a Jewish program. And it's not just coincidentally a Jewish program; it's not that Hollywood just happens to be Jewish, and this trendy new thing of trying first to make rap and other aspects of Black life fashionable among White teenagers and now promoting interracial sex just happened to come from Hollywood as some sort of natural development. No, this is entirely artificial; it is something the Jews have been planning and working toward for decades.

I've been telling you for a long time what they were trying to do, even when they were doing it very subtly and were denying that they were doing it. It wasn't so subtle, of course, that other perceptive observers didn't understand what they were up to, but most of them were afraid to comment on it. And the reason they were afraid was the "Holocaust." They were afraid that if they imputed any sinister motives to the Jews who own Hollywood, they would be accused of "anti-Semitism," and the whole "Holocaust" apparatus, with Jewish soap and lampshades and gas chambers and the rest, would be unleashed on them. But now all of Hollywood's subtlety in their race-mixing campaign is gone. Now it's all out in the open, all quite brazen and obvious.

Take a look at the latest race-mixing abomination to come out of Hollywood, Mr. James Toback's film *Black and White.* They are really gloating over the way they have corrupted and multiculturalized White teenagers in America. First they uprooted and alienated young Whites from their own heritage, their own racial community, their own folkways. They made them feel that they had nothing to identify with, nothing to belong to, nothing to be proud of. To be proud of one's European heritage, of the qualities and accomplishments of one's White ancestors, is to be racist. What is really cool is the hip-hop culture. It is cool to be Black. That is the poisonous

message the Jews of Hollywood and Madison Avenue have been putting into the minds and hearts of many White teenagers. It is cool for a White girl to have a Black boyfriend. That is the deliberate, calculated message of Hollywood. And most of the people who see what they're doing to our people are afraid to call them to account for it because of the "Holocaust" myth.

And just about every White American who has some inkling of the horror now occurring in Rhodesia understands that the reason the television networks are remaining silent about that horror is that it is Blacks killing and raping and plundering Whites there, and that if it were the other way around their television screens would be full of it day and night. They understand that much, but they are afraid to carry their understanding much further and to connect Jewish ownership of the mass media with this anti-White bias, because to do so would be "anti-Semitic," with all of its connections to the "Holocaust" and gas chambers and lampshades.

That's what I mean when I say that the Jews use the "Holocaust" as a shield for their activities today. So if you ever wondered why "Holocaust" museums and "Holocaust" memorials are sprouting like poisonous mushrooms all over America -- if you ever wondered why Jews and their bought politicians are insisting that "Holocaust" propaganda be pounded into every White child's head in school -- now you know.

Moral AIDS

Last month a few of my fellow members of the National Alliance distributed some flyers on the campus of the University of Texas in Austin. The flyers warned White women about the AIDS dangers of sexual contact with non-Whites, pointing out in particular that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely to be infected with AIDS-causing HIV as heterosexual White males are. Well, the usual suspects really had a fit about our flyers. The Jews and the liberals and the feminists and Marxists and the rest organized a "rally against racism" on the campus, with the wholehearted support of the university administration. The student newspaper joined the chorus of those bewailing the fact that anyone would believe that Blacks are in any way different from Whites in the matter of sexually transmitted disease and that anyone would want to discourage sexual relations between White women and Black men. I mean, that's all terribly racist, isn't it, and there's just nothing worse than racism, is there? The liberals and the Christians were wringing their hands about our racism, and the Marxists and the feminists were muttering darkly about some sort of physical retribution against us.

I received a prissy letter from the university administration complaining about our leaflets, and a radio station in Austin, KVRX, interviewed me about the affair. The radio interview gave me an opportunity to counter some misinformation our opponents had been disseminating on the campus, to the effect that our statement that Blacks are much more likely to be HIV carriers than Whites is false. The anti-racists wanted the public to believe that there's no difference between Whites and Blacks where AIDS is concerned. I mean, we're all equal, right? It's embarrassing to them to have people talking about the much higher HIV infection rate of Blacks. That smacks of racism!

The part of our message that caused the most distress to the Politically Correct folks at the University of Texas was our warning to White women to stay away from Black males. That upset the Jews and Marxists, of course, because they have been pushing hard to encourage interracial sex. That's the ultimate cure for the race problem, they claim. When everyone is a mulatto, when we've all become the same shade of brown a few generations hence, then there will be no more racism, and we all will live together happily forever after. Well, of course, we expect that sort of poisonous propaganda from the Jews and the Marxists. What is really disappointing is the degree to which this poisonous attitude has taken hold in the university community generally, and also among the general public.

And you know, it's worse than simply having been taught incorrect information about racial differences. And it's worse than simply a change of opinion about racial matters. It's a general softening, a general feminization of public attitudes. American universities not only have been dumbed down in the name of equality; they also have been wimped down. They have been demasculinized.

I was an undergraduate at a Texas university too -- Rice University -- 45 years ago. Even then, in the 1950s, I had the feeling that the university community was not entirely in touch with reality. We were 20-year-olds with the attitudes of children. Five hundred years before -- even a century before -- 20-year-old males were men, with men's responsibilities. In the past, 20-year-old

women also had responsibilities, including a husband, a home, and three or four children. About the most serious concern I and my fellow undergraduates had in the 1950s was keeping our grades up enough to avoid being drafted for the Korean War. Still, we were a bit more mature than today's crop of undergraduates.

You know, there are some types of behavior which stem from fashion, and some types of behavior which stem from character. An example of fashion-based behavior might be the prevalence of cigarette smoking, for example, or the type of intoxicants used. When I was an undergraduate, smoking was considered a low-class thing. It had been more prevalent in my military school, where the students came from a wider range of social backgrounds. At the university, however, there was a blue-collar stigma associated with smoking. A few students smoked, mainly because they had gotten hooked on it and weren't strong enough to quit, but it definitely wasn't fashionable. Girls, in particular, didn't smoke.

Probably a more striking change in behavior is drug usage. Fifty years ago the only drug acceptable among students was alcohol. Perhaps in some of the very Jewish schools in the Northeast other drugs were fashionable, but certainly not in Texas. Whisky and gin and beer, yes; marijuana and cocaine and heroin, no. We knew about these drugs, but anyone who used them would have been a social outcast on campus. They weren't fashionable.

Weakness and failure also weren't fashionable. Success was. When the semester grades for students were posted, they had a distinct social significance. Getting A's was no guarantee of popularity, of course, but getting Ds and Fs was a guarantee that one would be considered a loser, and no one wanted to be seen in the company of a loser. Those were the days before football scholarships -- and certainly before basketball scholarships -- at least, at my school. Success still is fashionable everywhere, I believe, but my impression is that losers and weaklings are protected much more from the consequences of their weakness than before. They are shielded from the social stigma of failure. Excuses are made for them. They are tolerated more than before. I think that may involve more than fashion, however. There may be a change in character involved.

That's certainly the case with race, although it's difficult to separate all of the factors involved. Fifty years ago if it had been discovered that a White female student was involved in a sexual relationship with a Black, that would have been the end of her. It would have been as if she had been discovered having sex with a dog: worse, actually. And it wasn't just a matter of Blacks being low-status people. There were wealthy Black entertainers in those days, but wealth would not have been a mitigating circumstance.

There are types of behavior that we abhor instinctively: types of behavior that nearly everyone abhors in a natural environment and that at some level those who have good instincts -- or one might say, good character -- continue to abhor even in an unnatural environment where natural reactions to abhorrent behavior are repressed. Homosexuality is one type of naturally abhorrent behavior. Racial mixing is another. These are not matters of fashion. Men who behave like women always have been despised. Women who mate outside their race always have been despised. Men who do not find such behavior abhorrent aren't simply responding to changes in

fashion; they are revealing flaws in their character. A community or a society that proclaims such behavior acceptable is a weak and morally flawed community, a weak and degenerate society.

You know, I'm not a social scientist, and I have neither the time nor the resources to do an academic study of the correlation between various changes we can see in our society and in the behavior of our people -- but I'm sure that there is, in fact, a strong correlation among three things: first, the increased isolation and shielding of our young men from the natural world; second, the lack of manliness; the lack of self-confidence, maturity, and responsibility; the lack of strength, daring, and independence in young men today; and third, the willingness to accept every sort of perverse, unnatural, and destructive behavior as "normal." It's as if an excessively sheltered life-style leads first to an atrophy of manly virtue and moral strength, the way lack of exercise leads to muscular atrophy, and then it leads to a shutdown of the normal powers of discrimination, almost in the way HIV causes a shutdown of the human immune system. One might almost say that while AIDS is gaining ground rapidly in the Black population, the moral equivalent of AIDS is ravaging the White population.

Although this moral disease has infected our whole society, it seems to me that it has done more damage in our universities than anywhere else. Perhaps that's because university students are somewhat more shielded from the real world than most of the rest of the population -- or perhaps it's because the purveyors of the disease have focused their infectious efforts on the universities. My feeling is that despite the postponement of the acceptance of responsibilities which is inherent in being a university student, university life need not be morally debilitating.

Here's one small example: In many German universities, especially before the disaster of 1945, dueling clubs were an important part of student life. They not only served to maintain consciousness of the concept of manly honor, but they taught young men to be willing to expose themselves to physical danger and to undergo pain. I'm not specifically advocating dueling in American universities. There are far more serious problems in the universities to be dealt with first. I'm just saying that I believe that our universities don't have to be the morally debilitating institutions that they are today. They don't have to be the sort of place where Political Correctness is more strongly entrenched and more rigidly enforced than anywhere else in our society, and where the average student believes that toleration for everything that is perverse and destructive is a virtue.

You know, the principal reason we need to be concerned about our universities is that the leaders in nearly every sector of our society pass through them and are influenced by them. When I speak with various people who are in our universities today or who have recently graduated, I get different impressions of the problem. Some tell me about the strong influence of the homosexuals on the campuses, about how tightly organized and powerful and militant they are. And of course, this is a striking change for me. When I was a student there was no homosexual problem at all. Probably there were a few homosexuals here and there, but they certainly weren't noticeable, and no one knew who they were. And it wasn't that they were repressed or persecuted. There simply was no homosexual problem. They weren't an issue.

Other people focus on the feminists, and their influence on the campuses also is a striking change. That was another problem we didn't have when I was a student. We had individual

women who were problems, of course, just as we had individual men who were problems, but we had no organized feminist nuttiness and perversity of the sort which is such an unhealthy influence today. Then there are the Marxists. The collapse of organized Marxism in the outside world seems to have gone unnoticed on our university campuses, which remain the one venue in America outside of New York City where this particular malignancy still finds its devoted adherents. When I was a student we had a few -- very few -- individual Marxists on the campus, but certainly no one took them seriously enough even to punch them in the nose. I guess we should have punched them in the nose and discouraged that particular bunch of freaks before they had a chance to do any more damage.

When I look at the really profound changes which have taken place in our universities during the past 50 years, I try not to become obsessed with any one change. I try to understand the whole pattern of changes. I look for common elements, and I always look for causes. What -- or who -- is behind the changes?

I see three really big changes, three patterns of change, and they are interrelated. One change is the imposition of Political Correctness. Every university in America now has what amounts to an Orwellian Ministry of Truth, which determines what ideas, what thoughts, what expressions -- even what facts -- are permissible. Give any hint that you have an impermissible idea in your head, and the Thought Police are all over you, and you're in real trouble. That's why the folks at the University of Texas had such a hard time coping with the fact that HIV infection is so much more prevalent among Blacks than among Whites: eight times as prevalent overall, and 14 times as prevalent if one considers just heterosexual males, which, of course, is what counts if one is warning White women about sexual contact with Blacks. That is a Politically Incorrect fact. And of course, suggesting that interracial sex is not a good thing, regardless of the AIDS danger, also is Politically Incorrect.

When I was a student people were free to think thoughts which some people considered offensive or to say things which offended other people. If you did that often enough you might become very unpopular, but that was your business. Nobody told you that you couldn't do it.

At the same time the mental straitjacket of Political Correctness was being imposed on our universities another imposition was being made that might at fist glance seem contradictory but which really was just a different face of Political Correctness, and that was the notion that tolerance is a wonderful thing. The reason this notion isn't contrary to Political Correctness is that it isn't tolerance in the usual sense of the word. Politically Correct "tolerance" is tolerance of all of those things that would be intolerable in a healthy society and intolerance of those things that used to be accepted by normal, healthy people. "Tolerance" today means accepting homosexuals and feminists and Jews and Marxists without criticism or question. It means smiling whenever you see an interracial couple. It means tolerating the sort of behavior engaged in by people like Bill Clinton, when he used to send out the Arkansas State Police to round up women for him. It means tolerating Janet Reno's burning down a church packed with women and children in Waco, Texas. It mean's tolerating Madeleine Albright's murderous assault on any country in Europe or the Middle East which refuses to obey the New World Order crowd. But it most certainly does not mean tolerating anything that smacks of White racism or sexism or homophobia -- or more generally, anything that is Politically Incorrect. The new "tolerance" is

just the smiley face of Political Correctness: the warm, fuzzy, friendly side of Political Correctness.

The second really big pattern of change at our universities also has taken place throughout our whole society, but it has hit the universities especially hard, and that is "diversity." When I was a student, not only an undergraduate in Texas but also a graduate student in Colorado and in California, the universities were White. The only really noticeable minority anywhere was the Jewish minority. At Caltech there was a tiny sprinkling of Asians. I can't remember any Blacks. I remember just a handful of Blacks at the University of Colorado. And it wasn't because there was any Jim Crow law keeping non-Whites out. Nor was it a financial barrier. I never paid tuition. I was a poor boy. I either had scholarships or I worked as a graduate assistant. The great advantage in those days was that there was a real sense of community. The universities were European institutions, White institutions, and as students we were part of them.

Today it's quite different. Some of the graduate schools are packed so full of Asians and other non-Whites that there's literally no room for White students. There's certainly no sense that one is part of a European institution. What the diversity-mongers have done is de-Aryanize our universities. I believe that the aim was not so much to get more Blacks and Filipinos and Chinamen and Pakistanis into our universities for the sake of diversity as it was to dilute the White presence to the point that we no longer would feel a sense of proprietorship: we would no longer feel that they were our universities and therefore wouldn't resist the changes being made. That's certainly the way it has turned out.

And it's not just the non-Whites who have added to the cultural dissonance at our universities. It is all of the newly empowered minions of Political Correctness: the feminists, the queers, and so on. And now I'll really stick my neck out and generalize from what has been happening in our universities to what has been happening in our whole society. The same people who have been busy de-Aryanizing our universities have been de-Aryanizing America. The process has gone a bit further in the universities, but all of America is headed for the same place, and it's not a very nice place.

Why are we going there? Well, that's because of the third change -- which is something I've already mentioned: namely, the wimping down of our people and the shutting off of their normal powers of discrimination. Can you imagine the people of any normal, healthy nation letting themselves be dispossessed the way we're being dispossessed? Can you imagine any healthy, White country permitting fast-breeding mestizos to come pouring across their southern border at the rate of more than a million a year without raising a hand to stop them? Can you imagine any morally healthy nation tolerating the sort of behavior we've seen in Washington during the Clinton era? How long has it been since we've assassinated a single politician? My God, we are sick unto death!

In my view, a White nation that permits its women to run with its former Black slaves not only is sick, but doesn't deserve to live. An Aryan nation that permits Jews to teach its young people and that permits Jews to control its entertainment media and to use those media to promote miscegenation and every other form of self-destructive degeneracy not only is sick, but is very close to death.

Believe me, if White Americans weren't already ravaged by moral AIDS and their government behaved the way the Clinton government has been behaving, the rotting corpses of politicians, judges, and bureaucrats would be swinging from every lamppost and power pole in Washington. The headquarters buildings of every major media corporation in New York and Hollywood would be burned-out ruins, and the blood of the people who had worked in those buildings would be running ankle deep in the gutters around the ruins. Every inner city and every non-White neighborhood in America would be blocked off while armed teams went door to door and made the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo look like a Sunday school picnic by comparison. That's what would happen if we were a healthy, moral nation, instead of a terminally ill nation brought down by the purveyors of moral AIDS.

Our Task

Every week I tell you that America is in serious trouble, that our race is in serious trouble. And I'm sure that most of you who are regular listeners believe that and also understand why we're in trouble. But it's clear that many White Americans don't believe we're in trouble. How could anything be wrong when the shopping malls are full of things to buy and they haven't even reached the limit on their credit cards yet? With unemployment down, inflation down, even the government's crime statistics down, how could we be in trouble?

It's clear that most of these Alfred E. Neuman types, these soccer-mom types, don't have a clue, but still sometimes they make me feel as if I'm deliberately trying to be a spoilsport, looking for problems where there are none, just so I'll have something to complain about. The fact is that most people are not able to see much beyond the ends of their noses -- or their television screens. If their television screens tell them over and over again that everything is rosy, except that we have a big problem with gun violence in America, for example, and that we really need to outlaw gun shows and register all gun owners, the soccer moms will agree, and they will even get out into the streets to demonstrate for laws requiring trigger locks on all firearms.

Beyond that, however, if they don't have Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather or Peter Jennings or Bill Clinton telling them that they have a serious problem, and if they're not being gang-raped at the moment or having their throats cut at the moment, they are inclined to believe that White Americans don't have any serious problems. As long as their refrigerators are full, and the electricity still keeps their television screens lit, and their credit cards are still good, they cannot be convinced that the future isn't basically rosy. Get trigger locks on the guns, get some more laws against hate crimes, and keep those troublesome heterosexual White males from upsetting the shopping cart, and with the help of the government in Washington we all can continue consuming in multicultural comfort and safety forever.

Well, there are a few places in America where what I just said doesn't apply, a few places where even the soccer moms are worried about things their television screens never show them: Douglas, Arizona, for example. I spoke about the situation there in my broadcast of March 18, and that situation certainly has not gotten any better in the last two months. Douglas, remember, is a town in southeastern Arizona right on the Mexican border. Hundreds of illegal aliens come across the border there every day. On some days thousands come across.

The U.S. Border Patrol, whose responsibility it is to keep them out, instead keeps itself busy pretending not to notice them. And the Border Patrol behaves that way not because the local bureaucrat in charge is lazy or corrupt, but because that's what he is ordered to do by his boss in Washington. That's what the Jewess in charge of Mr. Clinton's Immigration and Naturalization Service, Doris Meissner, tells him to do, in effect, by setting policies and imposing conditions on the actions of the Border Patrol which make it impossible actually to protect the border.

In my March 18 broadcast I mentioned a local rancher, Roger Barnett, who has been trying to protect his 22,000-acre cattle ranch in the Douglas area from the damage caused by trespassing illegal aliens from Mexico. I talked about his efforts to stem the flood by performing citizen's

arrests of an estimated 3,000 illegal aliens during the past two years, and of the lack of cooperation from the Clinton government. In fact, the Clinton government would like nothing better than to lock up Roger Barnett for opposing the growing invasion of the southwestern United States by Mexicans -- and even more they'd like to lock him up for calling attention to the Clinton government's refusal to protect America's borders.

I'll read you a few paragraphs from a Reuters news dispatch out of Phoenix ten days ago. This news report is by David Schwartz and is dated May 10:

U.S. and Mexican officials, concerned about mounting tensions over ranchers rounding up illegal immigrants in far southeastern Arizona, are planning to investigate the potentially violent situation. Plans call for Mexican officials to travel to the state following a flurry of incidents in which armed ranchers have nabbed people illegally crossing the border and turned them over to the U.S. Border Patrol, said Mexican Consul Miguel Escobar Valdez in Douglas, Arizona. Escobar Valdez said such actions set a "dangerous precedent" that must be stopped. "We do believe that the potential is there for violence," he told Reuters. "We do believe that private citizens are doing things reserved for law enforcement agencies. … Whether they have documents or not, they are still human beings, and they should be treated accordingly - not have a gun shoved in their face or be roughed up," he said.

Now, let's think about what this Reuters news report from Phoenix says. And remember, what I just read was not my wording. It was the wording of a Jewish reporter working for a Jewish news agency. The problem being reported on -- the potentially violent situation in southeastern Arizona -- according to Reuters, is not the hordes of illegal aliens pouring across our border, it is not the invasion of our country by Mexicans -- it is the attempt by American citizens to protect their property from the invaders. That's the problem, as seen by Reuters, as seen by the Mexican consul, and as seen by the Clinton government. We're the problem, those of us who want to stop this invasion of our country are the problem, not the illegal aliens.

The Clinton government pretends that the problem in southeastern Arizona is a human rights problem, a problem of illegal aliens having their supposed human rights violated by nasty, bigoted, heterosexual White males with guns, such as Roger Barnett. If the Clintonistas can just organize a few more big anti-gun demonstrations by the feather-brained soccer moms of the country, then we can get rid of that racist, sexist Second Amendment and take the guns away from heterosexual White males such as Roger Barnett before he violates the human rights of any more illegal aliens and causes violence in Arizona. Really, that is exactly the way the people in your government in Washington think. They see Roger Barnett as the problem, not the illegal aliens.

In this maddening situation, Roger Barnett seems to be the only person in contact with reality. I'll read from the May 10 Reuters report again:

Area rancher Roger Barnett, a leader in the roundups, said residents are just doing what they can to defend their property against a siege of illegals. "I want the people off my property," said Barnett, whose cattle ranch spans 22,000 acres near the border. "You won't want them in your backyard or front yard. It's an invasion without guns, but we're still getting invaded."

And Roger Barnett also told Reuters that he and other Americans in the area have no choice about being vigilantes, because the government is letting them down. That's exactly right, Mr. Barnett, it's an invasion of our country, and it's nonetheless dangerous -- it's nonetheless destructive of our future -- just because most of the invaders aren't carrying guns. And our big problem -- yours and mine -- is that the filthy, treasonous government in Washington not only is letting us down, but it is on the side of the invaders. The Clinton government and the Jewish media are against us and for the invaders.

Now, before I am accused of distorting the news myself and not giving you the full story, I should tell you that Doris Meissner's U.S. Border Patrol actually does more than trying to prevent Roger Barnett from interfering with the Mexican invasion; it also does pretend to be patrolling our border. The Reuters article from which I have been quoting points out that in March of this year the Border Patrol arrested 31,015 illegal aliens in the town of Douglas, which itself has a population of just 15,000 citizens. That's amazing, isn't it? In a one-month period this year, the Border Patrol arrested more than 31,000 illegal aliens in an American town with a normal population of only 15,000 citizens, and I'll bet this broadcast is the first you've heard of it. I mean, the news was in the May 10 Reuters report I've been reading to you, but somehow the major media overlooked it. Imagine yourself living in an American town of 15,000 which is so overrun with illegal aliens that the Border Patrol can arrest 31,000 of them in a month without even trying. What a nightmare! You'd consider that a newsworthy situation, wouldn't you? You'd think that the Federal government ought to declare your town a disaster area and send in the Army. And yet the mainstream media haven't told you about the situation in Douglas, Arizona. Could it be because they don't want you to know about it?

And I should add that the arrest of more than 31,000 illegal aliens a month in Douglas is just a pretense. It's just an effort to keep the local citizens from following Roger Barnett's lead and cleaning the town out themselves. None of these 31,000 illegal aliens were punished for invading the United States. None were imprisoned or shot or flogged or hanged or skinned and staked out on an anthill in the desert, the way their ancestors used to treat our ancestors in the area 150 years ago. They were simply given a free meal and bused back across the border, so that they can invade us again. Nothing -- absolutely nothing -- was done to discourage them from trying again. That's why the flood continues to grow. It's because the Clinton government isn't really trying to stop it and doesn't want it to stop. What the Clintonistas want to stop is people like Roger Barnett. I'll read you the final two paragraphs from the Reuters report:

Border Patrol officials said they are doing what they can about the arrests by local residents, telling them to call and not act on their own. Special patrols of about two dozen agents also have been formed to deal with the rancher problem.

"We're concerned about the safety and the rights of everyone," said Rob Daniels, a Border Patrol spokesman in Tucson. "We're trying to defuse the situation as best we can."

Listen, I shouldn't have to tell you that when the U.S. government sees what is happening in Arizona as a "rancher problem" and equates the supposed "rights" of illegal aliens with those of American property owners, we're all in real trouble in this country -- not just the folks in Douglas, but all of us. For a long time I've been telling everyone that we're in trouble, but when

so many people still are relatively comfortable it's difficult for them to take me seriously. Their view of what's happening in the world is determined by what they see on their TV screens. They really don't see any further than that. That's why the Jews and the Clintonistas are able to get hundreds of thousands of brainless female twits marching in Washington to demand the repeal of the Second Amendment. The soccer moms live in a suburban-yuppie world where they expect the government to solve their problems, provide for their needs, and protect them from their own weakness and indiscipline. They believe that everyone should have guarantees of safety and happiness. They don't understand that we live in an inherently dangerous world in which we need to be able to protect ourselves, and they really believe that they'll be doing good when they get their Big Brother in Washington to confiscate all the guns, so that little Johnny can't take Daddy's gun to school and blow away little Susie with it.

In their world these twits can't imagine the sort of world Roger Barnett is forced to live in because of the policies of their Big Brother in Washington. They can't imagine how much worse they will make his world if their Big Brother succeeds in disarming him. Most of them probably don't even care. I saw one of the twits who was in last Sunday's anti-gun march in Washington boasting to the TV cameras that "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." My, she was proud of herself! She exulted in the power of the mindless mob of which she was a part, the power of the lemmings on the march behind their Big Brother in Washington. She would gladly trade Roger Barnett's right to protect himself for another chance to see herself on television. Roger Barnett isn't even real to her because she hasn't seen him on television, and she really doesn't want to hear about his Politically Incorrect problem. Of course, her tune will change when the invasion that Roger Barnett and a few others are trying to stem overwhelms him and the invaders are in her front yard. Then she'll yell to Big Brother for help, and when Big Brother helps the invaders instead, perhaps she will begin to understand that we do have a problem.

Well, that's getting a bit off the track. I have called to your attention the Clintonista immigration policy in action in southeastern Arizona because I wanted an absolutely clear and unambiguous example of the fundamentally treasonous and criminal nature of the government we have in Washington. To be honest with you, I can think of a hundred other policies of the government that fully justify putting every politician and bureaucrat in Washington up against a wall. But in many cases it's relatively easy for those who control the government and the media to muddy the waters and to keep the public confused about their motives.

In last year's war against Serbia by the Clinton government, for example, the media and the Clintonistas were able to persuade a substantial part of the American public that Madeleine Albright's terror-bombing of Belgrade was done for "humanitarian" reasons. Nine years ago the government and the media were able to persuade much of the public that Washington's war against Iraq was to protect American interests rather than purely Jewish interests. And today many Americans -- in addition to the brain-dead soccer moms -- have let themselves be persuaded that the real reason for the big push by the media and the Clinton government to register all gun owners is concern for the safety of children, just as they have let themselves be persuaded that the drive to censor the Internet and require filters on all computers in schools and libraries is based on concern for keeping pornography away from the eyes of children.

But the willful failure of the Federal government to fulfill its most fundamental obligation, which is the protection of the sovereign territory of the United States against foreign invaders -- well, that's a bit harder to explain away, isn't it? That's the sort of thing that most Americans -- not just extremists like me, but most Americans -- still call treason. And treason is the sort of crime for which most Americans still believe hanging is an appropriate punishment.

I mean, there are crazies in this country who really believe that it's racist and fascist and un-Christian to protect one's land from invaders: that we ought to throw open our borders to the Third World and welcome with open arms the dark subhumanity that comes flooding across, sharing all we have with them in order to atone for having been more successful than they, for having built a civilization while they squatted in their filth and multiplied. But the crazies understand that they're a pretty small minority, and they don't want to have to explain their views to the rest of the country.

In addition to the crazies there are those with really sinister motives. There are the people who control our mass media, for example -- and by that I mean the Jews: the Jews as a whole, the Jews as a people. Don't be fooled by the fact that a tiny minority of Jews have spoken out against open borders, and that an even tinier minority actually are involved in the immigration control movement. The thing that's important here, the thing that is decisive, is that the big Jews -- the leaders of the Jewish community, the Jews who control the mass media -- are in favor of maintaining the flooding of America with non-Whites. They are happy with the situation in Douglas, Arizona, but they know that most Americans wouldn't be happy if we knew about it, so they keep it quiet, so that we won't know about it. They keep it off our television screens. And when they do talk about it, like Reuters reporter David Schwartz did, they talk about it quietly, and they refer to it as a "rancher problem."

The Jews always have a false explanation for their destructive activities and policies, a cover excuse to keep us confused, to keep us guessing, so that we'll give them the benefit of the doubt. How much doubt can there be about what is happening in southeastern Arizona? What excuse can they possibly have for blacking out this story?

And then there are the politicians: may every one of them die violently and painfully at the end of a rope or in a bloody ditch, and may God damn all their souls to hell! I've blamed the situation in Arizona on Bill Clinton and his Jewish director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, but it won't be substantially different under George Bush. Politicians don't really have policies these days. They don't have ideologies any more than they have morals or principles. They are simply prostitutes with party affiliations and career strategies. And they all take their orders from the same people.

I don't really like to become emotional on these programs. I'll finish today with a simple statement of fact: America is being invaded. We're being invaded by mestizos and Indians, by non-Whites, who want the country we built and intend to take it away from us. This invasion is supported not only by radical egalitarians, who believe that every featherless biped in the world really is the same as every other and that we ought to share everything equally, but it is supported by the Jews who control America's mass media, because they are hell-bent on destroying the White majority in America by any means and thereby ending any possibility of

opposition to their own power. And because it is supported by the Jews, the politicians in Washington will not oppose it. If America is to survive, it will only be through the efforts of patriots such as Roger Barnett -- hundreds of thousands of such patriots, hundreds of thousands of White men with guns. And it will only be over the dead bodies of the politicians and their Jewish masters. That is America's problem. That is our task.

Termites

A number of noteworthy things have happened during the past few days. For example, the situation on our southern border, on which I commented last week, has continued to worsen. The Clinton government continues to regard the problem there as a rancher problem rather than as an invasion by illegal immigrants.

Privately the Clintonistas are irritated that White ranchers in Arizona have been interfering with the invasion, and that one of them, Roger Barnett, who owns a 22,000-acre cattle ranch near Douglas, Arizona, on the Mexican border, has arrested more than 3,000 illegal immigrants during the past two years and called attention to the government's willful failure to protect the border. The Clintonistas -- and by that term I mean all of those people, both inside the government and out, whose policies are supported by Bill Clinton and his government and who in turn approve of the government -- the Clintonistas want the invasion to continue, and they don't want anyone interfering with it. They also don't want anyone calling attention to it, because that might rouse public opposition to the invasion. The American public, or at least a substantial portion of the public might not believe the Clinton government's assertion that it is doing everything it can to protect our borders, but somehow just can't keep the mestizos from invading the United States. They've been hoping for the past two years that either Roger Barnett would be killed by some of the mestizos he was arresting or would kill a mestizo and could then be charged with murder and gotten out of the way. But Mr. Barnett is both a competent and a careful man, and he continues to be a thorn in the side of the Clintonistas.

So the Clintonistas now have taken the public position that they are concerned about "human rights" violations by vigilantes such as Barnett. They want to shift the public's perception from mass invasion to individual Mexicans who are being harassed by Barnett and other ranchers. That's just the sort of thing to distract the soccer moms and others who were captivated by the Elian Gonzales soap opera. In the hands of the Clintonista spin doctors the mestizo invasion has become a "human rights" problem. Bill Clinton's Jewish Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, met with Mexico's Foreign Minister Rosario Green -- *oy, veh!,* did I say Green? That doesn't sound like a Mexican name, does it? Madeleine Albright met with Rosario Green last week to plan a joint strategy against the vigilantes who are arresting the illegal aliens. They issued a joint statement on May 18 condemning the American ranchers. They are considering asking the United Nations to post UN observers along the border to watch for "human rights" violations. In addition Rosario Green announced that she has hired lawyers in Washington to sue the ranchers on behalf of the illegal aliens. She said:

The government of Mexico will use all of the legal and political resources at its disposal to guarantee that any violation of the rights and dignity of Mexicans is investigated and, if applicable, penalized.

And Attorney General Janet Reno -- that's our attorney general, not Mexico's -- Janet Reno has pledged to help in gathering evidence to prosecute the ranchers.

You have to pinch yourself to be sure you're not dreaming when Alice in Wonderland statements of this sort come from Washington and are reported with a straight face by the media. The unfortunate fact is that Albright and Reno are officials of our government, and they are conspiring with an official of a foreign government to prosecute U.S. citizens for protecting their property against the depredations of foreign criminals. And Mexicans who cross our border illegally are criminals, plain and simple, despite the preference of the media and the Clinton government for the euphemism "undocumented migrants." So we have these female Clinton gangsters getting together in Washington with the female foreign minister of Mexico not to address the problem of mestizos from Mexico invading our country and trespassing on the property of U.S. citizens, but instead to figure out what to do about American ranchers violating the supposed "human rights" and "dignity" of illegal aliens. Albright and Reno and the other Clintonistas aren't concerned in the least about American sovereignty or the rights of U.S. citizens; that's too much a male thing. They're concerned only about keeping the flow of illegals coming and not hurting their feelings by making them feel unwelcome. As crazy as it sounds, that is what is happening. And soon we may have a United Nations "peackeeping" force on the border to shoot any American who tries to stop a mestizo from exercising his "human rights" by coming across the border.

Well, that's pretty bad, but I'll tell you something that's even worse, and that is the substantial element among ordinary citizens who don't see anything wrong with the invasion or with the government's way of dealing with it. Last week a patriotic Arizona resident who is fed up with the Clinton government's refusal to stop the flood of illegal immigrants put up a billboard in Cochise county, where Roger Barnett lives. He urged other residents to telephone their congressmen and to complain about the invasion. The state's biggest newspaper, the *Arizona Republic*, immediately published a statement by a trendy businessman in Bisbee, also in Cochise county, condemning the billboard as divisive and racist. There seems to be a big enough supply of such businessmen and preachers and bureaucrats around so that the media always can find one to make a statement of the sort they want.

Two weeks ago two illegal mestizos came up to the of home an American who lives in Brackettville, Texas, near the Mexican border. The area has been plagued by illegals breaking into homes, stealing everything not nailed down, and assaulting residents. The American homeowner, 74-year-old Samuel Blackwood, shot one of the illegals, who died. Blackwood was arrested and charged with murder. And I assure you, the local businessmen, politicians, preachers, and media people will see to it that he gets a judicial lynching, so that no one can suspect that they are racists. They'll behave just the way the establishment people in Jasper, Texas, did after three drunken rednecks dragged a Black behind their truck two years ago. A local judge, Herb Senne, commented on what he considered Blackwood's overreaction to the two illegals who came to his house:

Nobody likes to have their property stolen, but you just learn to adjust to it.

Really, that's an exact quote of what the judge said last week to a reporter for the *Houston Chronicle:* **"You just learn to adjust to it."** Don't try to defend yourself or your property. That's racist. That's male. Just adjust to having your property stolen. Just adjust to the

trespassing. Just adjust to the invasion of your country by illegal mestizos. That's the safe, feminine thing to do. That's the Politically Correct thing to do.

That's the sort of reaction you might expect in New York City or in Washington, DC. But television has spread the sickness everywhere. There are people who dance to the media tune even in those areas most heavily impacted by the invasion. And that's what I really want to talk about today: not about the invasion of our country by mestizos, but about the reaction of our people to the invasion -- and to many other things that are being done to us. The question is: do we blame the Clinton government for the disaster which has befallen our country, or do we blame ourselves? After all, we elected this government -- twice. Even if we didn't vote for the piece of filth in the White House, we did nothing to stop him from what he is doing.

You know, the great bulk of our people always have lacked both judgment and principles. Most Americans have about as much moral sense as a brass doorknob. And I'm talking about your neighbors and colleagues and friends and relatives -- and mine. They have an instinct for conforming; for doing and saying what they think is expected of them; for adapting -- or as Judge Herb Senne of Brackettville, Texas, would put it -- for adjusting. And as I said, that's the way it's always been. We've always depended on a rather small minority to decide what is right and what is wrong, what is honorable and what is not, as well as what will benefit our race in the long run and what will not. When we had wise and good and honorable men as leaders, and when we followed their lead, our people prospered. If 225 years ago we'd had the sort of leaders we have today, Patrick Henry and Thomas Paine would have been locked up and forced to undergo sensitivity training, and we would have adjusted to King George's way of doing things. Well, on the bright side, at least, Bill Clinton wouldn't be in the White House, because there would be no White House.

So again: should we blame ourselves for being nothing but a worthless herd of lemmings, a herd which for the last few generations has failed to produce even a small minority of loyal and responsible leaders to show us the way? Or if the leaders were there and are there, should we blame ourselves for failing to heed them? Or should we look elsewhere for the cause of our disaster?

In trying to answer this very important question, let us note first that self-criticism often is a very beneficial thing. Only by recognizing our mistakes and shortcomings and studying them, analyzing them, can we hope for progress. The person who is unable to criticize himself or recognize his own faults -- the person who cannot blame himself for anything, but always blames others for his mistakes or failures -- will never be able to improve himself, because he cannot even admit the need for improvement. He always will be a loser and a failure. But above all, we must be objective in analyzing our problems. We must not be afraid to put the blame where it belongs because of some artificial taboo. Perhaps we are entirely to blame for our difficulties. On the other hand, perhaps someone else should share the blame for what has happened to us. If that is the case, let us not be afraid to say so. Our objective is to survive, and we must go wherever that objective leads us.

Having said that, I also should tell you that I believe that there is little to be gained by lambasting ourselves for being a herd of lemmings. There is little to be gained by bewailing human nature.

We can change human nature only very slowly -- and with great caution -- over the course of generations. For now we must accept what we are and try to make the best of it. And if we think about the matter very carefully perhaps we will decide even that Mother Nature didn't really make a mistake in designing us as a race 98 per cent of whom are lemmings. That has its advantages as well as its dangers. It allows us to work together for a common purpose, for example, instead of having everyone running off in a separate direction.

So let's ask our question this way: Why have we not had good leadership during this century? Why have we followed crooks and liars with no regard for the welfare of our people, crooks and liars and charlatans who have led us into every sort of vice and degeneracy and false path and now are rushing us headlong down the slope to racial extinction? Why? What went wrong? Did natural flaws develop in our society, in the system by which we have governed ourselves, or has some external enemy laid us low? Is our society suffering from faulty design or from termites?

A quick answer is: both. Our society has design flaws which we must endeavor to correct, and it also has termites, which we must exterminate. To understand this answer and to elaborate on it, just look around. Look at other things which are happening to us besides the mestizo invasion and the government's refusal to stop that invasion. And when we think about what is happening, let us not focus entirely on what our people are doing which they shouldn't be doing; let us remember that most of our people do only what they are told to do, only what they are manipulated into doing, and so let us direct our inquiry primarily into who is manipulating them and how and why.

That, of course, is a very big inquiry. If you've been listening to my broadcasts for a while, you know that most of them have dealt with one aspect or another of this inquiry. Today we'll only have time for one aspect besides the immigration situation, and that's racial mixing. It's useful to look at that, because it leads us quickly to the heart of the termite problem -- because, you see, immediately behind the racemixing problem is the promotion of racemixing by the controlled media: the deliberate encouragement of racial mixing by Hollywood and Madison Avenue.

Whenever you study public behavior, whenever you study fashions and trends, you quickly realize that the basic principle is "monkey see, monkey do." If you want to encourage a certain trend, a certain fashion, a certain type of public behavior, you don't try to reason with the public. You don't lecture the public. Instead you present to the public as many images as you can of the sort of behavior you want to encourage, and the lemming instinct will do the rest. Have you seen some of the advertisements put out for an Italian clothing manufacturer under the name "United Colors of Benetton"? Their favorite theme is racial mixing between Whites and Blacks: a little redheaded, blue-eyed White girl holding a Black infant, a Black baby in diapers kissing a White baby, and so on. They started on that theme a couple of years ago, and they are pushing it more and more boldly. Well, the clothing company is Italian, but their advertising agency, Saatchi & Saatchi, based in London, is entirely Jewish from top to bottom.

The same urge to depict scenes of racial mixing is rampant among advertising agencies on this side of the Atlantic. The Jews of Madison Avenue love to use models of indeterminate race for the advertisements they design: quadroons and octoroons and various Eurasian blends. And they seem to have a rule that whenever there is a group scene, there must be Blacks in it. It's gotten to

the point where the lemmings feel uncomfortable if they see an advertisement which shows an all-White scene. If they see an advertisement with a group of White children playing together, or a scene in an all-White classroom, the lemmings wonder where the Black child is that is practically obligatory these days for advertisements featuring children. And it's not just advertising. Every reporter with a camera covering a news story or a feature for a slick magazine is on the lookout for a Black in the crowd when he composes his shots -- and if he is lucky enough to be able to focus on an interracial couple, he knows that he will get bonus points from his boss. The idea is to remind the readers over and over and over again that we live in a multi-racial society, and, oh, isn't it wonderful! The idea is to make Blacks and other non-Whites seem like part of White society and to make racial mixing seem not only normal but trendy, fashionable. Even *National Geographic Magazine* has climbed onto the media bandwagon. Look at the photographs on pages 7 and 14 of the current June issue.

Even the advertising on boxes of breakfast cereal directed at children has the same, poisonous message. Not only does the advertising depict Black and White children together, it depicts White children dressing and behaving like Blacks: backward baseball caps, baggy shorts, Black jive talk, and adult Black rappers or basketball players as role models. The idea behind this advertising is not to sell more breakfast cereal to Blacks; it is to make White children feel that it is cool to be Black, that it is cool to be a part of the hip-hop culture, that it is cool to have a lot of Black friends, that it is cool to be a wigger.

And you know, this interracial advertising has not merely followed changes in our society; the advertising has led the changes. Traditionally the purpose of advertising is to persuade the public to buy a product. The advertiser seeks to make the customer not only want the product but to feel comfortable with it, to trust the manufacturer, and for this reason the advertiser seeks to avoid taboos, to avoid angering or alienating the customer. With the interracial advertising that certainly hasn't been the case. The advertisers have been on a crusade. The purpose has not been just to sell products. It has been to change the ideas and attitudes of the White public. They have proceeded with a certain amount of caution, of course, but it is clear that the product they have been trying to sell is not just breakfast cereal or Calvin Klein blue jeans, but racial mixing between Whites and Blacks.

And the reason they're trying to sell it is exactly the same reason they don't want Roger Barnett interfering with the flood of mestizos pouring into White America from Brown Mexico. Do you understand that? It's really very important. It is the key to understanding everything else that is happening today. The Jewish advertisers on Madison Avenue have exactly the same purpose as the Jews in the Clinton government -- Jews like Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and the head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Doris Meissner -- who're trying to keep the illegal aliens coming into the country.

If you have even the slightest doubt that this is a deliberate, Jewish policy aimed at corrupting and destroying our people, then look at what the Jews in Hollywood are doing with the new films they are producing. I mentioned the film *Black and White* in my broadcast three weeks ago. You really should see it. Then you will have no doubt what the termites are up to. And I hardly need to tell you that the Jewish campaign is working. Arizona and Texas and California are becoming darker, more alien. White kids are behaving more like Blacks. White women are bedding down

with Blacks and producing little mongrels in greater numbers than ever before. Monkey see, monkey do.

Yes, we do have a termite problem, and we do need to get an exterminator on the job soon. And we also have a problem with flaws in our society and in our government, flaws that gave the termites the opening they needed to get in and begin gnawing away at America and our people. When the exterminator has done his necessary work and we begin rebuilding our society, we need to fix those flaws so that we'll never again have a termite problem.

Images

I'm the chairman of the National Alliance. I'm trying to build the National Alliance into a strong enough organization so that we can have a major influence on a number of policies which are important to the future of our people. We want to change the government's policy on immigration, for example, which is flooding America with non-White immigrants, both legal and illegal. We want to regain control of our mass media of news and entertainment, so that we can put an end to the media propaganda which encourages racial mixing between Whites and non-Whites. We want to change our political system so that we never again have a person such as Bill Clinton in the White House or a person such as Madeleine Albright in our State Department. We want a better future for our people.

We work toward our goal by educating the public and by recruiting from that portion of the public which responds positively to our educational effort. With the new members we gain we are able to enhance our educational effort and reach more people. But we do have problems that make our task very difficult. I'll tell you about one of those problems.

In our recruiting efforts we usually find it easier to recruit people at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder than at the top. A man who used to work in a chicken-plucking plant and has just been replaced by a Mexican willing to work for half as much is fairly easy to recruit. He feels personally injured by the government's immigration policies. He has lost his employment and is concerned about his future. He understands that we really do have a problem in America which needs fixing.

And we do recruit some unemployed White chicken-pluckers, but not as many as you'd think. For one thing we don't direct our recruiting effort primarily toward chicken-pluckers. We try much harder to recruit teachers and engineers and successful businessmen, because they have the skills and the character traits we need to do our work successfully. Furthermore, they already wield much more influence than the average chicken-plucker, and we need all the influence we can get.

Another factor which keeps the percentage of chicken-pluckers fairly low among the members of the National Alliance is that many chicken-pluckers don't have as much inclination to be concerned about long-range problems as the better educated and more successful members of our society do. We aren't able to offer the unemployed chicken-plucker an opportunity to get his job back any time soon, and that's his main concern; we're only able to give him an opportunity to work for the long-term interests of his people.

And for these reasons we have many more teachers and engineers than unemployed chicken-pluckers among our members -- but the unfortunate fact is that we have far fewer than we need. Considering the crisis situation our people are facing, you'd think that all of the best and the brightest would be rushing to join the National Alliance, but we find that only a minority of the most intelligent and successful White Americans are responsive to our recruiting efforts. Why is that?

Well, certainly, part of the problem is moral corruption. Being smart and successful doesn't automatically make our people responsible or altruistic. Many of them are concerned only about themselves. As long as the present system is feeding them well, they don't care about anything else. But there's more to it than moral corruption. Part of our recruiting problem is that even many very bright people are not as rational as we'd hope. Their thinking is limited by certain psychological obstacles.

For example, one of the pieces of recruiting material we've distributed most widely is a little three-inch by five-inch card which has the simple message:

Earth's most endangered species -- the White race: help preserve it.

Many people have responded favorably to this message, but many more haven't, because they can't think of our race as being endangered. They think to themselves, "We don't need preserving. We've always been able to take care of ourselves. We're the most powerful race on earth. We have more wealth and power and prestige than any other race, by far. We are a favored race, a privileged race. We're on top. In America we're the majority race. The richest man in America is White. Most of the big corporation executives are White. Most members of the Congress are White. All of our Presidents have been White. So why are you raising the alarm about the need for us to preserve the White race? We don't need to be concerned about that. It's not a real danger.

Actually, it's not so much that they think that; it's that they feel that. As I said, the problem is more psychological than intellectual. White people -- White Americans, in particular -- have developed a certain habit of thought, a certain psychological attitude based, I believe, in a long tradition of excessive comfort and luxury. They have the feeling that for White people to be concerned today about the growing power of non-White minorities is a bit like a Southern plantation owner 200 years ago being concerned that his Black field slaves were getting too much to eat. A plantation owner should not be so stingy. Raising the alarm about non-Whites flooding across our borders today is like White railroad workers 125 years ago complaining about the railroad bosses importing Chinese coolies to take their jobs because the coolies would work for less. It seems to middle-class Whites today such a petty thing. It's unworthy of us to complain, undignified. We are the bosses, the owners, the lords of the manor. It lowers our status to begrudge non-Whites a better life. It makes us seem less powerful, less lordly -- it makes us seem weak and timid -- to express concern about the threat posed by non-Whites. Aristocrats don't have such concerns; just peasants do. I have a suspicion that many French aristocrats had a similar attitude in 1788 or thereabouts. The rabble want bread? We don't begrudge them their bread; let them eat cake!

That's certainly not a perfect analogy. We aren't concerned primarily about a violent revolution or a violent political uprising by Blacks or Mexicans. Actually, we would welcome that. It would snap middle-class Whites out of their "let them eat cake" attitude. We're concerned about the long-range effects of having non-Whites on our turf. We're concerned much more about the effects they're having on our culture and our morality than the effect they're having on the crime statistics and the employment opportunities for White chicken-pluckers. What we're most concerned about is the effect non-Whites will have on our genes. We don't want them breeding

with us. But again, to many middle-class Whites such a concern is *infra dig.* Their attitude is based more on a fear of losing status than it is on whacky liberal notions about equality.

And as I said, this comes in part from the idea that truly superior people don't need to be afraid of people of lower status; that we should, in fact, be especially benevolent to our lessers: the old idea of *noblesse oblige.* But there's more to it. The Jews have used their control of the media to create certain images in the public mind, and one of their most effective creations is the image of the White racist. He is portrayed as a Neanderthal whose knuckles drag on the ground, a violent and hateful person who lives in a trailer with a yard full of derelict cars, has no education, does only manual labor, and hates Blacks because that makes him feel better about himself. We've all seen a thousand editorial cartoons portraying White racists just that way.

And, as in many lies, there is a bit of half-truth mixed in there. It is the White chicken-pluckers who are most seriously impacted by Blacks, Mexicans, and other non-Whites. The CPAs and engineers are above it all at the moment -- it hasn't caught up with them yet, though it soon will -- but the White chicken-plucker is out of a job now, and he's angry about it. It's the unskilled working-class White who is most immediately threatened, both economically and socially, when the government pushes Affirmative Action programs and forced housing programs and opens our borders to the Third World.

Back in the 1960s and 1970s, during the most violent phase of the so-called "civil rights" demonstrations, the TV news cameras always focused on the unshaven, pot-bellied White guy in a dirty undershirt with a cigarette dangling from his mouth, his face contorted in anger, standing on the sidewalk and screaming obscenities at the Blacks marching in the street. This was the White chicken-plucker who had just lost his job. He was a real person, even though people in his situation made up only a small minority of those opposed to the forced racial mixing of America in the 1960s and 1970s. The point is that he was a low-class person, a low-status person, and the media chose him as their White racist poster boy. He was the one the cameras always zoomed in on. They crafted their image of the White racist consciously and deliberately, and it worked. This image -- the image of the angry, unemployed White chicken-plucker standing on the sidewalk and screaming obscenities at Black demonstrators -- has been pounded into the public consciousness, and it's a low-class image. Middle-class Whites are frightened to death of being viewed as part of this image. It would be a sure loss of status.

When Bill Gates gives hundreds of millions of dollars to various Black causes, he may be motivated in part by the calculation that he will curry favor with the Clinton government, with the Jews in the Department of Justice who are trying to dismantle his company, and with the Jews in the media. I happen to believe that's a mistaken calculation on his part. I believe that they will continue their effort to break up Microsoft and clip Bill Gates' wings. But the relevant point here is that Gates can give as much money as he wants to specifically Black causes -- even to something as utterly wrongheaded as a project to reduce the Black death rate in Africa by vaccinating Black infants -- without any loss of status. If, however, he were to give any money at all to a specifically White cause -- for example to a project to raise White racial consciousness in order to reduce the rate of interracial marriage -- he definitely would lose status. Not only would any specifically White effort be seen by many of his peers as a violation of *noblesse oblige*, but

the media Jews would paint him into the same frame with the angry, unemployed White chicken-plucker. They would use their image of the White racist against him.

So how should we deal with this? Well, one thing we certainly will do is continue our educational effort. We will continue to reach out to all of our people, rich and poor, middle-class and working-class. We'll continue to keep them aware of the destructive policies of the Clintionistas and the media bosses. We'll continue to raise the alarm about the immigration disaster, about the growing rate of miscegenation, about the darkening of America, about the deliberate subversion of our morality and our culture. We'll continue to try to make everyone think about these things, to be concerned about them, and to accept responsibility for the future of our people.

And a growing minority of our people will continue to respond to us. But as long as our outreach is limited to an essentially intellectual message -- as long as we are asking people to respond to facts and ideas -- we can expect a positive response only from a minority. To move the majority we need to be able to craft and use emotional images the way the Jewish media bosses do. We need to be able to make people feel -- not just to understand, but also to feel -- that the low-class thing is to continue to ignore what the government and the media are doing to our people, that the low-class thing is to continue to shirk responsibility for the future of our people.

Crafting and using emotional images is much easier when you have Hollywood or a major television network at your disposal. We haven't gotten to that point yet but we're working on it. And there's certainly no shortage of opportunities waiting for us. For example, the murders of White people in Rhodesia continue, and the murders are being committed now in the cities as well as on the farms and in the rural areas. On Wednesday of last week a gang of Black supporters of dictator Robert Mugabe attacked a White man on a busy street corner in Bulawayo, Rhodesia's second largest city. While bystanders watched without attempting to interfere, the Blacks beat, kicked, and strangled the White man. When he was dead they danced around his body, and one of them made a call on a cell phone and boasted that they had just killed another White. Incidents of this sort -- the killing of Whites by Black mobs, the trashing and burning of White farmhouses, the torture and killing of the pets of White farm families -- all of these horrible things have been filmed by news crews, because the Blacks are quite proud of what they're doing and are happy to be on film. These films are full of dynamite images: much more emotional stuff than some low-class White guy in a dirty undershirt being used as a negative status symbol for White racists. Let me give saturation TV coverage to these images from Rhodesia on all of the networks here for a few months, and I could put a substantial crimp in the miscegenation rate here.

Here's another example: the commerce in White sex slaves is booming, and the Jewish control of this commerce is more open than ever. I've spoken on my broadcasts about the White slave trade, and there was even a brief report on ABC television a couple of years ago. The television report even had interviews with some of the Jewish slave traders in Israel. There was no attempt by ABC to use images that would make Jews look bad, of course, but the potential certainly is there. After this ABC report the Israelis decided to try to clean up their act by outlawing the buying and selling of slaves in Israel. It was embarrassing to the Jews to have it publicized that the slave trade is protected by law in Israel. Well, the Jews still haven't outlawed the White slave trade in

Israel, but they're debating the matter in the Knesset, in the Israeli legislature, now. The fact of the matter is that there's so much money being made by the Jews in kidnapping young Gentile girls from Ukraine and Russia and Poland and forcing them to become sex slaves in Israel that they are reluctant to put any crimp in their business. And the White slave trade has a very long history among the Jews, going back more than 2,000 years. So at the moment it's still legal in Israel to buy and sell slaves -- as long as they're not Jews.

Instead of cleaning this up, the Jews are simply trying to cover it up. There was a big international women's rights conference going on in New York, at Columbia University, this week. The conference addressed itself to such problems as wife-burning in India, genital mutilation of women in Africa, and violence against women elsewhere. I saw the news coverage of this conference on three channels, and none of them mentioned the Jewish slave trade in women from eastern Europe. None of them mentioned the buying and selling of kidnapped women in Israel. None of them mentioned the flourishing business in forced prostitution carried on by Jewish organized-crime gangs from the former Soviet Union. Instead they pointed to three countries they accused of being against women's rights. Those countries were Pakistan, Afghanistan, and the Vatican. So what do you think? Is the Vatican really more hostile to the protection of women than Israel? Does the College of Cardinals try to justify the White slave trade the way the Knesset does? I think not, but you'd never guess that from watching this week's news coverage of the women's rights conference, in which the Vatican was named as an enemy of women's rights and Israel wasn't mentioned.

If you'd like to see some emotional images, let me direct a few filmed interviews with some of these White sex slaves who've been kidnapped from a village in eastern Europe, taken to Israel, and forced into prostitution. Some of them are beautiful, young girls still in their teens. Let me do a few interviews with these teenagers choking back tears as they describe what has happened to them: the rapes and the beatings and the Israeli police laughing at them when they sought help. Let me do a few interviews with their Jewish owners and exploiters. Many of these Jews aren't even embarrassed: "Vell, it's a business. Ve are businessmen. Vot do you expect, already?" Let me craft a few images from these interviews and saturate the television screens of America with these images for a while, and I'll guarantee you that not only will the billions of dollars going to Israel every year from the U.S. Treasury come to a halt, but the FBI suddenly will discover the Jewish organized crime gangs in the United States, which during the past decade have become more powerful and dangerous than the Mafia ever was. The FBI suddenly will decide that it no longer has to pretend that these Jewish organized crime gangs aren't really a problem. The FBI will decide that half of these Jewish crime bosses being so-called "Holocaust" survivors is not really an excuse to let them continue to get away with murder.

So here's the point: whoever is able to control the images presented to the public -- whoever is able to design and craft these emotional images that appeal to basic instincts and then is able to hold the images up to public view -- whoever is able to do that can control the public's attitudes -- and the way the public votes. In any country that's a lot of power. In a democracy such as the United States it amounts to virtually total control. And unfortunately it's largely hidden control, behind-the-scenes control. That's why you hear me keep coming back to the subject of Jewish media control in America.

That's why you hear me say over and over again that we must break this Jewish media control. That's why all of my efforts and the efforts of my organization, the National Alliance, have gone into building a multimedia machine for reaching the American public with an independent voice. And that's why the most powerful Jewish pressure group in America, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, held a big press conference this week and once again declared me the most dangerous man in America. I am dangerous to them because I am telling you and many thousands of other Americans about the simple but very important things we talked about today and that we talk about every week.

And listen! You also can be dangerous to these enemies of our people. Just talk with your friends and neighbors about the things I talk about with you. Let's all try to be as dangerous as we can.

Music of Rebellion

Last year I got into the business of producing and distributing music. I had a couple of reasons for doing so. A general reason is that I want to continue to build my capability for communicating with the public through every medium that can be used effectively for that purpose, and music can be a very effective medium. A specific reason is that I wanted a medium for communicating with alienated young Americans who listen to a type of music known as "resistance music." These young Americans have grown up in multiculturalized America. They've been weaned on Jewish television programming. They've gone to racially mixed schools and been lied to by Politically Correct teachers about how everyone is "equal," about how we must all learn to get along with one another, that more and more "diversity" and multiculturalism are the irresistible wave of the future, and that no normal person should want to resist this wave anyway because it's good and, oh, so wonderful! The music these kids have heard while growing up has been very heavy on rock, and the media bosses are now phasing them into rap.

Instead of adapting to multiculturalism like good, little lemmings should, however, these young people have rebelled. The multicultural planners, the media bosses, have succeeded in alienating them, in cutting them loose from their roots, but the media bosses have not succeeded in making them like being uprooted; the Jews in Hollywood and New York have not succeeded in making the kids like or accept multiculturalism. The kids have rebelled in various ways that the planners of America's destruction simply didn't count on.

The healthiest elements among these young people have responded to their tribal instinct and have sought to reestablish their racial roots in one way or another. Resistance music has played an important role in this quest for roots and community and meaning. Some of the music expresses very explicit defiance of those who have attempted to force the kids into a multicultural life-style. It expresses anger against the government. It expresses resentment against the Jewish planners behind the government's multicultural programs. It expresses hostility against non-Whites and against everyone who is allied to the non-Whites; it is fighting music. All of this music that expresses anger and resentment and rebelliousness is properly called "resistance" music, and most -- though not all -- of it belongs to the "rock" genre.

Back in the mid-1950s the Jews began inaugurating many of their programs to multiculturalize America. One of these programs involved moving young Whites away from traditionally White musical forms and replacing these White musical forms with Black music. The most notable aspect of this program was the use of singer Elvis Presley to popularize rock' n' roll among young White people. Before Elvis, rock 'n' roll was essentially a Black musical form, with Black roots, Black performers, and Black listeners. With their control of the popular-music industry and broadcasting, the Jews were successful in their effort to drag rock 'n' roll across the color line, just as they are succeeding now in popularizing another Black musical form -- rap -- among young Whites.

The Jews were so successful in popularizing rock among young Whites, in fact, that the kids eventually began to think of it as their music: as White music. Then young White musicians turned the tables on the Jews by writing their own rock lyrics, and their lyrics were rebellious

lyrics, angry lyrics, defiant lyrics, lyrics which told the Jews, in effect, to go to hell, that young Whites would not permit the Jews any longer to force Whites to multiculturalize. The Jews responded by labeling the music with these defiant lyrics "hate music."

Despite the label, and despite the efforts of the Jews to suppress it by denying it access to the mass media, resistance music continued to attract new fans among young Whites. And the music evolved. The genre broadened. Resistance lyrics were written for some country music. My company, Resistance Records, sells this country music under the label "Johnny Rebel." Resistance music also incorporated other music from the past which had nothing to do with rock. Resistance Records, for example, also sells march music and other patriotic music from the very racially conscious Third Reich. On the Internet you can see a listing of all of the resistance music I distribute at resistance.com.

And all of this music, whether rock or country or German march music, is denounced by the mass media as "hate music" so long as it shows any trace of racial consciousness or resistance to multiculturalism. But as I said a moment ago it was the healthiest elements among our young people who gave expression to their tribal feeling in their music. Others have expressed their alienation in different ways -- in less healthy ways. Some have rebelled against the unnatural environment of multiculturalism without really understanding fully what they are rebelling against. Instead of having a positive alternative to the Jews' programs, they have simply rejected everything -- or at least, everything traditional. They have become nihilists.

Some have turned to Satanism as a way of expressing their anger against the traditional world they feel has let them down, a multicultural world in which they feel they have no place. Their music is full of Satanic imagery and mumbo-jumbo. There are pentagrams and goat's heads and cabalistic characters from the Hebrew alphabet in the graphics accompanying their music. Satanism is almost a parody of traditional Judaeo-Christianity, with chanting and rituals and priestly hocus-pocus and so on.

Satanic music should not be mistaken for pagan music. Pagan music is much more serious music, and its purpose is not so much to express resentment against Christianity as it is to give expression to the healthy religious feelings of pre-Christian Europe and to express an awareness of blood and soil and very deep racial roots. It is not nihilistic, and it really belongs with the other positive forms of resistance music: that is, with what the Jews denounce as "hate music."

The nihilistic music, on the other hand, is fine with the Jews. They would prefer, I believe, for everyone to be a good, little multicultural lemming, but if one must rebel against that, then the rebellion should take a nihilistic form. And of course, Satanism isn't the only form of nihilism. For example, there's a whole category of rock music which is called "Death Metal," and let me tell you, it is very sick stuff. It is totally hedonistic, like Satanic music -- you know, everything goes; if it feels good do it; you have no responsibility to anyone or anything but yourself; nothing is sacred; nothing is worthy of respect; nothing matters but your own personal pleasure. But Death Metal goes beyond hedonism: far beyond it. It is music that glories in perversity, music that seeks to defile, music that exalts sickness and unnaturalness and pain and decay and destruction and death. Its lyrics deal with cannibalism, with necrophilia, with bestiality, and with

every other perversion imaginable. Torture and mutilation are very common themes. It's morbid, twisted stuff.

The concerts put on by these nihilist musical groups are quite extreme. They may involve people urinating or defecating on each other on stage. Sexual intercourse of various types may take place in the background. And real or simulated genital torture and mutilation may be part of the show. I know a fellow who plays in a rock band called "Genitorturers." And that's what they do: genital torture, live and on stage.

Now, you might wonder why I'm telling you about these things. First, I want you to know that I don't distribute such music and have no intention of doing so. Everything produced or distributed by my company, Resistance Records, is positive, healthy, racially oriented resistance music: what the Jews call "hate music." If the Jews hate it, I produce it and distribute it; if the Jews like it, I have nothing to do with it. But I do have two interests in nihilist music. My first interest is why this sick music, this Satanic and Death Metal music, is increasingly popular among young White people in America and in Europe. Why is it attractive to so many young people? I have some ideas about that, and I'll share them with you in a moment.

My second interest in this sick music is the Jewish connection. I mentioned that I know a fellow who plays in a Death Metal band. He sent me a CD he had produced, complete with Satanist symbols in the accompanying graphics for the jewel case. I was surprised to note that the CD had a Time Warner copyright. Marilyn Manson is probably the best-known performer in the Satanist music genre. His records are distributed by Interscope, which is a property of Universal Studios, which is owned by Jewish liquor-and-media billionaire Edgar Bronfman, Jr. One obvious reason the Jews produce and promote and distribute this sick music is simply greed. They pay to have it produced, they put their labels on it, and they sell it in their big record stores in New York and Los Angeles and San Francisco because they make money on it. An appallingly large number of White teenagers are attracted to the stuff.

Well, greed is just one reason. It is not surprising that where there is a market for something, the Jews will come crowding in and elbow everyone else aside in their eagerness to grab the profit for themselves. But why not try to make money from real resistance music also? There's a big, largely undeveloped market for that music too. Why do they leave that market to me and focus their own efforts on the necrophilia and Satanism and genital torture? They never permit any real resistance music to be sold in the big record stores where they sell their sick music.

You see, both resistance music and nihilist music, Death Metal music, are in a sense rebel music, music which expresses a rejection of what we might call the "mainstream" world. Resistance music fans reject the mainstream world because it has been multiculturalized, because it no longer is a White world, and they want to make it White again. Death Metal fans reject the mainstream world simply because they have become alienated and no longer have an attachment to anything but themselves. The Jews attempt to suppress the former music and promote the latter. And that fits right in with the general Jewish tendency: always promote that which is destructive and destroy that which is healthy.

And if you doubt that Death Metal music is really destructive, then you just haven't been exposed to it. You've led too sheltered a life to understand how much really nasty stuff is out there. Go to a Death Metal concert sometime. Read the lyrics to a few Death Metal songs. In fact, listen; I'll read to you a few lines from one of the more popular Satanist bands, Deicide. This is from a Deicide song called "Sacrificial Suicide":

Lust into reality
Satan angel of the black abyss,
Satan lord I hail
Insane blasphemous -- Satan
Sacrificial suicide,
Ritual to end my life
Behemoth incess my fate -- Satan
Damned to tell, end of my life
Wrath of God -- Satan
Sin my soul, blesses with fire
Throne of stone -- Satan
I must die, in my wake
Seventh gate -- Satan
Suicide, end my life
I must die -- Satan
Suicide sacrifice, thrust of evil deep inside
Lucifer never lies, take away thee mortal life
Demigod, Satan son, commend to body to the ground
Father Satan, I'll find peace when I am God.

Well, of course, much of that is simply gibberish and non-words, but the flavor is quite clear. The Jews understandably are a little shy about publicizing their involvement in this stuff where middle-class parents might find out about it and become alarmed. They'd just as soon you not ponder too much on the involvement of Time Warner's boss Gerald Levin or Universal Studios boss Edgar Bronfman in the production and promotion of Satanic music. But they're certainly not shy about rubbing your kids' noses in it. The Jews peddle this filth to confused White teenagers as shamelessly as any Black crack dealer selling his poisonous wares on a school playground.

I want to stress this point: the people promoting this filth are not just sleazy, marginal Jews in trenchcoats fresh off the boat from Russia. They are filthy-rich, billionaire Jewish media bosses, respectable Jews, the leaders of the Jewish community, Jews who own Hollywood film studios and arrive in long limousines at the White House for state dinners and have every politician in the Congress in their pockets. They are the Jews behind the multiculturalizing of America, the Jews who planned forced racial integration and open borders and Affirmative Action. They are the Jews whose programs have uprooted and alienated millions of young, White Americans. They are the Jews who, in response to the alienation and anger they themselves have caused, now sell Satanic and Death Metal music to American teenagers. That's an example of what they proudly call *chutzpah.*

And now the other question: why do any White kids tolerate this filth? Why is there a market for it? Why do 15-year-old White boys and girls from good families listen to lyrics with very explicit descriptions of sex with corpses? Why do they pay to go to concerts where they watch a woman on stage having her genitalia sewed shut with a needle and thread, to the screeching and thumping accompaniment of a rock band?

Part of the answer is obvious. Kids will do anything -- and I mean absolutely anything -- which is fashionable. They will put safety pins through their nipples or studs through their tongues without having a clue as to what it's all about, except that other kids in their peer group are doing the same thing. If the Jewish media bosses promote it, a substantial portion of the kids will do it without a second thought. And really, Death Metal is no worse than the rap music that the Jews also are promoting among young Whites. The young White lemmings, who are more or less acclimated to multiculturalism, go for the rap. Alienated young Whites without a clue tend toward the Death Metal. One advantage the latter music has is that it will shock their parents, even liberal parents, whereas liberal parents hardly can be shocked by rap without running the risk of seeming to be racists.

There's more than cluelessness and a desire to shock parents involved in the growing popularity of Death Metal, however. The music reflects a growing morbidity in the outlook of young White people. The growing suicide rate among young Whites also reflects this. Alienation is not a normal, healthy condition. When a large number of young people are uprooted and no longer have a clear sense of identity or a clear sense of belonging to a natural community, to a racial community, one should not be surprised at the development of various pathologies, such as hedonism and the fascination with death.

One also should not be surprised at the various forms of destructive behavior -- especially self-destructive behavior -- which are becoming much more common among young White people.

One should not make the mistake of blaming bad behavior on the music, however. The kids who listen to this music already had problems. The music is a symptom of their pathology, not the cause of it. The Jews have destroyed their world, have cut them off from their roots, and that is what the kids are reacting badly to, not the music. When a kid who listens to Satanic or Death Metal music carves up a neighbor's pet -- or his own little sister -- in some sort of Satanic ritual, the music didn't make him do it; the Jewish media bosses and the politicians in the government who destroyed his world with their multicultural programs made him do it. And exactly the same thing can be said about White teenagers who plan and carry out massacres at their schools. The Columbine High School killers were Marilyn Manson fans, but Marilyn Manson didn't make them slaughter 13 people. Edgar Bronfman, Jr., who sells Marilyn Manson's music, made them do it: Edgar Bronfman, Jr., and his fellow filthy-rich Jews, who consciously and deliberately, with malice aforethought, planned the destruction of the White world we used to have in America, where White teenagers could grow up with roots in a healthy and natural way.

Perhaps you can understand now why I thought it worthwhile to talk with you about the rather distasteful subject of Satanic and Death Metal music. It's not an obscure, underground little phenomenon. It's big business for the Jews who are pushing it. Time Warner and Universal Studios don't waste their time with little, underground phenomena. And it is about as clear and

unambiguous an indicator as you can find of what is happening to our people, of the sickness that is overtaking us. I want to rub your noses in it. I want you to smell the stink of death that is in it. And I want you to understand who is behind it and why they're behind it.

You know, there are a lot of mainstream Christian preachers who have railed against Satanic music from time to time, but not one of them has breathed a word about the Jewish connection. Oh, my goodness, no! That would be anti-Semitic! They would have you believe that this sickness just sprang up of its own accord, out of nowhere, for no good reason. And of course, if you approach it that way, it just doesn't make sense. It doesn't seem real. You have to understand the Jewish connection before you can take this sickness seriously.

I'm telling you that you'd better take it seriously. I'm telling you that you'd better understand what it's all about and how it fits in with everything else that is happening these days.

And I want to give you some positive news too. The number of people who listen to real resistance music -- the positive, healthy kind of resistance music that I produce and distribute -- the kind the Jews call "hate music," is growing fast. One of these days soon there will be enough of us to make some changes in this world. And by God, when that day comes we're going to have very little patience with the soft, pampered middle-class folks who didn't pay attention to what was happening because they were too busy at the shopping mall or too busy watching the ball game or too afraid of being labeled "haters" by the Jews and their allies. The anger is building, the rage is building, and it's going to break loose.

The Evil Among Us

Today I have some new information I want to share with you. It is information on a subject I've discussed with you more than once in the past: namely, the Jewish trade in White female slaves. The reason this new information is noteworthy is that it comes directly from the horse's mouth, so to speak. It is from the June 16 issue of the *Jerusalem Post* -- actually, the Saturday supplement to the *Jerusalem Post.* In Israel, of course, they have Saturday supplements instead of Sunday supplements. The *Jerusalem Post's* documentary article on Israel's trade in White slaves, published just two weeks ago, is astoundingly frank and straightforward, and in today's broadcast I will read to you directly from the article.

You know, one of the biggest problems facing me or anyone else trying to inform the public in a way that contradicts the party line propagated by the television networks is credibility. I tell the average citizen something like, "In Israel it is legal to buy and sell slaves, as long as they aren't Jews. The slave trade is big business in Israel, and it's legal." The average citizen's response to this statement is: "I don't believe it. That can't be true. Everyone knows that Jews are liberals and are big supporters of human rights. They would never tolerate such a thing as the buying and selling of human beings in their own country. Don't you ever watch television? If you did, you'd know that Jews just aren't like that." That reminds me of the refrain from a hymn I used to sing in Sunday school when I was a child. It went something like: "This I know, for the Bible tells me so." Today, of course, television has replaced the Bible as the source of all truth for the great mass of people -- certainly for everyone who is incapable of looking at the world around him and reaching his own conclusions based on the evidence.

Actually, I believe that no amount of evidence will change the mind of a true believer in the TV religion, any more than it will change the mind of a Bible-believer. Get yourself a copy of the *Jerusalem Post* -- and it's available in the New York Public Library and in a number of other larger libraries around the country -- and show it to a true believer, and he'll still tell you that he doesn't believe it. He'll tell you it's a forgery. It can't be true, because it doesn't agree with what he's seen and heard from television.

Anyway, here goes. I quote from the June 16 issue of the *Jerusalem Post:*

Every year hundreds of women, and an unknown number of girls under the age of 18, are bought, sold, drugged, imprisoned, and forced to work as prostitutes in Israel's thriving sex industry. In countries such as Russia, Ukraine, Latvia, and Hungary, traffickers prey on desperate women. Facing poverty, the women are lured to Israel with the promise that they will make fabulous salaries working as teachers or caregivers.

Here, I will interject two comments of my own. First, the reason that so many young women in eastern Europe are facing poverty and are desperate is that the countries in which they live were bled dry by half a century of Jewish communism. In the case of Russia and Ukraine, of course, it was nearly three-quarters of a century. In the case of Hungary and Latvia it was the United States government which turned these formerly free countries over to the communists at the end of the Second World War to do with as they pleased.

Do you remember what started the Second World War? Initially it was just a territorial dispute between Germany and Poland. The Germans wanted back the German territory which had been taken away from Germany and given to Poland at the end of the First World War. But when the Germans, under Hitler, began taking back that territory, in September 1939, Britain and France declared war on Germany, ostensibly to protect the freedom of Poland. The Germans had done nothing against Britain and France and wanted very much to remain at peace with those countries, but the politicians of Britain and France had other considerations.

The fact that the Soviet Union also invaded Poland in September 1939 was all right with Britain and France. They didn't declare war on the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union was for all practical purposes under Jewish rule. They did declare war on Germany, because Germany, under Hitler, had broken loose from the grip of the Jews, had freed the German media and German education and German finance and German politics and German culture from Jewish influence, and was in the process of kicking all of the Jews out of Germany. That was the reason for the Second World War, not Polish freedom or Polish territorial integrity. That was the reason why, when in April 1943 the German Army discovered the mass graves of some of the 25,000 Polish officers and intellectuals murdered by Jewish communists and invited the International Red Cross and journalists from many nations to view the evidence, the controlled media in Britain and the United States ignored the evidence and blamed the atrocity on the Germans. That was the reason why, at the end of the war, those countries that had gone to war ostensibly to insure the freedom of Poland agreed to turn Poland and Latvia and Hungary and the rest of eastern Europe over to the communist butchers who had carried out the massacre of the elite of the Polish nation.

Of course, the communists economically drained and ruined all of these countries. And these communists were Jews. Which is to say, the Jews were the prime movers in the communist regimes imposed on these countries after the war and also were the primary beneficiaries of the regimes. In Hungary, for example, there was the regime of the communist Jew Matyas Rakosi, followed by another communist Jew, Ernö Gerö; in Romania the communist Jewess Ana Pauker ruled the country as First Secretary of the Central Committee; in Poland the Minister for State Control was the communist Jew Roman Zumbrowski; in Czechoslovakia the Secretary General of the Communist Party was the communist Jew Rudolf Slansky; in Yugoslavia, while Tito held the spotlight, the communist Jew Moshe Pijade was the chairman of the National Assembly and president of Serbia; and so it went. And this in a Europe whose Jews supposedly had all been "Holocausted" by Hitler. There were tens of millions of Hungarians and Poles and Latvians and Serbs and other eastern Europeans under the yoke of communism who were wishing that Hitler had actually "Holocausted" the Jews. These communist Jews were so hated by the eastern Europeans they ruled and exploited that there was constant turmoil, and after the Hungarian uprising in 1956, many of the leading communist Jews were replaced by Gentile front men, while the Jews continued to exploit the people from behind the scenes.

Even as the communist regimes of eastern Europe began collapsing during the last 15 years or so and their economies were "privatized," Jews continued to plunder the people among whom they lived. Using money from their brethren abroad and collusion with their corrupt kinsmen still in the various governments, they managed to buy up the most valuable factories, mines, and other national resources at fire-sale prices and then milked them for all they were worth.

I apologize for the long digression, but I wanted to make it clear just why so many of our young women in eastern Europe are living in poverty today and are desperate to improve their prospects, making them easy prey for Jewish slave dealers. It is the Jews who, more than anyone else, are responsible for the impoverishment of eastern Europe. The Jews, beginning with Karl Marx, invented communism, and then they used it to exploit the Gentiles among whom they lived.

My second comment is that the women lured and entrapped by Jewish slave dealers are made doubly easy prey because they never have been warned to beware of Jews. And the reason that they never have been warned is that the Jewish communists of every regime in eastern Europe enacted legislation making it illegal to do so. To warn a young woman never to trust a Jew -- to tell a young woman what Jews are like and what they do -- is "hate speech," and "hate speech" is a penal offense in nearly every country of eastern Europe. Jews may not be criticized. It is illegal to tell the truth about them. And of course, the Jews and their bought politicians and their feminist and homosexual and minority allies are pushing hard for similar laws against so-called "hate speech" in the United States.

Let's return to the June 16 issue of the *Jerusalem Post,* where I read to you how financially desperate eastern European girls are lured to Israel with the promise of big salaries as secretaries or teachers or caregivers. The article continues:

But when they come to Israel their passports and travel papers are taken away, in order to prevent them from leaving. They are raped and beaten. Trafficked women are treated as objects, as commodities to be bought and sold by pimps for thousands of dollars or held in debt bondage, forced to work to pay off large sums of money. Their "owners" imprison them in locked houses or apartments with barred windows. They can rarely leave the apartment and are prevented from going out unaccompanied. They are frequently abused, especially if they refuse to have sex with a customer or try to escape. . . . In brothels, massage parlors, and sex clubs throughout the country, these women "slaves" are subjected to violence, degradation, and terror. According to a report released last month by Amnesty International entitled 'The Trafficking of Women to Israel,' the country is rapidly becoming a major destination for sex trafficking and slavery.

Now, I should tell you that I am skipping around in this long article and reading you just bits and pieces. It is full of heart-rending stories about individual female slaves, and there's not time to read all of them to you. One of the stories is about Anna, a 31-year-old unemployed physics teacher from St. Petersburg. She was lured to Israel by a Jew who promised her good working conditions and $1000 a month, which was 20 times what her salary had been in Russia. Now I'll read to you exactly what the *Jerusalem Post* says about Anna:

Anna arrived here in October 1998 on a tourist visa. She was met at the airport and taken to an apartment and locked up with six other women . . . [from eastern Europe]. She was auctioned twice and finally bought for $10,000. Taken to Haifa, she was held in captivity with two other women. The apartment in which she lived had bars on the windows." Et cetera. The article goes on to say that the Jew who had bought Anna repeatedly reminded her that he knew where her family lived in St. Petersburg, and that he would harm them if she escaped or failed to obey his orders. Anna was not able to escape, but she finally was deported back to Russia by Israeli

immigration authorities because her tourist visa had expired. Her former "owner" remains at liberty, and Anna remains in terror that he will one day show up again at her residence in St. Petersburg.

Then there is the story of a young woman from Belarus -- from White Russia. Again I read the exact words of the *Jerusalem Post:*

Tatiana (not her real name) had been promised a job working as a cleaner in a hotel in Eilat. She was told the job would pay enough to support her mother and six-year-old son. In Eilat a man pretending to be from the hotel where she thought she was going to be employed took her to a brothel, where she was forced to work as a prostitute. She was told that she would have to repay her 'sale price' and travel costs. She tried unsuccessfully to escape and was finally freed after a police raid. She was held in Neveh Tirza. Three days after her arrest Tatiana found an anonymous note on her prison bunk threatening to kill her and punish her family if she spoke out about what had happened to her. She petitioned the chief of police but was told that the Israel Police cannot guarantee anyone's safety abroad. She testified in June 1999 and was deported later that month. . . . Her fate is not known. A police spokesman refused to comment on the case."

Now, listen very carefully, because we are getting to the real meat of this article. I will read you exactly what the *Jerusalem Post* says about the role of the Israeli government and Israeli law in this horrifying business:

In Israel prostitution is not illegal. Nor is there legislation against trafficking or slavery, though there is a law forbidding taking people out of the country by force. Police officials complain that in the absence of legislation their options are limited. . . .

Now I'm skipping to another paragraph:

According to the statistics provided by the Israel Police, in 1997 between 500 and 600 police files were opened under Article 10 of the penal code, which covers prostitution and obscenity offenses. An unknown additional number of cases against traffickers and pimps were also opened under other sections of the penal code, for crimes such as assault, kidnapping, and unlawful possession of passports. And though the police have opened more than 1,100 files during the past three years, only 126 cases against men involved in trafficking have actually been brought to court. During the same period more than 1,200 women were deported from Israel. According to sociologist Esther Herzog, director of *Shin -- "The Movement for Equal Representation for Women"* -- in 1999 the police arrested more than 400 women but only 28 pimps. And even these minuscule numbers, she says, are probably inflated. Since there is no law here against trafficking in human beings or slave trading, it is impossible to know how many of the above cases were related to trafficking, and how many were connected to prostitution-related offenses, such as pimping or operating a brothel.

I hope that you absorbed what I just read: There is no law in Israel against trafficking in human beings or slave trading -- and consequently there is a flourishing trade in White slaves in Israel today. I didn't write that, and it's not from the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.* It was written by two female Israeli journalists and published two weeks ago in a prominent Jewish

newspaper in Jerusalem. You might wonder why such devastating information was published by a Jewish newspaper.

There are a couple of reasons. First, the same feminism which the Jews push so enthusiastically in America has cropped up in Israel too. Jewish women always have resented the greater sexual attractiveness which Gentile women have for Jewish men. After all, there's not much a Jewess can do about her face or her personality. Too many Jewesses look like Ana Pauker or Madeleine Albright and swear like Madeleine Albright. These Russian and Ukrainian girls being forced into prostitution in Israel not only are better looking, but they are much softer and more feminine than Israeli women. I believe that there is no question but that Israeli Jewesses would like to see them out of Israel. They don't like the sexual competition, and as organized feminists they have enough muscle to be able to express their views in Israel's mass media.

That's one reason this article appeared in the *Jerusalem Post.* The other reason is that the Jews who publish the *Jerusalem Post* understand that there's no real danger that the Jews will be called to account for their slave trafficking. They understand that with their control of the mass media everywhere in the Gentile world, they can say whatever they want among themselves with little risk that the soccer moms or couch potatoes of America will ever hear about it; and if they do happen to hear about it, they won't believe it; and even if they do believe it they're too demoralized and spineless to do anything about it.

Want to try an experiment? Get yourself a xerox copy of the June 16 *Jerusalem Post* article from a library. If that issue has mysteriously disappeared by the time you get to the library, send me $25 for my time and trouble and I'll xerox my copy of the article and mail it to you. Take your copy of the article to the editor of your local newspaper. Send a copy to your congressman. Have your kid take it to his high school social studies teacher for class discussion. If you're a university student enrolled in a class in international relations or ethics or law or any subject relevant to this article, take it to your professor and ask him what he thinks about it.

I'll guarantee you: not one of these people will appreciate having this matter brought to his attention. The newspaper editor and the congressman will already know about it, but they won't want to talk about it. The high school social studies teacher would prefer that your kid bring a case of live hand grenades to class for discussion. And the university professor will have visions of his chances for tenure evaporating if he can't get you to shut up and go away quickly. And as I said at the beginning of this program, the average lemming will find the whole issue unreal because he didn't see it on TV. You won't even be able to embarrass a Jew with it. He'll just brazenly deny it and accuse you of "anti-Semitism."

That, unfortunately, is the state of public and private morale in America today. That's why our civilization is going down the tubes. That's why Timothy McVeigh blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City. It was the only way he knew to get people to look up from their ball games for a minute and pay attention to what's happening to their world.

So, why do I bother? I bother because between the ball-game fans at one end and the corrupt politicians and corrupt Christian preachers and corrupt newspaper editors at the other end there is an intelligent and responsible two percent or so of the population -- a moral two percent --

capable of understanding and caring about what the Jews are doing to our world and to our people. And these Russian and Latvian and Hungarian girls lured to Israel and forced into a life of slavery and degradation are our people.

Among the moral two per cent of the U.S. population there are people who care as much as I do about the fact that their government sends billions of dollars a year to prop up a regime which permits beautiful, young White girls to be stripped, raped, beaten, put up on an auction block, and sold to whichever leering, swarthy, hook-nosed kike makes the highest bid. We fight wars to protect that regime from its Arab neighbors. We permit the kinsmen of those who make up that regime to control our mass media of news and entertainment. We condemn the Germans for trying to free themselves from such control.

There are Americans who care about these things as much as I do. And by God, we intend to do something about these things, even if we have to do it Timothy McVeigh's way. I hope it doesn't come to that, but we will break the grip of these Jews and their collaborators on our society.

Basics

I really do need a secretary. I have a flood of mail coming in every day, and usually I don't have time to read most of it. This week, though, I had a couple of hours to spare, and I read a hundred or so letters before I began this broadcast. If I had a secretary to keep my office organized and help me with my work, I'd read a lot more of my mail. I'd probably even answer some of it. Not only is it polite to read the letters that people have taken the time to write to me, but it's useful. I learn a lot from my mail. And of course, it makes me feel good to read letters from people who appreciate my broadcasts -- especially from people who tell me that they have learned something from listening to my talks, that I have helped them understand what is happening in the world.

I must confess to you, however, that I myself usually learn more from reading my hate mail than I do from reading friendly letters. The most common type of hate letter I receive is from Politically Correct college girls of both sexes. They all have pretty much the same flavor: "Ooooh, my god! How can you be soooo stupid as to believe that skin color makes any difference! Don't you realize that we're in the 21st century now? Your ideas went out of fashion with the Stone Age. I can't believe that there are still people like you around. You should sell your trailer, get your teeth fixed, and go to school. Maybe you would learn something!"

Well, you may wonder what is useful in reading letters of this sort. Actually, they serve primarily as a constant reminder to me that there are many lemmings out there. Some of the lemmings lecture me about the things they have learned in class or from television about race and history and world affairs, and you'd be amazed at some of the things they've been taught and actually believe. But that's useful too. It reminds me that reason plays a negligible role in the belief system of these people, and it does very little good to attempt to use reason in straightening out their thinking. In order to move them we must go beyond reason; we must appeal to their most fundamental primate instincts.

Well, when we own a major Hollywood studio or a television network, we can generate the images that appeal to the instincts of the lemmings. Then we can compete with the Jews in the business of manipulating their instincts. For now, while we are limited to words and reason, there's not much point in addressing ourselves to the lemmings. For now, we can speak effectively only to the two per cent or so of the population that is susceptible to reason. And I really am interested in knowing what's on the minds of this two per cent. I do want to know what the people who are capable of thinking are thinking -- and feeling -- as our civilization crumbles and our race slips into the abyss of extinction. Because, you know, even though we can't win any elections with just this two per cent, we can win the war . . . if we can get most of them -- or even half of them -- properly oriented and properly motivated.

So what are the things that are keeping that thinking two per cent from getting their act together? Well, one thing is conservatism. Many people still can't let go of the notion that we must solve our problems in a civilized and orderly way, like ladies and gentlemen. Well, you know, we lost that option a long time ago. Really, all you have to do is look around. Go out into the street. Go into any big city supermarket or shopping mall. Look at the people. They are the voters: the 400-pound welfare moms, and the Mexicans and Vietnamese who've been here long enough to

become citizens, and the beer-bellied baseball and basketball fans -- the sort of people one sees on Oprah and the Jerry Springer Show. The ladies and gentlemen of America can't outvote them. We can't save our people or our civilization by playing according to the old rules. We can't win by being ladies and gentlemen. We have to use our heads, of course, but we also must at least be willing to get down and dirty when necessary. We must be willing to break every old rule and to make new ones.

I remember what it was like living in a world where most people respected the old rules. I remember White neighborhoods, where mothers stayed home and took care of their children, and White schools . . . and even White shopping malls, believe it or not. It was a world in which ladies and gentlemen ran things, and it was a much cleaner and more decent world. It had its faults, of course. I found it a little too stuffy and prudish and restrictive, but it was an infinitely better world for our people than this Clinton-era world. The biggest problem with that civilized, White world of 50 years ago was that even then the rules were way out of date. The rules were no longer able to protect our society from our deadliest enemies, who had found ways around the rules. They were able to infiltrate and subvert every institution of ours.

We clung to meaningless rules -- we clung to civility and politeness and table manners and dressing properly and other outward forms -- while they corrupted and subverted from within. It was considered rude to point to the corrupters and subverters. We may not have admitted many of the brasher and pushier New York and Hollywood Jews into our society, but we thought it was all right to admit the ones who had learned to dress and talk like us, the ones who had learned our manners and could pretend to be ladies and gentlemen. Our polite and civilized society carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

And even today the conservatives cannot let go of it. They are so enamored of its rotted-out hulk that the stink of its decay doesn't discourage them. But, still -- I can remember the time when I too didn't understand where the stink was coming from, and so I believe that there are some conservatives who still are worth talking with, some who still can learn to let go.

And then there are the liberals -- or rather, what I call the "incidental" liberals, in order to distinguish them from the intrinsic liberals. Incidental liberals are people who accept liberal policies only because they don't understand. They aren't lemmings, but they have nevertheless let themselves be misinformed to the point that they might as well be lemmings. They've simply absorbed what they've been taught in school and by the controlled media about all the races being inherently equal in ability and morality, about differences in individual and group achievement being due entirely to differences in environment and in opportunity, about the only difference between Jews and everyone else being a matter of religion, and so on.

It's not that they feel a need to believe these things because of some psychological trauma caused by faulty potty training, as is the case with the intrinsic liberals. It's just that they never questioned what they were told. Perhaps they grew up in a rural area or a small town which was essentially White and Gentile and so didn't see the glaring contradictions between reality and what they were taught. Perhaps they just aren't very perceptive. Perhaps hearing sophomore college girls squeal, "Ooooh, my god! How can you be soooo stupid!" whenever someone

violated a taboo of Political Correctness has made them gun shy: they haven't wanted to risk becoming an object of ridicule themselves.

What folks like this need is a good, big dose of reality. Sometimes moving to a big city will do the job. Sometimes military service will clear up the problem. I've had a number of letters from people in the Army who've confessed to me that until recently they had believed much of the television propaganda about racial equality, and it wasn't until they'd had a chance to experience the wonders of the colored brother up close and had gagged on the experience that they realized they had been lied to and began looking for the truth. But you must remember that these people aren't real liberals. A real liberal will continue making excuses for Blacks even after going through basic training with them in the Army. A real liberal will flee from the reality of life with Blacks in the big city but even after reaching the safety of a Whiter area will not admit why he fled. Real liberals need more than a dose of reality to straighten out their thinking. They need an experience at least as traumatic as whatever it was that went wrong during their potty training. They'll get it, but it may come too late to do much good.

And there are the individualists. I've spoken about them in earlier broadcasts. They are the folks who believe that they are properly oriented and properly motivated when they are focused entirely on looking out for Number One. You talk to them about the danger America is in, the danger the race is in, and they look at you as if you're crazy. They're thinking, "What does that have to do with me?" The brighter individualists are capable of understanding that the mess all of us -- including them -- are in now is the consequence of too much individualist thinking in the past, of too many people shirking their responsibility for the race. Even so, they look at the situation around them today, and their first thought is, "It's every man for himself!" It's no wonder that the enemies of our people extol the virtues of individualist thinking and hold out individualist teachers and "philosophers," such as the Jewess Ayn Rand, for us to follow.

About the only way to get any useful cooperation out of an individualist is to convince him that the danger we all face is so imminent that it really is a matter of hanging together or hanging separately: that the situation is deteriorating so rapidly that he cannot escape the consequences of egalitarianism and multiculturalism and Clintonism run wild by acting entirely on his own. He must be convinced that his own immediate self-interest is tied to the welfare and survival of his people. But that's becoming an easier proposition all the time. Ten years ago even an intelligent and farsighted individualist might reasonably believe that the deluge wouldn't come until after his lifetime, and so it was not his concern. Today, finding it hard to get air even standing on tiptoe, he is not so sure that the flood will wait, and he is much more amenable to reason.

So our task is to continue to build understanding and motivation among the thinking portion of our people: to persuade the conservatives to let go by showing them where the stink is coming from, to show them that the corpse they are clinging to really is dead; to educate the incidental liberals by helping them see the facts they have overlooked; to make the individualists understand that individualism just doesn't make sense at a time when the tide is carrying our boat farther and farther from the safe harbor we all seek, and it is clear that we will only get there if we all row together.

Perhaps I am just an unrealistic optimist to believe that we can do these things. But I myself have been to all of these places I've talked about. I used to be a conservative. And I used to believe that Jews were just like all the rest of us except that they went to a different church; I believed that the reason Blacks behaved badly and had never accomplished much was that they had had a bad break, that they hadn't had a fair chance. And I even went through an individualist phase, when I thought I was so much smarter than everyone else that I could manage by myself; I hadn't explored my roots yet -- I hadn't understood yet that I am only a very small part of something much bigger and more important than myself.

And because I came through all of these things, all of these errors, I believe that others can too. In fact, I know they can, because I see the proof of it in my mail every day. And I know that these broadcasts are helping them. We just need to do more than we're doing now: more radio stations, a bigger audience, more effective use of all our media, not just radio, and the development of new media. We need to continue building our communications infrastructure as rapidly as we can. We need to recruit more help for that task, just like I need to recruit a secretary.

We're getting there. We're reaching more of our people every day. We just need to move faster, and one of these days we'll be able to begin having an effect on the lemmings too. We'll be able to begin appealing to basic instincts. We'll even have some of those sophomore college girls changing their tune about what's stupid and what isn't.

So let's reiterate now the basics of what we're up against, the basic elements of our present predicament. First, we are in the midst of a demographic disaster of unprecedented magnitude. The racial composition of America is changing more rapidly and more profoundly than the population of any major country ever has changed in peacetime. In 1950 the population of the United States was 90 per cent White. Today it is only 70 per cent White. That's a tripling of the percentage of non-Whites in just 50 years. If present trends continue, in just another 40 years Whites will be less than 50 per cent of the population. We'll be a minority in our own country. That is a fact that is not even under dispute. The Clintonistas are crowing about it. They are looking forward with glee to an America in which Whites no longer are a majority as much as we are dreading it.

Not even the causes of this demographic disaster are under dispute. The White birthrate has fallen below the replacement level, while non-White birthrates remain high -- and the flood of new immigrants, both legal and illegal, pouring across our borders is mostly non-White, which is why the Clintonistas are determined to keep the borders open. On top of everything else, the rate of miscegenation between Whites and non-Whites is skyrocketing, as the mass media and the government and the mainstream Christian churches do everything they can to encourage racial mixing and mongrelization. This is the physical aspect of our problem.

We also are in the midst of a moral disaster. I hardly need to tell you that the willingness of the American electorate to tolerate the sort of scandalous behavior we have seen in the Clinton administration is as unprecedented as the demographic changes which are taking place. I mean, there was a time not so long ago when it would have been unthinkable to have as a major presidential candidate a man who as governor of a state was in the habit of sending out the state

police to scout up women for him and bring them to the governor's mansion for his sexual pleasure or who had a brother conducting a flourishing trade in illegal cocaine sales from an office in the governor's mansion and got caught doing it and convicted and sent to prison. It used to be that that sort of behavior just wasn't tolerable. But now, as long as people's credit cards are good, they don't seem to mind. They're quite willing to have a piece of smiling, charming filth like Bill Clinton as their President, as long as their refrigerators are full and there are plenty of ball games on TV. Half of the electorate don't care that their President is a perjurer and a rapist and a user of illegal drugs who solicits campaign contributions from foreign powers. Half don't care, and the other half don't care enough to do anything about it as long as the economy seems superficially healthy. That is a moral disaster, and it is unprecedented.

The public displays of homosexuality and the acceptance of homosexual behavior in our universities and elsewhere also are unprecedented. So is the extent to which feminism influences public policy. So is the extent to which our men have become effeminate wimps.

Finally, we are in the midst of a political disaster, or perhaps it would be more accurate to call it a power disaster. We have a political system, an electoral system, which for all practical purposes is controlled by the people who control the mass media: in particular, television. No candidate for national or even state office can be elected without television. The average voter sees and hears the candidates only on his television screen. That's his only way of knowing the candidates, his only way of making a choice. This is unprecedented.

Prior to about 1922, when commercial radio broadcasting began to become a significant medium, voters learned about candidates only by hearing them speak in person at local public meetings or by reading about them in newspapers. Even then, of course, the personal bias of a big-city newspaper owner could make a substantial difference in a candidate's chance of being elected. But at least, in those days there were a number of newspapers with various owners in every big city. With the increasing importance of radio broadcasting during the 1920s and 1930s, with the accumulation of newspapers in fewer and fewer hands, and with the advent of commercial television broadcasting after the Second Wold War, the relationship between candidates for public office and voters changed in a radical way.

Today the Jews' monopoly control of the mass media gives them the sort of political power that newspaper owners and ward bosses couldn't even dream about 75 years ago. Worse, it is a hidden power. The average voter doesn't see it. He doesn't even know who the big media bosses are. He just sees the faces on his television screen and doesn't think about how they got there. But the politicians certainly think about it. The politicians understand whom they must please and whom they dare not offend in order to receive favorable TV coverage. They understand which policies they must support and which laws they must pass in order to remain in favor with the media bosses.

So those are the three major disasters that have befallen our people and with which we must deal: the demographic disaster, the moral disaster, and the media disaster. And of course, they are all tied together; they are all aspects of a single disaster. We wouldn't have a demographic disaster if we didn't have a moral disaster. We wouldn't permit our country to be invaded and taken over by non-Whites if we still were a manly people with a manly sense of responsibility. And what has

subverted our morality, what has sapped our manliness and our sense of responsibility more than anything else, has been the Jewish control of our mass media of news and entertainment. More than soft living and luxury, more than the transition from a rural, agricultural life-style to an urban, industrial life-style, the Jewish domination of Hollywood and Madison Avenue during the past half-century has taken us to the brink of extinction.

If we want to pull ourselves back from the brink, if we want our people to have a future again, we must face these things and overcome them. We must halt the darkening and mongrelization of America; we must regain our morality and our manhood; and we must regain control over our media of mass communications and thence over the people.

Black Is Good; White Is Bad

Today let's talk a little about the mass sexual assaults on White women by Blacks and Puerto Ricans that occurred in New York City a little less than two weeks ago. The assaults were on the Sunday before last: June 11, which in New York is officially Puerto Rican Day. And I should tell you that that fact alone dampens my sympathy for the victims right from the start. It's hard to feel sorry for anyone who would choose to live in a place that has an official Puerto Rican Day.

I don't know what your image of Puerto Ricans is. I believe that for most Americans it's a smiling, brown face serving them some sort of iced beverage with rum while they are relaxing under a beach umbrella. That's the average soccer-mom's image, which she acquired from watching those television commercials for Caribbean cruises. Whites who live in New York and have to deal with Puerto Ricans on a continuing basis have a different image: they call them "cockroaches," *"cucarachas."* They are the ghastly result of crossbreeding Caribbean Indians, Blacks, and an especially low grade of White trash and teaching their mongrel offspring to speak Spanish -- of a sort. They are probably the most unsavory ethnic group in the very unsavory stew of ethnic groups which is New York City.

About the only good thing that can be said for the Puerto Ricans is that they have set off a lot of bombs in various U.S. government offices over the years, and on one occasion they launched an assault on the U.S. Congress and shot half a dozen congressmen. They also made a reasonably creditable -- but unfortunately unsuccessful -- assassination attempt against President Harry Truman in 1950. But these valiant acts were carried out by an almost-White Puerto Rican elite and hardly compensate for the worthlessness of the average Puerto Rican.

After Puerto Ricans in New York's Central Park sexually assaulted approximately 50 White women -- plus a couple of non-White women -- following the Puerto Rican Day parade on June 11, everyone was looking for someone to blame. The first thing the media and the politicians had to say about that is, "Don't blame the Puerto Ricans! It wasn't a racial thing! The victims were of all races." Well, while it is technically correct that not every single victim was White, anyone watching films of the attacks can easily see that nearly all of them were -- while all of the attackers were non-Whites. The rampaging mob really wasn't interested in Black and Puerto Rican women, and so non-White women who were in the area managed to scurry out of harm's way, while the mob of Puerto Ricans and Blacks deliberately singled out White women -- and White girls as young as 14 -- ripping off their clothes, squeezing their breasts, and thrusting their fingers deep into their genitalia. White men who accompanied some of the women were held and forced to watch while the non-Whites brutalized and humiliated their women. Despite the fact that nearly all the victims were White, the news story on the assaults in this week's issue of Gerald Levin's *Time* magazine pictured both of the two Black victims, including one with peroxided orange hair. The aim clearly was to create the impression that at least half the victims were Black. The story in this week's issue of Katherine Meyer Graham's *Newsweek* magazine had a photograph of one of the two Black victims.

Some of the women blamed the police, who ignored the victims when they pleaded for help. There were rumors that the politicians had ordered the police not to arrest or harass the Puerto

Ricans, lest they riot. I'm inclined to say, well, that's life in the Great Satan these days. What do you expect?

But many people are acting surprised by the sexual assaults and the reports that the police refused to intervene. The media and the politicians have been telling them that the crime rate in New York is going down: they have been boasting that the great experiment in multicultural living is succeeding. And now this! What a nasty surprise! That's like a family living in a cockroach-infested apartment. The family is too lazy or too preoccupied with other things to clean up the apartment and get rid of the cockroaches. They have heard rumors that cockroaches spread disease, but everyone still seems healthy, so they just discount the rumors, ignore the cockroaches, and continue watching their ball games on TV. Then they start getting sick. I'm not surprised. Are you surprised?

I'll tell you what does surprise me, and that's the fact that the Puerto Rican Day assaults have gotten any media coverage at all. This is the sort of thing that the controlled media nearly always take great pains to ignore. They don't want to confuse the lemmings, who have been taught that multiculturalism is the most wonderful development since the wheel. It makes me suspect that one of the women who had her genitalia probed by the subhumans in Central Park knows somebody who was willing and able to raise a fuss.

Certainly, these mass assaults on White women by our colored bothers generally are ignored successfully. Two moths ago, for example, Black college students had their so-called "Black Springbreak 2000" celebration in Biloxi, Mississippi. Approximately 20,000 young Blacks congregated in the Biloxi and Gulfport area, generally behaving as we expect 20,000 young Blacks to behave when they have the local law enforcement agencies overwhelmed. They ate in restaurants and walked out without paying. They smashed up convenience stores when the storekeepers ran out of beer. One unhappy White storekeeper complained, "My bathrooms are ruined. I didn't believe people could be so mean and ugly." Well, I hope you believe it now. Other Whites were shocked to see Blacks pulling down their pants and relieving themselves on the sidewalks.

The real Black behavior, however, manifested itself when White women and girls who didn't have the sense to stay indoors -- or in some cases were caught going to or from their places of employment -- were spotted by the Blacks. The cry would go up: "There's a White girl. Get her!" Then exactly the same thing would happen that happened in Central Park. The unfortunate White girl would be mobbed by Blacks, her clothes would be ripped from her body, and she would be fondled and probed while other Blacks gleefully watched and videotaped her humiliation. There were even photographs in the local newspapers of stripped White girls running from the mob and trying to cover their nakedness with their hands while the Blacks leered at them and made obscene gestures. But these Mississippi newspapers, just like those in New York, carefully avoided describing what happened in racial terms.

Well, that's certainly not the Mississippi I remember from the days when I was an undergraduate. In those days if a mob of Blacks had assaulted White women the way they did two months ago, not one would have left Biloxi alive. Roadblocks would have been set up to keep them from fleeing, and they would have been hunted down and killed to the last Black. The police would be

manning the roadblocks and helping to provide the firepower. But you know, Mississippi is part of the so-called "New South" these days, where Blacks not only can get away with that sort of behavior, but the politicians and the media make excuses for them and cover for them.

Well anyway, my point was that you didn't hear about what happened in Biloxi two months ago unless you happen to live there. I got my information from the Gulfport, Mississippi, *Sun Herald,* but it certainly wasn't in the *Washington Post* or the *New York Times.* Most such incidents are successfully covered up by the national media. The incidents this month in Central Park are the rare exceptions to the rule.

So who is to blame for this situation? Well, the soccer moms undoubtedly will find some small flaw in the system to blame, some minor breakdown in the system which is supposed to permit them to live in the multicultural jungle that America has become without being assaulted by the animals who also live in the jungle. They want to put a Band-Aid on the system -- perhaps fire some lower-level police official -- and then have things continue as before but without the assaults. They want to be able to stroll through Central Park on Sunday afternoons, with subhuman animals all around them and still be perfectly safe. They are out of touch with reality. Reality is that if you insist on living in a jungle, then you should expect to be eaten.

Reality is that Whites and non-Whites are different. To Blacks and Puerto Ricans, grabbing a woman in public and ripping her clothes off is no big deal. Rape is no big deal either. Blacks really don't understand why Whites take rape so seriously. In the Third World rape is a macho thing. Young men do it and get away with it. And of course, as we bring more and more non-Whites into the United States, we must expect to see more and more of the sort of behavior we saw in Biloxi and in Central Park. And it's not just the non-Whites. In fact, already White behavior also is moving in that direction. The Jewish mass media already have pounded the notion into the heads of the lemmings and the college girls of both sexes that whatever is Black is good, that Blacks and Puerto Ricans and Mexicans may have cultures and lifestyles different from ours, but really, theirs are better than ours, cleaner and greener and wiser and less offensive than ours, nicer than ours. The same sort of destructive nonsense is being taught in many of our public schools and in our colleges and universities.

I'm sure you've heard this "Black is better" party line yourself often enough, but I'll read you a couple of paragraphs from a letter I received a few days ago from a woman who provides a perfect example of just what I've been talking about. This particular soccer mom, who goes by the name Cherylynn Hoff, apparently listened to one of my broadcasts, didn't like it, and decided to tell me how displeased she is with my Political Incorrectness. Ms. Hoff writes:

I am an educated, upper-middle class "White" woman of wholly "European" descent, the kind of person you wish to recruit. Your attitudes and beliefs, beyond embarrassing me, highly offend me. I'd like to know what makes you feel you are, in any way, "better" than anyone else.

"Better" seems to be a word Ms. Hoff finds offensive, because she encloses it in quotation marks. Actually, there are a number of words in her letter in quotation marks -- the word "European," for example -- and I suspect that these are words she has been conditioned to feel uncomfortable about. Ms. Hoff continues:

First of all, in terms of protecting our territory from non-Whites, you must remember that your 'European' heritage indicates that you are culturally and racially from Europe, not from the Americas. The Europeans came and exploited and abused this good American land and its native peoples, who have traditionally held beliefs and practices of deep respect for the land and Nature, the kind of knowledge and respect that hundreds of thousands of well educated, upper-middle class White people are paying big bucks to learn at seminars, retreats, and alternative education programs. Why? Because White Europeans, while having the market cornered in terms of aggression, control, and manipulation, have missed the boat in terms of spiritual values that honor and respect the beautiful earth and the beautiful creatures that Great Mother Earth has created for us. . . .

It is Whites who brought the Blacks here -- as slaves. They did not come of their own volition. They were stolen by force from their tribal structure, the attributes of which you obviously have no knowledge or basis for understanding. Go educate yourself, darling, about the value of elder wisdom as passed to indigenous youth through traditional tribal rites of passage, and you will find a structure desperately missing and much needed in the depravity of White America. Your ignorance and lack of capacity to appreciate what you can learn from indigenous cultural structures are, beyond embarrassing, obviously extremely dangerous. Gunpowder, arms, egoism, and a drive to control, manipulate, and destroy are not qualities of which to be proud. Yes, they helped Whites get on top for a minute period of this earth's long history, but they are not qualities that will enable Whites to endure their deluded brand of supremacy. The natural order will take place, and people like you will fade away under the patchwork of multiethnicity and interbreeding, fight as you may in an unattractive quandary of fear and hatred. You live in fear and thus are fighting a losing battle. I can bet hands down that many of your members cannot hold a candle to the many intelligent, beautiful, talented, well educated, loving people that I am blessed to have in my life who come from a variety of different ethnicities and cultures. . . . Frankly, I don't want more people like you on this earth. The contributions my friends of color and my friends of same-sexed sexual orientation have made to our society are vast. . . . .

Well, you know, I didn't choose that letter to read to you for its brilliance, but because it is typical of a mind-set which unfortunately is very common among White Americans, not only among women but also among feminized men, who like to think of themselves as educated. And in a superficial sense they are educated, in that they have passed through one of the institutions pretending to be universities in America these days. When Bill Clinton speaks to university audiences about the fact that Whites are rapidly approaching minority status in America, it is women like Ms. Hoff -- and their male counterparts -- who applaud. They really have been trained to hate their own race, their own civilization, their own traditions.

Black is good, White is bad. That sounds pretty simpleminded, but in essence that is what people like Ms. Hoff have been taught. An ironic aspect of this situation is that these people have an instinctive realization that American society is in a terminal state of decay -- Ms. Hoff refers to it as "the depravity of White America" -- but when they go looking for solutions, the Jews, wearing their "New Age" guru hats, are waiting for them at the ticket booth, ready to take their money and stuff them full of even more baloney about "indigenous cultural structures" and the wonders of the colored brother in "seminars, retreats, alternative education programs," and the rest of the New Age brainwashing apparatus.

One of the standard features of such seminars, retreats, and so on is the claim that Blacks and so-called "Native Americans" are much more sensitive to environmental problems than we are. White heterosexual males are obsessed with gunpowder and destruction, while people of color are born environmentalists. That's about as blatant a falsehood as you'll find among all of the New Age hocus pocus. Take a look sometime at the membership of serious environmental groups such as the Sierra Club. You'll have a hard time spotting a non-White face among them. Really, they would like nothing better than to have more "diversity" in their ranks, but the non-Whites just aren't interested. To Blacks and Mexicans environmentalists are crazy to be concerned about things like trees and whales.

Take a look at conditions on any Indian reservation. They don't spread their trash around like that because the White man forces them to. They do it because they don't understand why they shouldn't. When Europeans began arriving here in substantial numbers more than 400 years ago, the only reason the Indians hadn't made much of an impact on the land was that they had only a Stone Age culture. They were still hunters and gatherers, without the know-how to sustain more than a very sparse population. If the Indians had had steel tools and gunpowder and machinery, there wouldn't have been a buffalo or a tree left by the time the Whites arrived. And there wouldn't be an environmentalist movement today were it not for the White people who are concerned enough about the environment to devote their time and money to trying to preserve it. Unfortunately, not every White person shares that concern -- many care as little about Nature as the Blacks and Indians do -- but it is only among Whites that there is any concern at all.

Anyway, back to Biloxi and Central Park. I always try to be completely frank with you, and so I should tell you that I rejoice whenever something like that happens. It makes me feel good to see even a very minor riot like the one earlier this week in Los Angeles. Of course, I am very sorry that many of the women who are raped or humiliated are completely innocent. It is a very rough educational experience for them. It's too bad that the women who are victimized when the Blacks revert to their jungle behavior can't all be Cherylynn Hoffs.

You know, I used to think that a good, brutal gang-rape by Blacks or Puerto Ricans would straighten out the thinking of someone like Ms. Hoff in a hurry. I don't believe that any longer, though. I've seen too many examples of just how strong a grip Political Correctness has on such people. They would rather die -- really, they would rather die -- than be Politically Incorrect, than be thought to have an unfashionable opinion. By the time Cherylynn was out of the hospital she would have figured out how what had happened to her was entirely the fault of heterosexual White males. Such people can be cured, but it'll take more than a gang-rape. To make the lemmings change course will take a scientifically designed program of mass conditioning of the sort the Jews have used to get them moving in their present direction.

Nevertheless, I still welcome these demonstrations of indigenous tribal exuberance such as we saw in Biloxi and Central Park. They may do nothing for Cherylynn Hoff, who will continue hoping for the extinction of the White race so she won't feel guilty or embarrassed any longer, but there are many other White women -- and White men too -- who are capable of learning something from these demonstrations. They need to learn a lot, while there still are enough of us to do something about the course of events.

The Nature of the Beast

Last week we spoke about the growing trade in White sex slaves in Israel and the reaction -- or lack of reaction -- to that trade in America. I read to you from the June 16 edition of one of Israel's major newspapers, the *Jerusalem Post*, in which two Israeli feminists reported on the luring of Gentile girls from Russia, Ukraine, Latvia, Hungary, and other eastern European countries to Israel with the false promise of high-paying jobs as secretaries or teachers and then the grabbing of these girls by Jewish slave dealers as soon as they land in Israel. The girls are raped, beaten, and terrorized by the Jewish slave dealers to make them compliant, and then they are auctioned to the owners of brothels and sex clubs, where they are kept in locked apartments and forced to work as prostitutes. The *Jerusalem Post* article also reported that the reason Israel is the center of the international trade in White female slaves is that in Israel it is perfectly legal to buy and sell human beings and to own slaves, provided they are not Jews.

And we spoke about the fact that Americans still support the state of Israel with billions of dollars in military and financial aid every year, and we still behave as if the attempt by the Germans 60 years ago to rid their country of Jewish influence -- the so-called "Holocaust" -- was the most terrible crime in the history of the world. Our news media here still refer to the slave state of Israel as a "bastion of freedom and democracy" in the Middle East. Our President welcomes the prime minister of Israel at the White House with open arms, instead of sending our Navy to the eastern Mediterranean to blitz Tel Aviv with cruise missiles and smart bombs until the Jews free all their White sex slaves and permit an army of United Nations "peacekeepers" to occupy Israel so that country can be taught that slavery is a "no, no."

Why is that? Why are Jews not held to the same standards as other people? Indeed, I received some reactions from listeners to last week's broadcast who told me that Jews cannot be held to normal standards of behavior because they are "God's people" -- did you get that?: "God's people" -- and it is wicked to criticize them: it says so right in the Bible, these listeners told me.

Our first tendency might be to dismiss such listeners as hopelessly primitive Bible-thumpers. Why should we take seriously any White person who believes literally and lets himself be governed by the Jews' own collection of superstition, myth, and pseudo-history? Well, one reason for taking the thumpers seriously is that, unfortunately, there still are a lot of them out there -- and many of them, aside from their habit of Bible thumping, are not really bad people. They have been deluded by preachers and churches; they have had a lot of nonsense pounded into their heads when they were young. But really, are people who believe that the universe was created in six days and that the Jewish fortune teller Isaiah was able to make the sun reverse its course across the sky -- are they any more ignorant or gullible than people who maintain that the only difference between Whites and Blacks is the color of their skin? Is the religion of the Bible worse than the religion of egalitarianism, the TV religion?

A better reason for listening to the thumpers is that they have a good point: a point that is relevant to our own concern with the Jews. The Jews are the "chosen people," the so-called "people of the Book." It's not just the more primitive Christian sects that make that claim; it is the Jews themselves. That claim, in fact, is the fundament on which all of their religion, all of

Judaism, is based, and it merits our serious consideration. We don't have time on this program for a comprehensive study of the Bible, but I recommend strongly such a course of study to anyone who is seriously interested in the Jewish question.

We can note quickly a couple of things about the Jews' Bible, however: about the Old Testament. It does condone slavery; it does condone the buying and selling of human beings. The Jewish god, Yahweh, or Jehovah, also sets his own stamp of approval on slavery in the Jews' Bible; he gives specific instructions to the Jews on buying and selling slaves. Slavery, of course, was an institution practiced by others as well as the Jews during the period of the Old Testament. What makes it relevant to the subject under discussion here is that Judaism is the most conservative of religions practiced in the world today. The Jews always have regarded every word of their Bible as inerrant. For centuries their rabbis have quibbled legalistically over the tiniest details, and their quibbling is set down in the Talmud, to serve as a guide for all observant Jews today. Every comment in the Old Testament about diet or clothing or grooming is taken as a divine commandment, which must be obeyed today by Orthodox Jews.

The Jews have insisted that the Christians change their religion to suit the Jews, and the Christians have been disgustingly accommodating. The New Testament accounts of the crucifixion, for example, have been drastically reinterpreted to absolve the Jews of all blame. The New Testament describes the Jewish mob which handed Jesus over for crucifixion and then demanded that the crucifixion be carried out, threatening to riot and screaming that they and their descendants would take the blame. When the Roman official in charge wanted to acquit Jesus of the Jews' charges against him, the Jews insisted that he be crucified and said, "His blood be on us and on our children." But in modern times the Jews complained that this New Testament account had led Christians to hold a grudge against them. And so the Christian theologians and church officials got busy and announced that it wasn't really the Jewish population of Jerusalem the New Testament was talking about in its accounts of the crucifixion -- it isn't the Jews who must bear guilt for the shedding of Jesus' blood -- it is all of humanity. That is the new interpretation.

And the rewriting of the account of the crucifixion is only one example of the ways in which the Christians have changed their religion in a vain effort to please the Jews. As a general rule, whenever the Jews yell, "Jump!" every Christian leader, from the Pope down to the most primitive radio evangelist, immediately responds, "How high, sir?"

But with the Jews it is quite different. Nobody even asks them to change their religion in order to make it less offensive to Christians or Muslims or others. And the Jews wouldn't dream of making any changes anyway. The interpretation in the Talmud is inerrant. If Yahweh told the children of Israel 4,000 years ago that it's okay to buy and sell slaves, then it's still okay today. And in the state of Israel today even the atheistic Jews in the government are very careful not to offend Orthodox Jews.

When the Romans conquered Gaul and Britain and parts of Germany, every Roman legion which marched north from Rome was followed by Jewish slave dealers, ready to buy from the Roman commanders their prisoners of war and the civilian inhabitants of conquered towns and villages. It wasn't just that some of the slave dealers happened to be Jews; buying and selling slaves was almost a Jewish monopoly, to the extent that being in the fur business or being a diamond dealer

in New York is a Jewish monopoly today. There's no law against a Gentile setting up a shop on New York's 47th Street and buying and selling diamonds, but no Gentile in his right mind would consider doing that. The Jews would gang up on him and have him fleeced and bankrupted within a week. An so it was with the buying of captives from the Roman Army. Jews, in fact, like to boast that they have been in some parts of Germany longer than the Germans have been there. And that's true to the extent that in the settlements that grew up around the permanent Roman camps along the Rhine and other places, the Jewish slave dealers had their own trading posts attached to the camps. When the Germans later forced the Romans out, some of the Jewish traders stayed.

A thousand years later the Jews still were buying and selling slaves in Europe to an extent which scandalized their Christian neighbors, resulting in a number of royal edicts during the Middle Ages prohibiting Jews from owning Christian slaves. After the discovery of the New World and the beginning of large-scale commerce in Black slaves between Africa and the West Indies, the Jews of the Netherlands -- especially those who recently had been expelled from Spain and Portugal -- were quick to grab a substantial part of the commerce in Black flesh for themselves. They were well positioned to do so, because they were prominent among ship owners and those already engaged in international trade.

My reason for making these historical and theological digressions is to establish the fact that slave dealing is sanctioned by both religion and tradition among the Jews. They can't get away with it in Europe or America these days, but in Israel, among themselves, they see no reason why they shouldn't follow their natural inclinations. They must disguise those inclinations, of course. But disguise, deception, is something that also comes naturally. The Jews have a *modus vivendi* that really is unique among the races of man. For at least the last 2,600 years -- that is, ever since the so-called "Babylonian captivity" -- and perhaps even much earlier, the Jews have striven to maintain their own separate identity and at the same time to live as a minority in non-Jewish societies. Other races have chosen one course or the other: either to be themselves, among their own kind, or to lose their own identity and assimilate into another society. The Jews always have wanted to have it both ways, and their skill at disguise and deception has been essential in the degree of success they have had.

And that gets us to the question I want to discuss with you today. What are the Jews really like? Which is the true Jew: is it the leering, hook-nosed slave dealer in Tel Aviv who brutalizes our women because his religion and the laws of his country permit him to do so, or is it the sensitive, violin-playing philanthropist Jew presented to us by Hollywood? More generally, is the real Jew the Israeli citizen who, while not a slave dealer himself, is comfortable with the traditions of his people and with the fact that his fellow Jews are still in the slave business -- or is it the friendly Jew who owns the clothing store at the mall where you shop and seems no more sinister than any other shop owner? Is it the alien-looking Orthodox Talmud-Jew, with his long sidelocks and yarmulke and black garb, that one sees in New York's "diamond district," or is it the normal-looking Jewish economics professor one had in college, who seemed like a nice guy?

Well, of course, the question is misleading. All of these Jews are "real Jews," but no one of them has all of the characteristics as an individual Jew that all of them together have. The fact is that there is quite a bit of diversity among the Jews. As an illustration of this, in Israel today the

Orthodox Jews -- that is the Jews who take Judaism seriously -- and the rest of the Jews are practically at war with each other over policy issues. The Orthodox Jews are actually burning down the synagogues of the non-Orthodox Jews. They are calling each other "Nazis." The atheistic and other non-Orthodox Jews outnumber the Orthodox Jews in Israel, but the latter are more tightly organized and more fanatical. The point is that Jews do disagree on many things.

So is it at all meaningful to associate things such as the White slave trade in Israel or the promotion of interracial sex between Whites and non-Whites in America with the Jews as a whole?

And the answer to that question is yes, it is meaningful to assign certain characteristics to Jews as a whole -- as a people, a race, a nation -- and also to hold the whole Jewish people accountable for certain policies and certain actions: "His blood be on us and on our children." That is something which has been understood for a long time, much longer than 2,000 years. Yet, a great many Americans today have been so confused by the brainwashing propaganda of the past few decades that they no longer understand it. They think that it is a reasonable policy for newspapers not to mention the race of a criminal, for example, because to do so might prejudice people against Blacks. You might argue that if a Black rapist or a Black mugger is on the loose, our people should know about it, so that they can protect themselves. They should know what he looks like. Yet, the liberal will argue that since not all Blacks are rapists or muggers, it's bad to mention the race of some who are, because that will cause our people to be wary of Blacks generally.

And of course that's true. People do generalize. People do stereotype. That's why we're still on this earth. It's a survival trait. Our ancestors a million years ago saw what happened when one of their people got bitten by a poisonous snake, and they began avoiding snakes generally, even though many snakes aren't poisonous. Better to be safe than sorry, they thought, even though our bad opinion of snakes generally might not be justified. The White women who got stripped and probed by Blacks and Puerto Ricans in Central Park a little less than a month ago had failed to generalize. They had failed to conclude that it's a good idea to stay away from any area with a high concentration of non-Whites, just because some non-Whites are like those they encountered in Central Park.

The Whites of Rhodesia also failed to generalize when they turned their country over to Black rule more than 20 years ago. Their politicians and their media people and their preachers said to them, "All Blacks are not terrorists. There are many hard-working, law-abiding Blacks. The terrorists are only a minority. It will be all right to let the Black majority rule our country, because they will keep the terrorists under control. It would be wrong to generalize about Blacks and Black-run countries. It would be racist." And the Rhodesians believed their politicians and media people and preachers. They failed to look around them at the Black-ruled countries of Africa, every one of which is a pest-hole and a basket case. They failed to consider the lesson of history, to look at Black behavior generally over the centuries. They believed that it would be wicked of them to come to a general conclusion about Blacks as a whole, as a race, because not all Blacks are the same; some Blacks are not bad, and it would be unjust to lump them in with the rest by generalizing. And so now history is phasing out the White Rhodesians. They have proved themselves unfit to survive. Since Mugabe was reelected a few days ago the attacks on

White farms and on White farm families have been stepped up. More and more of them are being forced off the farms they have owned for generations. Soon all of them will be gone.

So now, why is it fair to lump the nice Jewish economics professor you had in college, the nice Jewish shop owner you know, together with Ehud Barak and Ariel Sharon and the White slave-owners of Israel? It is fair because if we fail to do it -- if we fail to draw correct conclusions about the Jews as a whole, as a people -- we ourselves will not survive as a people. The Jewish shop owner, the Jewish professor, do not exist in a vacuum; they exist in an ethnic context. They are not simply individuals; they are members of a racial community, a national community. They are Jews, and that word has a real meaning for them. They are Jews whether they are religious or not, whether they ever have entered a synagogue or not. They are Jews whether they are in the White slave business in Israel or in the television business in America or simply shop owners or professors.

In Israel there are Jews who believe that permitting Israel to become the world center for the trade in White slaves was a tactical error that may end up costing the Jews as a whole more than it's worth, just as there were some Jews in Germany before the Second World War who believed that the promotion of communism was a tactical error for the Jews as a whole and might end up costing the Jews as a whole more than they would gain from communism. But when it comes to making a choice, the Jewish shop owner and the Jewish professor will not turn against their own people just because they believe that the Jews' trade in White slaves is a tactical error. The Jews in America overwhelmingly favored the bombing of Belgrade last year by Madeleine Albright in order to force the Serbs to be nice to the KLA terrorists who were trying to take over Serbia's Kosovo province. But they would not favor bombing Tel Aviv to force the Israeli government to stop the Jewish trade in White slaves. The friendly Jewish shop owner and the nice Jewish professor overwhelmingly favored the sending of troops into Kosovo to force the Serbs into line with the New World Order, but I will guarantee you that they would not favor the sending of troops into Israel to break the Israeli Jews of some of their nasty habits -- such as forcing Russian and Ukrainian and Latvian and Hungarian girls into prostitution -- or torturing Palestinian prisoners or sending Mossad assassination teams into other countries to murder people the Jews don't like by squirting poison into their ears or planting radio-controlled bombs in their telephones. No honest person who really knows the Jews will contradict me on that.

I'll reiterate: despite their diversity, the Jews are a unit, and if we are to survive we must understand that and act accordingly. In deciding our own policies we must consider the effects of the Jews as a whole on our society and on our people. The salient fact is not that the Jewish economics professor we had in college seemed to be a nice guy; the salient fact is that Jews own Hollywood and Madison Avenue and are using that ownership to persuade White girls that it is fashionable to have sex with Blacks. The salient fact is not that the Jewish shop owner we know is a friendly and helpful guy; the salient fact is that we have an open-borders policy which is flooding America with sub-human trash from Mexico and the rest of the Third World, and that policy is favored by the great majority of Jews in America, but by only a small minority of non-Jewish White people.

The salient fact is that if we do not think about the Jews as a whole and do something about them as a whole, history will phase us out just as surely as it is phasing out the White Rhodesians.

The Rubes and the Carnies

In our last two broadcasts we have talked about the Jewish trade in White slaves and about why the Jews engage in such activity. Today we'll expand that discussion to some related subjects.

First, however, let me tell you that after last week's broadcast, just as after the broadcast of the previous week, a number of listeners wrote to me that I am wrong about the Jews, that they really are not the evil and destructive creatures I have made them out to be; they are clever and sensitive and creative and have made many important contributions to our society. They reminded me of Jesus and Freud and Einstein and suggested that our civilization is based on the contributions of these three Jews. I don't know why they forgot to mention Karl Marx. A few years ago, when communism was still fashionable, the apologists for the Jews used to list Jesus, Marx, Freud, and Einstein as examples of great contributors to Western civilization, and then they would slyly mention that all four just happened to be Jews.

I will come back to this matter of Marx, Freud, and so on a little later in our broadcast today. At the moment I'll just mention that the reason I bring these names up is that some people tell me that these are the men we should think of when we think of Jews, not the Jewish slave dealers. The slave trade is an anomaly, they tell me, and it is not at all representative of Jews and their activities.

Well, well, well! I have on my desk at the moment a news item from Brazil. It is dated July 5 -- that's just 10 days ago -- and was reported by Reuters news agency. It is about a child prostitution ring operated in Brazil by Israeli diplomats in order to satisfy the sexual appetites of Israeli tourists. I'll bet you haven't seen anything about this on whichever network television news program you watch. The head of the child prostitution ring is Arie Scher, Israel's consul in Rio de Janeiro, The ring recruited girls as young as nine years old and organized sex parties with the children for Israeli tourists. One of the child prostitutes was questioned by Brazilian police and led them to the home of a Hebrew language teacher in Rio, Georges Schteinberg, where police seized photographs of hundreds of naked children and videos taken at sex parties with the children. Viewing the videos, police officials recognized the swimming pool and deck of the Israeli consul, Arie Scher, which was the scene of many of the sex parties.

I'll quote directly from the Reuters news report:

Police said a young girl testified she was filmed and photographed by the teacher, Georges Schteinberg, having sex with Israeli tourists. She also explained that Scher participated in some of the sessions . . . . 'We confirmed that the pornographic pictures were taken next to the consul's pool and on his deck,' said Roberto Costa, a chief investigator for the civil police.

Arie Scher, of course, was immediately whisked out of Brazil by the Israeli government before the Brazilian police could question him. Now, why is this story significant? After all, among every nationality there are perverts and degenerates and child molesters. Yes, but not every government is involved in child prostitution. Are we supposed to believe that the Foreign Ministry back in Jerusalem didn't know that one of their diplomats was using the consular

residence in Rio de Janeiro to entertain big-shot Israeli tourists with sex parties featuring children? Are we supposed to believe that Israel's super-efficient intelligence apparatus wasn't aware of what Jewish tourists were doing at the consular residence? And doesn't this sort of thing fit right in with the Israeli government's toleration of forced prostitution and White slavery?

I'll read you something else. This is a much older report about White slavery. It was written in 1925, in Germany:

The relation of Jews to prostitution and, even more, to the White-slave traffic, could be studied in Vienna as perhaps in no other city of Western Europe, with the possible exception of the southern French ports. If you walked at night through the streets and alleys of Leopoldstadt [the Jewish district of Vienna], at every step you witnessed proceedings which remained concealed from the majority of the German people until the War gave the soldiers on the eastern front occasion to see similar things, or, rather, forced them to see them.

When thus, for the first time, I recognized the Jew as the coldhearted, shameless, and calculating director of this revolting vice traffic in the scum of the big city, a cold shudder ran down my back.

Those words I just read are from chapter two, volume one of *Mein Kampf.* The author is Adolf Hitler, describing his horror at what he saw as a young man in Vienna just before the First World War. Now I'll read you a more recent comment on the White-slave trade:

In Russia, for example, traffickers prey on orphanages. In a typical scenario, a trafficker will pay an orphanage director approximately $12,000 to take a group of children on a "field trip" to the local McDonald's, for example. Groups of children will then leave the orphanage with the trafficker and never be seen or heard from again.

Those were the words of New Jersey's Congressman Christopher Smith, introducing a bill into the House of Representatives just a few weeks ago. The bill, designated H.R. 3244, is the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000.

Congressman Smith, of course, did not dare to identify the slave traders who abduct Russian girls from orphanages and force them to become sex slaves, but I'll tell you who they are. They are members of the *Organizatsiya*, the Jewish organized crime syndicate misleadingly referred to by the media in this country as the "Russian Mafia." It seems that the passage of 90 years and a so-called "Holocaust" have not persuaded the Jews to change their ways.

Jews don't operate in a vacuum, of course. In Russia and Ukraine, for example, where the Jews currently obtain most of the girls and young women they enslave for the sex trade, they depend upon a corrupt environment. The Jewish slave trader who abducts young girls from an orphanage in Moscow or St. Petersburg, as related by Congressman Smith, depends upon a corrupt official in charge of the orphanage who will accept a bribe to let the Jew take the girls on the "field trip" from which they never return. In Russia the official corruption permeates every level of government. The Jews had nearly 75 years to arrange that, to stamp out the old, aristocratic way of doing things and replace it with their way.

I had hopes that when Boris Yeltsin lapsed into his final vodka stupor, a Russian patriot might take his place and begin a general housecleaning in Russia. It's becoming increasingly obvious, however, that Vladimir Putin is no patriot. He is simply another Russian front man, somewhat better disciplined than Yeltsin and less dependent on vodka, but he receives his orders from the same people behind the scenes. There was a big revelation in this regard just a few weeks ago, when the political police in Spain leaked the news that Putin had been slipping secretly into the country for visits to a luxurious villa on Spain's south coast, near Cadiz. The villa is owned by Boris Abramovich Berezovsky, the Jewish billionaire media tycoon and racketeer, who was the power behind Boris Yeltsin and appears now to be the power behind Putin. Other villas around the Berezovsky villa in Spain which Putin visited are owned by leading gangsters in the *Organizatsiya,* and the Spanish police observed conferences between Putin and these Jewish gangsters -- which explains why Putin has made absolutely no move against the organized crime that is plaguing Russia.

Putin did arrest one leading Jewish gangster last month and charged him with stealing money from the government. That was Vladimir Gussinsky, who is one of Berezovsky's Jewish rivals for the control of Russia's mass media. The power struggles in Russia these days are between various groups of Jews, with the real Russians having virtually no say in what goes on. Gussinsky was locked up for only four days- -- just long enough for the Jewish media in the West to begin squawking about "anti-Semitism" in Russia and hinting that the Putin government was beginning a "persecution" of the Jews there. And of course, Bill Clinton and half of the members of the U.S. Congress expressed their "concern" over the Gussinsky arrest. It was the same when the Iranian government cracked a Jewish espionage ring in Iran recently and arrested a group of Jewish spies. If Putin had arrested a real Russian, or if the Iranian government had arrested a dozen French or Polish or German spies, the media over here wouldn't have been interested, and there would have been no expression of "concern" by Clinton and the other politicians.

Here's another related matter; that's the huge influx of Jews from the former Soviet Union into the United States. As the communist system the Jews had built up in the Soviet Union began to come apart in the 1980s, primarily as a consequence of a disastrously inefficient economy -- an economy that was supporting a huge load of parasites, with the Jews foremost among them -- Soviet Jews began looking for another host, like fleas on a dying dog looking for a healthier dog to jump to. Some of them went to Israel, but the United States was their host of choice. In order to get around the very tight limitations on immigrants from Europe, the Jews over here began wailing about "anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union and how their Soviet Jewish brethren were being "persecuted." That, of course, was pure baloney. It's true enough that the real Russians hate the Jews passionately -- and for very good reason -- but the only people over there who have been persecuted since the Reds took over are the Russians, not the Jews. But the wailing was a good enough smokescreen for Jews and their allies in the U.S. Congress to slip through a special immigration quota for "victims of persecution" in the Soviet Union: the so-called "Lautenberg Amendment." For all practical purposes, it applies only to Jews. Any Jew living in Russia can claim "victim" status, and when he arrives in the United States is automatically entitled to all sorts of benefits at the expense of American taxpayers.

Most Americans are blissfully unaware of this racket. Not only do we now have several hundred thousand Soviet Jews in the United States who have never worked a day in this country, receiving a government check each month, and living in subsidized housing, but we have given the *Organizatsiya* a foothold here that we will come to regret dearly. Certainly, most Jews who come here from the Soviet Union aren't gangsters -- but about 10 per cent of them are, according to the estimates of police officials who must try to cope with them. If they weren't Jews they wouldn't have been admitted to the country. Their criminal records and their mob affiliations alone would have kept them out. But they're here now because of the unique status the Jews have arranged for themselves, here as everywhere else.

The FBI and many other police agencies in America recognize the threat posed by the *Organizatsiya,* or "Russian Mafia," as the media insist on calling it in order to keep the public from realizing its Jewish nature. In money laundering, drugs, gambling, the slave trade, child prostitution, illegal weapons dealing, organized car theft, insurance fraud, securities fraud, you name it, organized Jewish gangsters from the former Soviet Union are rapidly dominating organized crime activities in the United States. And yet very little is being done to stop them. For one thing, they all carry Israeli passports, and when one of them is in danger of arrest he simply catches the next plane to Tel Aviv, where he is safe from extradition.

There are other factors involved, however, which make the *Organizatsiya* infinitely more dangerous than the Italian Mafia ever was. Police agencies, including the FBI, are very hesitant to crack down on these Jewish gangsters because they are Jews, and the first thing a Jewish gangster does when he is arrested is proclaim his innocence and accuse the cops who arrested him of being "anti-Semitic" and using "Nazi tactics." Police agencies everywhere have been sensitized to these words. They duck, run, and take cover whenever they hear them.

A much more substantial shield for the *Organizatsiya* is corruption. The Italian Mafia, of course, used to bribe cops on the beat, police officials, judges, prosecutors, mayors, governors, and other politicians in order to stay in business. The difference is that the Jews use corruption much more effectively than the Mafia ever did. A corrupt politician taking money from the Mafia always had to worry about being exposed by the media. Italians didn't control the media. A politician in the pocket of the *Organizatsiya,* on the other hand, has very little worry that he ever will see a headline in a Jewish newspaper accusing him of taking bribes from the Jews. Soviet Jewish gangsters are invited to the White House and to Democratic Party fund-raising dinners, where they can have their photographs taken with Bill Clinton. That just doesn't happen with the Italian Mafia.

This business of Jewish organized crime is really extremely important. It is something that will influence the life of every American in the near future, just as it influences the life of every Russian today, and I want to talk about it in much more detail in later broadcasts. For now, I just wanted to use the example of the *Organizatsiya* as one more piece of evidence for the fact that Jews really are special; they really are different. They are not like us, and they are not just members of another ethnic group who need to become more fully assimilated, and then they will be just like us.

In a couple of earlier broadcasts I used the Jewish role in the White-slave trade as an example of the unique nature of the Jews, and some listeners accused me of picking on the Jews. They believe that the Jewish role in the slave trade is an anomaly, not at all characteristic of the Jews as a whole, just as they believe that Jewish organized crime is an anomaly, just as they believe that Marxism was an anomaly, just as they believe that the Jewish control of Hollywood and Madison Avenue and the rest of America's mass media is only a coincidence, a fluke with no special significance and certainly nothing to worry about.

What they see as characteristic of the Jews is Jesus, Marx, Freud, and Einstein -- except that it's not really fashionable to talk about Marx and his Jewishness these days. The apologists for the Jews seem to believe -- and would like to have us believe too -- that the Jews are pretty much like us -- that is, they aren't fundamentally alien; they're just a very bright, sensitive, creative, innovative, and well-meaning people, and we shouldn't hold White slavery, communism, or the *Organizatsiya* against them. Instead we should be thankful because they gave us Jesus, Marx -- excuse me, we're not supposed to mention Marx any more -- because they gave us Jesus, Freud, and Einstein.

I think that I'll not get into religion today, so let's just talk briefly about Freud and Einstein. In popular lore they are held up as the founder of the modern science of the mind and the founder of modern physics, respectively. The average member of the public has the vague notion that if it were not for Sigmund Freud we would know nothing about psychology or psychiatry today, and that if it were not for Albert Einstein we would have neither nuclear energy nor space travel. This notion is not based on fact but rather on a myth propagated by the Jewish mass media simply because these two men were Jews.

Sigmund Freud may have been a pretty clever Jew, but he also was a charlatan. He understood some things about the peculiarities of the human mind -- as did other students of the mind in his day -- but he, in a typically Jewish fashion, embellished, embroidered, waved his arms, and dramatized. He was a clever showman, a poseur, as much as he was a scientist. Freud, with the help of his fellow Jews in his profession and in the media, created a pseudo-scientific illusion which caught the attention of many people. With a sober face he advanced as science what really was not science. But it was flashy and catchy and clever, and many people believed it was science. Ultimately, Freud did more to hold back an understanding of the human psyche than he did to advance it.

Einstein wasn't a charlatan. He was a very competent mathematical physicist, and he made some genuine contributions to our understanding of our world. But he did not invent nuclear energy or even lay the theoretical groundwork for the use of nuclear energy, nor is he the father of space travel or of modern physics. But he was a Jew, and because of that his name has been drummed into the public's consciousness. Every couch potato and baseball fan recognizes the name Einstein, but none of them has ever heard of James Clerk Maxwell, or Max Planck or Arnold Sommerfeld or Erwin Schrödinger or the other giants of modern physics. That's not because the work of these men was less important or less fundamental than that of Einstein; the reason is that they weren't Jews.

Now I'll state a fundamental truth that is basic to an understanding of the nature of the Jews and of the Jewish role in our civilization. That truth is that the Jews as a whole are myth makers, illusion builders -- or to put it less politely, they are tricksters. Their whole existence among us is based on deception and illusion and misdirection. Some of them are very clever. Some of them are creative. But they are quite alien in their nature. It is almost as if they had landed here from another planet. They disguise their alienness with a remarkable talent for deception. We are like a bunch of rubes at a circus, at a carnival, and they are the carnies.

And where the rubes are concerned, the carnies stick together. Certainly, not every Jew is involved in slave dealing or child prostitution or welfare fraud or is a member of the Organizatsiya or, in the case of older Jews, belonged to the Communist Party. But whenever the call "Hey, rube!" goes out, all of the carnies do their part to assure that the carnies win the fight -- which is why you didn't hear about the Israeli consulate in Rio de Janeiro being a center for child prostitution until I told you about it today. The nice, non-communist, non-gangster Jews who control your media thought that it would be better for the rubes not to know about it.

The Jewish Mob in America

I promised last week that I would tell you in more detail about what organized Jewish criminals are doing in the United States, and that's what I'll do today. Actually, I've discussed this subject with you a few times in the past, especially in my broadcast of May 16, 1998, which was titled "Paying the *Organizatsiya."* There have been many new developments in Jewish organized crime during the past few years, and although the mass media have carefully avoided talking about these developments, never using the word "Jew" and referring only to "Russian" organized crime when they do occasionally mention the subject, a new book was published just a few weeks ago by Little, Brown and Company, which provides an up-to-date and reasonably good introduction to the topic of Jewish organized crime. I'll refer occasionally to the book during today's broadcast. The title of the book is *Red Mafiya: How the Russian Mob Has Invaded America.*

Interestingly enough, the author of the book, Robert Friedman, is a Jew himself, which just goes to show that when there's money to be made, whether in selling books or pushing drugs, Jews will even turn on each other. Certainly, the Jewish gangsters turn on each other often enough in Friedman's account. Both in Russia and in the United States, members of the Jewish mobs machine-gun and bomb each other today even more readily than the members of the Italian gangs used to shoot it out in Chicago back in the 1930s. And although Friedman adopts the standard media ploy of referring to the gangsters as "Russians," he really cannot help revealing that nearly all of them are Jews.

For example, when he comments on the reluctance of the FBI and local and state police to crack down on the so-called "Russian Mafiya" or even to investigate it, he notes:

. . . [I]n general, state and Federal law enforcement agencies were loath to go after Russian mobsters, instead devoting their energies to bagging Italian wiseguys . . . . And because the Russian mob was mostly Jewish, it was a political hot potato, especially in the New York area.

Friedman even points out that the mainstream, "respectable" Jewish organizations, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, pressured the police agencies to take it easy on their kinsmen in the Jewish crime gangs, claiming that any publicity associated with investigations or arrests would "foster anti-Semitism" and lead the Gentile public to protest against the continued influx of Jewish gangsters into the United States from the Soviet Union as "refugees." Even after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, however, writes Friedman:

Jewish organizations continued to lobby the Justice Department to downplay the threat posed by the Russian mob. 'The Russian Mafia has the lowest priority on the criminal pecking order,' admitted FBI spokesman Joe Valiquette during a 1992 interview.

Well, I'm sure it hasn't been too difficult lobbying the Clinton Justice Department to be nice to Jewish gangsters, since they have been the source of so much of Clinton's campaign money.

The Anti-Defamation League, of course, has a long history of cozy associations with Jewish crime bosses and with the FBI, giving the Jewish pressure group a great advantage in pulling the necessary strings to shelter the most important of the Jewish gangsters from prosecution. And it wasn't just the Anti-Defamation League that sheltered the flood of Jewish thugs, extortionists, murderers, drug dealers, White slavers, and racketeers pouring in from Russia. The Jewish religious establishment in America did everything it could to facilitate the influx. That's a noteworthy point because the Jewish gangsters are portrayed by apologists for the Jews as being barely Jewish, Jews with no real consciousness of being Jewish, while the Jewish religious establishment is portrayed as being a pious bunch of rabbis, especially the Orthodox Jewish establishment. Actually it was in the Orthodox establishment that the gangsters formed their most useful connections.

Friedman points out that the first of the Jewish mob's godfathers in the United States, Evsei Agron, owed his crime career to a politically connected Orthodox rabbi, Ronald Greenwald. Rabbi Greenwald had gotten his political connections working for Richard Nixon's 1972 reelection campaign. He was Nixon's ambassador to the Jewish community. In the 1980s Rabbi Greenwald became mob boss Agron's one-Jew think tank and facilitator. Mob insiders report that most of Agron's rackets were planned in Rabbi Greenwald's Manhattan office. A leading mob member in Toronto, Joseph Sigalov, is also a leader in Canada's Orthodox Jewish community and the publisher of an influential Orthodox newspaper.

So, if these Jewish mobsters get invited to Democratic Party fundraisers and serve as advisers to Republican reelection committees and are in tight with the Orthodox Jewish religious establishment, and if the FBI thinks they're not really as important as the Italian gangsters, maybe we shouldn't worry about them either. Maybe they're really not such bad guys. Maybe they're just nice, Jewish boys who sometimes step over the line and break the law.

Well, the Italian gangsters certainly don't look at them that way. A member of the John Gotti gang in New York was recorded with a wiretap warning an acquaintance:

We Italians will kill you. But the Russians are crazy -- they'll kill your whole family.

This view also is shared by policemen who have had to deal with the Jews. A New York City policeman told Friedman:

The Russians are ruthless and crazy. It's a bad combination. They'll shoot you just to see if their gun works.

One leading Jewish gangster in the United States, Monya Elson, was a hit man, a contract killer, before he became a gang boss. He began by murdering Ukrainians in Kishinev, his home town. Then he went to Moscow and murdered Russians. Then he came to America and began murdering Americans. He boasts that he has more than 100 confirmed kills. And it's not just that the Jews are more ruthless, vicious, and bloodthirsty than the members of the Italian Mafia. They are smarter, better organized, better protected politically, and much greedier: while the Mafia is stealing a million dollars, the Jews are stealing a billion. Finally, there are many more Jewish gangsters in America than Italian Mafia members. By the early 1990s there already were some

5,000 hard-core Jewish gangsters from the former Soviet Union operating in the New York area alone. That's more than the members of all of the Italian Mafia families in the United States.

And the Jews are continuing to pour into the country from Russia. The current flood began nearly 30 years ago, when corrupt politicians in the Congress, working with mainstream Jewish organizations and the Jewish media, enacted legislation that opened a sewer line from the Soviet-Jewish underworld to America. The late Washington Democratic Senator Henry Jackson, who never went to the bathroom without getting permission from the Jews, spearheaded the effort to tie trade agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union to an increase in the flow of Jews from the Soviet Union to the United States.

The pretext for giving special status to Jews, for using U.S. economic power to persuade the Soviet government to permit Jews to leave when no one else could leave, for allowing the Jews who left to come to the United States without the usual immigration background checks -- even for having American taxpayers foot the bill for flying them over here and then pay for subsidized housing, food stamps, and other special benefits for them -- all of this was based on the pretext that Jews were persecuted in the Soviet Union. The mass media over here portrayed the Jews in the Soviet Union as the principal victims of communism, rather than as its originators and its principal beneficiaries. That's an especially egregious example of the Jews' "big lie" technique, in which they brazenly stand the truth on its head, because with their monopoly control of the media there is no one to contradict them.

Friedman interviewed a well-known Jewish gangster in Miami, known to his associates as "Tarzan." His real name is Ludwig Fainberg. He came to the United States from Ukraine, a country whose natives have traditionally hated the Jews, for very good reasons. Fainberg is not a religious Jew, but he certainly is very Jewish, the kind of Jew the real Ukrainians instinctively despise. But was Fainberg persecuted in Ukraine? Hardly. Friedman reports:

To . . . [Fainberg] being Jewish simply meant having certain privileges. 'Jews were the richest people in town,' he told me. 'Jews had cars, Jews had money, Jews lived in nice apartments. We were comfortable. My mother had nice clothes and jewelry. We took a vacation once a year to Odessa, a stunning city with a boardwalk and gorgeous beaches. It was filled with mobsters and entertainers. It was a city with a Jewish flavor.

Fainberg is describing his life as a Jew in Ukraine in the 1960s and 1970s at the height of the supposed persecution of Jews by the communist regime. There was persecution, all right, but it was the Ukrainians who were persecuted by the Jews, not the other way around.

The same story is told by other Jewish gangsters. Marat Balagula, the Jewish godfather of organized crime who succeeded Evsei Agron in New York after the latter was assassinated, also came from Ukraine. He told Friedman:

Jews had some of the best positions in the country, They were the big artists, musicians -- they had big money.

The Soviet government did crack down on dissidents of all races, of course, and this included those Jews who tried to undermine the government's policy in the Middle East because they considered it pro-Arab, just as it included Ukrainian nationalists and other ethnic separatist groups. But it did not include members of the Jewish organized crime gangs, who were not dissidents. The Jewish criminals -- and the Jews generally -- were happy with the situation in the Soviet Union, because it allowed them to exploit the Russians and the Ukrainians. They already were living high on the hog in the Soviet Union when their Jewish kinsmen in the United States opened the border to the Promised Land for them, and they seized the opportunity to live even higher on the hog.

The collapse of communism made things worse for the real Russians and Ukrainians, because it destroyed the order in their countries and allowed the Jews to run wild, plundering and pillaging at will. But it did not dampen the desire of many of them to come to the United States and plunder and pillage even more. Friedman quotes Boris Urov, formerly the chief investigator of major crimes for the Russian attorney general. Urov said:

It's wonderful that the Iron Curtain is gone, but it was a shield for the West. Now we've opened the gates, and this is very dangerous for the world. America is getting Russian criminals. Nobody will have the resources to stop them. You people in the West don't know our Mafiya yet. You will. You will!

The name of the game in Russia after the breakup of the USSR in 1991 was "privatization." It was praised by the bought politicians and the controlled media in the West as a giant step toward a free-enterprise society, with inefficiently managed state-owned enterprises and natural resources being sold to private businessmen, who, spurred by the profit motive, would manage everything much more efficiently, resulting in a great increase in Russian productivity and prosperity. That was the theory. Actually, privatization was a massive looting of Russia's wealth by the Jews. The Jewish bureaucrats inside the government made "sweetheart" deals with the Jewish mobsters outside the government, who in any case were the only citizens with the capital to buy anything.

Everything which previously had been owned, in theory, by all the people collectively and managed by the state ended up in the hands of the Jews, and the Russian people had nothing, not even in theory. Instead of becoming more prosperous, the Russian economy has declined every year since the end of communism in 1991. The Russian people have been reduced to a state of beggary. While Russian and Ukrainian peasants kill one another fighting over a few potatoes in the fields, in Moscow and St. Petersburg and Odessa Jews cruise the boulevards in their Mercedes, wearing diamonds and furs, eating in glitzy restaurants where a meal costs more than a real Russian earns in a month, and patronizing sex clubs stocked with beautiful Russian women.

The Jews aren't even trying to use the stolen wealth of Russia to get the country back on its feet. Like a plague of locusts they have devoured everything they could, and the rest they have moved out of the country. Hundreds of billions of dollars of Russia's capital is taken out of the country every year by the Jews as the looting continues. It's not just that they want to be the richest people in a rejuvenated, capitalist Russia. Their greed is purely destructive. It's a grab-and-run

operation. When the U.S. government, through the International Monetary Fund, sends billions of dollars in loans to Russia, it simply disappears. The Jews squirrel it away, and it's never seen again in Russia. And over here the politicians pretend that they don't know what's going on.

But they do know what's going on. The CIA's spies send a steady stream of reports back to Washington. They reported that Boris Yeltsin and the crowd around him were all on the take and were controlled by the *Organizatsiya.* But the Bush administration and then the Clinton administration pretended not to know. All the Bushites and the Clintonistas cared about was that Yeltsin was the candidate being promoted by the Jews in Russia -- and of course, by the Jew-controlled media over here -- and so they promoted him too.

I don't know whether or not you remember when Yeltsin was running for reelection in 1996, but I do. All of the Jewish media people over here were sweating it. They were afraid that a real Russian nationalist, a Russian patriot, might win. The Clinton government was holding out the promise of more money for Russia only if Yeltsin won. In fact, Bill Clinton was campaigning as hard for Yeltsin's reelection as Yeltsin was.

I'll tell you what would have happened if an honest and intelligent Russian nationalist had won instead of Yeltsin. He would have replaced the key leaders in the Army and the secret police with people he could trust. He would have done this carefully but quickly. And then he would have sealed Russia's borders and halted communications with the rest of the world for perhaps 48 hours. At the end of that time there would not have been a Jew or a collaborator with the Jews left alive in all of Russia. The Russian Orthodox Church would make him a saint, and the Russian people would remember him with gratitude and affection for as long as the Russian nation lasted. But of course, with all of the Jew-controlled media in Russia pushing hard for Yeltsin, and with plenty of vote-stealing going on, Yeltsin was reelected, and the looting of Russia continued.

And in America the Jewish mob has continued to consolidate its power. The Miami gangster, Ludwig Fainberg, was really gloating when he explained to Friedman the difference between the Jewish situation in Russia and the American situation and what the Jewish gangsters have in mind for America. The Jews of Russia are cunning predators, he explained. That's the way they have survived the hard conditions there for centuries. But the Americans are soft and trusting, like sheep ready to be fleeced and slaughtered. American laws were made only to be broken by the Jews.

A New York police detective lamented to Friedman:

Why are we being victimized by non-citizens who can run to Israel or Russia and can't be extradited? The Russian gangsters have told me that they've come here to suck our country dry. . . .

How did the Russian mob become so entrenched? They are into Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid fraud. Why is it that every ambulance service in Brooklyn is run by the Russian mob? Why are so many of their doctors practicing without a license? They have invaded Wall Street

from boiler-room operations to brokerage houses. Nothing is too small for them to steal. Even the guys with the multimillion-dollar Medicare scam still have to have their food stamps.

I'll add two comments to Friedman's report on Jewish organized crime in America. First, it will not be stopped, regardless of whether Al Gore or George Bush wins the White House this year. The FBI has essentially put the Italian Mafia out of business in the United States during the past decade, but it won't put the Jewish Mafiya out of business, and the reason is that the Jews have vastly more money at their disposal for corrupting the system than the Italians ever did, and America is rapidly becoming as corruptible as Russia.

In fact, I have a strong suspicion that the reason the FBI suddenly made a major effort to cripple the Italian Mafia was to make room for the Jews. The Italians and the Sicilians thought they had the fix in, but the Jews trumped them with a bigger fix. In the sort of country America has become since the Second World War, any criminal organization run by intelligent men with hundreds of billions of dollars at their disposal to corrupt the system -- and with the protection of the mass media -- can't be stopped by governmental action. Individual Jewish gangsters will be arrested, and have been arrested in the past, but the sort of decisive action needed to stop Jewish crime cold will not be taken.

My second comment is that the Jewish Mafiya does not operate in a vacuum. It operates within the Jewish community as a whole. It operates with the support of the Jewish establishment, from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to Hollywood and the *New York Times.* It also operates with the support of the Christian establishment, from Billy Graham up to the Pope. These support groups won't put up a fuss if the FBI arrests a Jewish contract killer or a Jewish extortionist or two now and then, but any realistic effort to stamp out the whole *kehillah* will have all of the support groups screaming bloody murder. To use other words, what we must deal with is not a criminal problem but a Jewish problem. The problem will be solved only after this fact is generally understood. Meanwhile, the American sheep had better resign themselves to a good fleecing.

The Faustian Spirit and Political Correctness

When I was seven years old I asked for and received my first chemistry set as a Christmas gift. It became the basis for a little laboratory I had in the garage from then until the time I went away to military school eight years later. Even before my first chemistry set I prowled through curbside trash heaps in my neighborhood, looking for discarded radios, which I would take home and disassemble completely, trying to figure out how they worked. At six I didn't understand much, but I was fascinated by every sort of technological gadget. Later the fascination extended to tools and weapons of every kind. I think it was an instinctive thing, which I inherited from my tool-making ancestors of a million years ago, who inherited it from their tool-using ancestors of five million years ago.

When I was 12 years old I discovered science fiction, and from then on I knew that I wanted to be an astronaut and explore other worlds. That was a long time before Sputnik or manned space flight, and before there was a real possibility for me to become an astronaut circumstances had compelled me to choose another career instead. But I nevertheless have continued to follow the progress of space exploration and always have taken some pride in the fact that I worked for a while in Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, where many recent space missions have been planned and the hardware for those missions has been designed.

I have thought often about the role of the tool-making instinct in the history and prehistory of our race. And I have associated this instinct with a more general characteristic of our people which I -- and others also -- have called the Faustian spirit. That's the spirit which drives us not only to build things and to invent things but to explore and to try to understand ourselves and the world around us. It is a spirit which makes us seek power not just for the sake of mere power, but also for the sake of progress, for the sake of building new things. It leads us to conquer not merely for the sake of conquest, but also to improve and develop that which we conquer. It leads us to value truth over and above any practical value that truth may have; to value knowledge above any monetary gain that knowledge may yield.

Thinking about these things led me long ago to the conclusion that it is this Faustian spirit which, more than any other trait of our people, led us to become masters of the whole world by the beginning of the last century. Some of the races of Asia are clever enough -- the Chinese and the Japanese, the Jews, the Indians -- but their cleverness has a different flavor from that of our people. We Europeans always have been the preeminent explorers and innovators, the people who explored because we wanted to learn more, not just because we thought there might be some money in it for us.

Neither the Faustian spirit nor the fascination with tools is universal among our people, of course. The Faustian spirit is essentially a masculine spirit, and it often is at odds with both the feminine spirit and the mercantile spirit. When our society is virile and forward-looking and willing to take chances, the Faustian spirit is dominant. When virility is in decline, and we become more interested in comfort and self-indulgence and security and conformity, then the Faustian spirit in us -- in our society, in our civilization -- also is in decline.

Well, everything I've said so far today is by way of introduction to a couple of really depressing illustrations of the decline in virility in that segment of our society that in healthier times was on the cutting edge of our climb upward toward the stars and was the purest embodiment of our Faustian spirit -- and that is our scientific/academic segment, the seekers of knowledge and understanding.

Let's begin with something everyone has heard about very recently: the mapping of the human genome: which is to say the determination of the sequence of the basic building blocks in the long strands of human genetic material that determine what we are. That is certainly a grand and worthwhile project, even if it is more a massive application of technology than a scientific breakthrough. And to me it really is depressing to have to note that some of the people involved in this grand project are so much in the grip of Political Correctness that their ability to do meaningful or valid science is in real doubt. One of the actors in the genome mapping project is J. Craig Venter, who is the president of a biotechnology company called Celera Genomics Corporation. Mr. Venter and his company hope to make lots of money from their genome mapping work by selling the results to pharmaceutical companies. And Mr. Venter also wants to be very sure that his company is in the forefront of Political Correctness as well as biotechnology.

At a White House ceremony a few days ago, in which several of the genome project's leaders met with Bill Clinton to make a public but somewhat premature announcement of the completion of the project, Venter used the occasion to tell the world that his company had used DNA from five individuals in its mapping work, and among those five were a mestizo, a Black, an Asian, and a White. The choice of DNA donors had been made, he said, "out of respect for the diversity that is America and to help illustrate that the concept of race has no genetic or scientific basis." Really. Blacks are not Blacks for genetic reasons but because of poverty and discrimination, I suppose -- or to be really Correct, Blacks are different from us only because of White racism, not because their genes are different.

That's about as silly and anti-scientific a statement as I have heard in this silly era. It's what one might have expected from the late Carl Sagan or some of the other Jewish pseudo-scientific gurus of Political Correctness, who spend much more time in front of the TV cameras propagandizing the couch potatoes than they spend in the laboratory, but it really is depressing to hear that coming from the head of a cutting-edge biotechnology firm. Perhaps Mr. Venter figures that his show of Political Correctness will help him garner a government grant. Anyway, any errors introduced into his part of the genome mapping because of his insistence that no differences be found among the genomes of the various races can be corrected later by objective researchers, but it is really disappointing that none of these objective researchers had the courage to speak up or even to laugh after he made his silly statement at the White House.

Well, I suppose that's no worse than the situation we had in the Middle Ages, when the priests would awe the peasants with the announcement that some statue in the church had been seen to weep real tears or to bleed from nail holes in its hands or feet, and the scientific-minded citizens would bite their lips in order to avoid laughing. In those days Politically Incorrect laughter could get a person burned at the stake. But really, it's a shame that we haven't made more progress in that regard during the past few centuries. Or to state the case more precisely, it's a shame that we

seem now to be sliding back toward the climate of superstition and fear and Political Correctness which prevailed at times in the past.

Another illustration of this sort of thing is the teaching of Black History in our schools. Historians who know better bite their tongues and are afraid to contradict the Politically Correct charlatans who make the most laughable claims about Black achievements and Black inventiveness. The charlatans get the promotions and the textbook contracts, and those who laugh at the charlatans get fired. Well, one of these days we'll return to sanity, hang the charlatans, redo the genome research, and rewrite the history textbooks.

There are other academic and scientific areas where the harm being done by Political Correctness has more immediately lethal consequences, however. It is a fact that, contrary to Mr. Venter, Blacks and Whites are genetically different. One of the genetic differences between the two races shows up in their different susceptibilities to infection by the Human Immuno-deficiency Virus, or HIV, the virus which causes AIDS. If Blacks and Whites are given equal exposure to the virus, Blacks are much more likely to become infected by it.

Beyond this genetically based difference in susceptibilities, behavioral differences between Blacks and Whites result in Blacks getting much more exposure to HIV. Blacks are much more promiscuous in their sexual behavior, for example, with many more sexual partners, on the average, than Whites. Blacks have a much greater rate of infection by other sexually transmitted diseases -- such as gonorrhea, for example -- and are less likely to seek treatment for these diseases, and the lesions from these diseases greatly increase the likelihood that HIV will be transferred during sexual activity. Finally, Blacks are less likely to use condoms and are more likely to be intravenous drug abusers than Whites. All of these behavioral differences lead to a greater incidence of HIV infection among Blacks than Whites. Of course, to a very substantial degree, these behavioral differences leading to greater exposure also are genetically based, just as is the difference in susceptibility to infection.

Anyway, whether due to genes or behavior, the fact is that Blacks have a much greater incidence of HIV infection than Whites do. That, however, is what might be called a Politically Inconvenient fact. There are times when the liberals and the Jewish media want to use the fact to persuade us to provide more AIDS relief to Africa, where the disease is decimating the Black population, but they don't want to talk too much about it in America, lest we start wondering why AIDS is spreading so rapidly among African Blacks and perhaps even start asking questions about American Blacks. What the liberals and the Jewish media want us to believe is that there is no substantial difference between Whites and Blacks where AIDS is concerned, and what difference exists is due to White racism or something of the sort which is our fault, not theirs. And one of the most important reasons the Jews and the liberals don't want us to think about Black and White differences with regard to AIDS is that they don't want to discourage sexual contact between Blacks and Whites.

In fact, the Jewish mass media, from Hollywood to Madison Avenue, are engaged now in a crash program to encourage sexual activity between White women and Black males. Every second film coming from Hollywood these days seems to be pairing White actresses with Blacks. And the fashion advertisements from Madison Avenue are showing White women together with Black

men much more suggestively than ever before. It is unfortunate, but our women are very susceptible to such suggestions. They are mindlessly eager to do whatever Hollywood and Madison Avenue convince them is fashionable at the moment, no matter how disgusting or self-destructive.

In view of this media campaign encouraging racial mixing, my organization, the National Alliance, has tried to counter it by appealing to the instinct for self-preservation in those White women in which that instinct is able to compete successfully against the instinct to be fashionable. To this end we have distributed a large number of leaflets and stickers warning White women of the AIDS dangers inherent in sexual contact with Blacks. Specifically, our materials warn White women not to have sex with intravenous drug abusers, bisexuals, or Blacks, and it informs them that heterosexual Black males are 14 times more likely to be infected with HIV than heterosexual White males.

Now, the liberals and the Jews don't mind our warning our women not to have sex with intravenous drug abusers or bisexuals, both of whom have a much higher infection rate than the rest of the population, but it drives them into a frenzy of hatred and rage when we warn them not to have sex with Blacks. I mean, that's racist, isn't it? The first thing they do is deny that Blacks are more likely to be infected with HIV than Whites are. And I'm sure that some of the White liberals really believe that. They have tried so hard for so long to convince themselves that Blacks are equal to Whites that they simply can't cope with any evidence that in fact the two races are intrinsically and irremediably different.

What is much more alarming than this liberal inability to deal with reality is the willingness of scientifically and medically knowledgeable people to go along with this denial of reality for the sake of Political Correctness. Three months ago National Alliance members distributed our AIDS warnings on the Austin campus of the University of Texas. The Jews, the liberals, and the Blacks reacted as one might expect, writing hysterical letters to the campus newspaper, organizing rallies against racism, and demanding that the university administration do something to stop the National Alliance's activities on the campus. Decades ago any men with principles, a sense of personal honor, or any regard for the truth were purged from the ranks of university administrators, and what's left is a collection of spineless bureaucrats whose main function is to beg for money and to suck up to Jews and other minorities. The president of the University of Texas, Larry Faulkner, is typical. In response to the demands from Jews and other liberals he issued a statement in which he said of our AIDS warnings:

We deplore the hateful and racially intolerant message expressed in these fliers.

Later in his statement he said:

Hateful messages such as those expressed in the fliers should be rejected by all civilized people.

Well, of course, there is nothing "hateful" or "racially intolerant" in our AIDS warnings. There are no racial slurs, no insults. The only thing said about any race in them is that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely to be infected with HIV as heterosexual White males. That's it. Why is that "hateful"? President Faulkner will tell you why it's hateful. It's not true that Blacks

are more likely to be infected with HIV, he'll tell you. Our statement about Blacks and HIV is false and is simply intended to prevent loving relationships between White women and Black men. Other campus spokesmen reported that they had checked with knowledgeable campus medical personnel and had been told that our statement about Blacks and HIV is false. The claim that our statement is false appeared in every news story about our AIDS warning which was published in the campus newspaper. Not one faculty scientist stepped forward to point out that our statement is essentially correct and errs only by slightly understating the disparity in HIV infection rates between Blacks and Whites: not one spoke up. And certainly, there are plenty of them who know the truth.

Some of our members distributed a number of our AIDS warnings in Tacoma, Washington, last month, and the reaction by local liberals and media people was essentially the same as at the University of Texas: lots of hand-wringing and moaning about "hate," and, oh, isn't it awful that we can't shut up the haters so that we can all love each other? And some of the hand-wringers were saying things such as, "The only race is the human race, so how can there be a racial difference in HIV infection rates?" Not very masculine thinking, to be sure, but that's what passes for reason in America these days. Of course, the hand-wringers were able to find a few "experts" to bolster their claims about AIDS being an equal-opportunity disease and our statement about the racial disparity in infection rates being false. These claims were repeated in every newspaper story about our distribution of AIDS warning stickers. The Tacoma Reporter, for example, in its June 29 issue, reported:

The Center [sic] for Disease Control's 1999 statistics show that heterosexual African-American males in the United States are only twice as likely to be infected with the AIDS [sic] virus as are heterosexual White males, no surprise to people who understand the lack of education and resources in neighborhoods whose residents are primarily black.

Well, of course, the statistics of the Centers for Disease Control show no such thing, although the Tacoma Reporter apparently found someone working there to tell the liberals what they wanted to hear. The Centers for Disease Control is the government's front line of defense against all of the new, exotic pathogens coming to America with the flood of Third World immigrants so beloved of the liberals. They have to keep track of and try to cope with everything from HIV to drug-resistant strains of the tuberculosis-causing bacillus to the West Nile virus. And when one race is much more susceptible to a particular pathogen than another race, then that's an important scientific fact the Centers for Disease Control needs to take into account. If they begin putting Political Correctness ahead of scientific rigor, we're all in real trouble.

And it was to the Centers for Disease Control that I myself went three years ago for information on the racial disparity in HIV infection rates before preparing our AIDS-warning publications. I went there again just a few days ago to see whether or not the data had changed, and it had. The 1999 data show that heterosexual Black males are now 15 times as likely as heterosexual White males to be infected with HIV. When I checked in 1997 the number was 14, but the racial disparity is increasing; the infection is spreading more rapidly among Blacks than among Whites, and the difference is not due to White racism.

It's understandable, of course, that liberals don't want to believe that there is such a huge disparity in infection rates between Blacks and Whites. They don't want to believe such a big number, because it implies a real racial difference, a genetically based difference. It undermines their whole egalitarian ideology.

Well, liberals are liberals. They are suffering from their own spiritual disease, their own disease of the soul. They've always been sick. What is really alarming now is that their sickness has infected our scientific and academic communities. Information no longer is judged on the basis of whether or not it is true, but rather on the basis of whether or not it is Politically Correct. That is one of the principal reasons why our civilization is in a state of decline today.

By the way, you may be interested in checking with the Centers for Disease Control yourself, before they stop posting Politically Incorrect data. Ask for the HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report, volume 11, number 2, for December 1999. You'll find the data broken down by sex, race, and sexual orientation.

Survival Essentials

Today let's back off a bit and take a look at the overall situation of our race. I believe that it's important to do that fairly often, so that we don't get lost in the details. So here's the situation: Very roughly, there are 100 million adult, heterosexual White men and women in the United States, and about as many White children and teenagers. There are roughly 80 million non-Whites of all ages, and I'm including among the latter the approximately six million Jews who live in the United States.

Among the 100 million adult, non-Jewish Whites in the United States, there are two to three million who are potential listeners to this broadcast. I don't know how many are actual listeners now -- probably between 100 and 200 thousand, which is somewhere between three and ten per cent of the potential. And of course, many of the potential listeners would not respond positively even if they were listening now. I receive letters often from listeners who tell me that they used to be in the enemy camp, they used to be Politically Correct, they used to believe what they saw and heard on television, and that after they began listening to these broadcasts it took them a while to wake up and get their thinking straightened out. Nevertheless, I believe that it is a reasonable estimate to say that we have two to three million potential allies in the United States: two to three million White men and women capable of becoming fighters for the survival and progress of our race.

Among the other 97 or 98 million Whites, not all are lemmings. There are probably seven or eight million men and women who are capable of independent thought, capable of having ideas not put into their heads by television, but who consciously have chosen to oppose the survival of their own people. Some of them -- a million or so -- are homosexuals, and their perversion comes first in their scheme of things. They will throw their lot in with anyone -- Jews, Clintonistas, Blacks -- who will allow them to keep their protected status, and they will oppose anyone who wants to have a healthy, moral society.

Similar considerations apply to the feminists. Not all feminists are anti-White, but like the homosexuals they will throw their lot in with whichever side will permit them to keep their protected status. They understand that they cannot expect to have abortion on demand, no questions asked, and special hiring and promotion quotas in a healthy, White society. Keeping their privileged status, which allows them to pretend that they are men instead of women and yet be afforded all sorts of advantages and protections that are not afforded to real men, is much more important to them than the survival of the race.

And then there are those who simply are corrupt, those who can think clearly and independently and who might prefer to live in a healthy, White world if they could, but who would much rather be very rich in a decaying world of mongrels than only moderately well off in a White world. For the corrupt, money, privilege, status, power, and even comfort come before race. We know who they are: all of the politicians, all of the mainstream media bosses who aren't Jews, most of the preachers, most of the bureaucrats, most of the big businessmen -- and millions more who desperately want to be like them: millions more who may not yet have achieved wealth or status or power, but who crave it above all else. Sure, they don't like Mexicans, but if they can keep

their labor costs down and make a bigger profit by hiring them, they will. Sure, they despise Bill Clinton and the rest of the Washington crew, but they'll suck up to that crew if they can get a few legislative or regulatory favors. Sure, they understand what the Jews are up to; they know that the Jews are methodically destroying our race, but if they can gain some momentary advantage for themselves by collaborating with the Jews they'll do it. They really don't care what sort of world their grandchildren will have to live in.

And then there are the lemmings, in their scores of mindless millions. When I say "mindless," I don't mean stupid. I really mean "soulless." Some of them are intelligent, and some are stupid; some are industrious and disciplined, and some are lazy and self-indulgent; some are reasonably honest, and some are not; but they all are merely herd animals, without the human capacity for making any independent moral or intellectual judgment. Apart from the herd they cannot feel or think; they cannot exist. They are important, however, because there are many of them -- and because whoever is pulling their strings, whoever is manipulating them, can make them all move together in any desired direction.

I'm exaggerating a bit, of course. I'm oversimplifying the description of lemmings. Lemminghood is not a condition which is defined with absolute sharpness. I have known lemmings who were almost human, lemmings who were not entirely comfortable with being lemmings, who really wanted to think for themselves and do the right thing but were afraid to. And I have known a few who actually made the transition from lemminghood to humanity -- although perhaps they never had been real lemmings in the first place; perhaps they merely had been running with the herd because it never had occurred to them that the herd might be running in the wrong direction; perhaps all they really needed was for someone to grab them by the lapels and say to them loudly and clearly: "Hey! Look where you're going. Is that really where you want to go?" Maybe there are a lot more like them now running with the lemmings who just need to be grabbed and given a good shaking.

And I'm oversimplifying when I say that the manipulators are able to move all of the lemmings together in any desired direction. Usually there's quite a bit of aimless milling around, and even when the manipulators are moving the lemmings they generally do so in a way which is deliberately not transparent. They like to maintain the illusion that there is no manipulation. They will move some of the lemmings in a Democratic herd and some in a Republican herd, and they will generate a lot of smoke and sparks to make it seem that the two herds are opposed to one another when they're really moving in the same direction. Then when the lemmings as a whole are not happy with developments, those in the Republican herd can blame those in the Democratic herd, and vice versa.

Anyway, that's roughly the way we're divided up: those who care about the sort of world we'll have in the future, and those who don't, with the latter vastly in the majority. But all of us together -- the caring and the uncaring, the pure in spirit and the corrupt, those who are racially conscious and those who think only about their special interests -- all of us together are headed for extinction. We are headed for extinction because the White birthrate is far below the replacement level, the miscegenation rate is way up, and the sewers of the non-White world are flooding America with their Brown and Black and Yellow filth. These trends will within the next few decades make us a minority in the continent we took away from non-Whites. And if we want

to have a clear picture of what that will mean, all we have to do is look at what is happening in Rhodesia and in South Africa today.

That's looking at our situation from a biological perspective: we are letting ourselves become outnumbered by non-Whites in those areas where we used to be the overwhelming majority, and those who are outnumbering us are our natural enemies, our competitors for living space and breeding space on this shrinking planet. Much worse, we are mongrelizing ourselves by interbreeding with these non-Whites. Numerical majorities can shift back and forth, of course, but from mongrelization there is no recovery.

We also can look at our situation from a moral perspective. We have in the past been outnumbered but nevertheless have remained in full control of the situation, because we were organized on a racial basis. When we were in the process of conquering the New World, we were, of course, outnumbered by the American Indians, but we were racially conscious, and we understood what we were doing. We understood that they were living here, and that we wanted the land for our people, and we took it. We weren't filled with any phony guilt from having Christian preachers or Jewish television producers telling us that we were wicked to conquer the continent for ourselves and that we should give it back to the Indians and return to England. It was a very simple moral issue: us or them; the land for our grandchildren or for theirs. We knew how to deal with that, and we were unbeatable. It was much the same in southern Africa. Being racially conscious and understanding quite clearly the difference between us and them, we were able to build strong, healthy, progressive White societies, even though we were greatly outnumbered by non-Whites.

In America today we still have a substantial, though rapidly declining, numerical majority, but our moral situation is quite different from what it was when our race was expanding across the globe. We have slid a long way downhill from the racial pride and self-confidence we had until approximately the beginning of the 20th century. It really is no exaggeration to say that the average lemming in America today has been pumped so full of artificial guilt by the media that he is uncomfortable even with the thought of being White. Many actually are ashamed and feel that they should do penance. I see this sort of thing every day. My organization, the National Alliance, publishes and distributes a number of pamphlets, leaflets, stickers and other materials that deal in one way or another with race. We distribute material with AIDS statistics broken down by race, for example: nothing derogatory or insulting, just facts. But the media describe this as "hate propaganda" every time, and the lemmings respond the same way. They really are apologetic about being White. As a race we have become a moral basket case, and in evaluating our prospects for the future that is something we must take into consideration.

Finally, we can look at our situation from a political perspective. If, 300 years ago, while a group of White settlers were in a frontier fort fighting off an Indian attack, some liberal in the fort had thrown down his musket and started whining that it was "racist" of us to defend ourselves from the Indians, that we ought to throw open the gate to the fort, invite the Indians in, and tell them that we wanted to be their brothers, some sane man in the fort would simply have taken out a knife and cut the whiner's throat, before going back to shooting Indians. And that would have been the end of it. That was the politics of our situation then. Politics was local, and it reflected the feelings of the people, which tended to be reasonably homogeneous and in close contact with

reality: which is to say, their feelings tended to be oriented toward survival. The lemmings, who made up the majority then as now and always, adjusted their thinking to that of the local leaders, who for the most part were the natural leaders, the men who were respected by those in their communities because of their wisdom, their character, their success.

Today politics is rather different. For one thing feeling is less homogeneous and much less in touch with reality. The whiners are far more numerous, and the more-or-less sane people are less likely to be in agreement as to how to deal with them. For another thing, politics is far less local and has lost its contact with the people. Policymakers in Washington are able to dictate the way in which the lives and behavior of people all over the continent are to be regulated. But intrusiveness is not the worst of it; the worst is that politics is far more democratic than it used to be -- which means in theory that the lemmings are looked to as the ultimate authority. Their votes rather than natural ability or achievement determine who the leaders will be: that is, the nominal leaders, the elected leaders, the figurehead leaders. And whoever is able to manipulate the thinking of the lemmings holds the real power, the real leadership. The source of that manipulation has moved from the country store to the town square, and from the town square to the centers of control of the mass media in Hollywood and New York. In other words, as America has become more democratic, the ultimate power has become concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, and they are the hands of people whose interests are utterly different from ours.

Here's a brief recap of our racial situation today: First, we are facing an imminent racial catastrophe, caused by a flood of non-White immigration, both legal and illegal; a non-White birthrate which is much higher than ours; and a horrendous rate of miscegenation, especially between White women and non-White men. If the present trend continues, our grandchildren will be living in a country with a non-White majority and will be subject to the same sort of dispossession and terror, of murder and rape, that our people are facing now in Rhodesia and South Africa.

Second, as a whole, we have been so thoroughly demoralized by the Jewish media and the Christian churches that in our present moral state we are utterly incapable of heading off this catastrophe. Our sense of racial pride and solidarity has been replaced by an artificially induced feeling of guilt that amounts to a racial death wish.

Third, the political situation has deteriorated to such an extent that even if the two or three million of us capable of becoming fighters for the survival of our race were able to clear all of the cobwebs of confusion and guilt from our minds and tackle our task with all of our moral and mental resources, we could not win through the democratic political process. The lemmings always will outnumber us, and as long as the Jews remain in control of the mass media the lemmings will vote the way the Jews want them to, which means that the whole power of government will be opposed to us. In this struggle, if the Constitution gets in the way, it simply will be swept aside by our opponents. Rights of assembly and of speech will be ignored.

That is our current situation, and if you have any doubt about the reality of it, then you haven't been paying close enough attention to what's been happening in the world. We really need to understand just how dangerous a situation we're in and dispense with all wishful thinking if there

is to be any realistic hope for our survival. Now, in view of this situation, what does it make sense for us to do?

Here's the answer: First, we need to continue developing our media for communicating with our people. Without communication there will be no survival. We must be able to communicate effectively not only with all of our people who merely need to have their thinking straightened out and be motivated, but we also must be able to communicate with the eight million or so of our people who are corrupt, who now are putting what they see as their personal interests ahead of their racial interests. As conditions change, interests change. In a war for survival, it sometimes pays to be able to talk with the people on the other side. Some of them may change sides.

It's even worthwhile to address our message to the lemmings. To most of them it always will be Greek, because it disagrees with what they see and hear on television, but as I noted earlier, some of those now running with the lemmings are not true lemmings.

So nearly our whole effort now should be on enhancing our ability to communicate effectively with our people: through the printed word and the spoken word, through the Internet and radio broadcasts and books, through video and music and graphic posters, through leaflets and stickers and every other means. And we'd better not waste any time, because the day is approaching rapidly when it will be illegal to say or write anything which is not Politically Correct. The Jews and their allies are working day and night to condition the public to give up their constitutional freedoms in return for the promise of more security. They'll deny they're doing that, but believe me, that's exactly what they're doing: every Jewish pressure group and every non-Jewish group which is allied to the Jews. They fully intend to take away our freedom while keeping the lemmings convinced that they're as free as ever. They already have a substantial majority of the soccer moms and the baseball fans believing that the Constitution was never intended to protect so-called "hate speech." The Jews, of course, will decide what is "hate speech" and what isn't.

One other thing: While we're building our media for communicating with our people, let's keep in mind a few general guidelines as to what's feasible and what isn't. It's not feasible to vote ourselves out of our predicament. As long as the Jews are able to reach the lemmings more effectively with their media than we are able to reach them with our media, the lemmings will vote the way the Jews want them to. So forget about political campaigns as a way to regain control of things. The only way we can use political campaigns effectively is as one more medium of communication: as a forum for talking to a portion of the public.

Under current conditions, it's not feasible to whip the enemies of our people, including the government, through violent or illegal means: through a campaign of terrorism, for example. We would lose everything in a hurry if we tried. Conditions always are changing, of course, and after the Jews succeed in scrapping the First Amendment we will have to reevaluate everything. For now, however, we must follow a course of strict legality.

Finally, forget about trying to save America or even Western civilization as we know it. We've lost those things. The Jews and their allies have effectively destroyed them. What we're trying to save is our race, our genes. Our aim is to ensure that out of the coming chaos and destruction it is

our genes which survive and emerge triumphant, not theirs, and that whatever remnant of our people is left to begin building anew is guided by a healthy and progressive ideology, not by the weak and sickly ideologies of the past.

If you believe that's a worthwhile goal, we can use your help now. Let me hear from you.

The Significance of the Holocaust

I was very pleased by the response to last week's broadcast. I've always thought that most people are more interested in specific, anecdotal, and personal commentary than in more general and impersonal commentary, and that's why I so often talk about very specific instances of Black crime, or liberal hypocrisy and nuttiness, or political corruption and treason, with names, dates, and places. But I am pleased to note that we do have many listeners who really care about the general principles underlying all of the specifics.

Today I'll begin in a general way, but then we'll move on to specific evidence to support the general theses. We'll start with the general role of the Jews in European or White or Aryan or Gentile society, whichever term you prefer. My thesis has been that the Jews -- as a whole -- always are destructive: morally destructive, socially destructive, even intellectually destructive, but above all racially destructive. Any society, any nation, any people that gives the Jews a free hand to do what they want will be destroyed by them. This is so because it is in the nature of the Jews to destroy everything that is non-Jewish, and because the Jews have a unique faculty for destroying other peoples' societies.

I'll come back to this thesis in a moment with some evidence, but first we should note the problems it presents to us in our educational program. One problem is the inability of many of our people to generalize at all. They see everything only in individual and personal terms. You tell them that the Jews as a whole are destructive to our society, and they'll say, "Oh, no, that isn't true, because I know some Jews who aren't doing anything destructive at all. They're just minding their own business and trying to earn a living like everyone else." They can't quite grasp the concept of Jews as a whole; all they can see are Abe and Dave and Izzy and Sara as individuals.

A second problem is the other side of the coin: many of our people cannot think about the role of the Jews objectively because they have been convinced that the Jews as a whole aren't like everyone else; they're special and deserve special consideration; they're not subject to criticism like other people. And I'm not referring primarily to the fundamentalist Christians, whose preachers have taught them that the Jews are "God's chosen people" and can do no wrong. I'm thinking of the somewhat more sophisticated people, who have been taught by the mass media and the schools that the Jews are exempt from criticism because of their unique victim status. They suffered so much in the Holocaust that they deserve special consideration, and to accuse them of bad motives or wrongdoing is like kicking someone who is down.

Certainly, if we exclude the most primitive and superstitious Christians from consideration, it is the massive Holocaust propaganda that makes it difficult for most people to think objectively about the Jews. And let me tell you, it was planned that way. We'll talk a lot more about that, but first let me finish my general thesis.

I said that the Jews as a whole are socially, morally, intellectually, and racially destructive, and that they have a unique faculty for being destructive. The reason for this is their unique mode of existence as a parasitic minority in a non-Jewish host population. Sometimes this dispersion -- or

diaspora -- as a minority among Gentile hosts has been supplemented by a geographical concentration of Jews in Palestine or Babylon or another Jewish center, and sometimes not. In either case, parasitic is the applicable adjective.

There are other parasitic minorities, of course, but none are anything like the Jews. Gypsies, for example, exist as a parasitic minority in most White countries. Gypsies generally are considered a nuisance because of their proclivity for stealing, and when they become too much of an irritation they are chased away by the local people. But Gypsies never have an ambition to take over a White nation and suck it dry. They never try to subvert the host population. They never try to take over the schools or the newspapers and propagandize their hosts. They generally want to live among themselves, maintain their own identity, and exploit their hosts just enough to get by without causing a strong reaction.

The Jews, on the other hand, always try to take over. They don't want the crumbs from Gentile society; they want everything. Gentile society, of course, resists, which is why the Jews have been expelled en masse from every nation in Europe, time after time, during the past thousand years. The Jewish method of overcoming the resistance is to corrupt the nation they are attempting to get their hands on. One aspect of the corruption is simple bribery. If you have enough money you may be able to buy privileges from the leaders of the nation. That worked when European nations were ruled by kings, and it works even better when a society is run by elected politicians. But if you really want to suck a nation dry, you need to go beyond bribery. You need to destroy a nation's solidarity. A nation is, after all, like a large extended family, with everyone related by birth, even if very distantly.

You're either in the family, a member of the nation, or you're an alien, not in the family. That's the essential distinction. So if you want to take over a nation, you need to make the members of the family, the citizens of the nation, forget their identity and their traditions. You need to corrupt the nation spiritually and morally as well as politically. You need to erase the distinction between insider and outsider; then you are no longer an outsider, and the resistance against you crumbles. Understand? That is and always has been the Jewish method: take over a nation by destroying it, by making a rootless, cosmopolitan, multicultural cesspool of it.

In other words, you need to gain control of the flow of information and ideas in the nation. You need to gain control of the mass media of news and entertainment. Then you can corrupt the nation's soul. You can determine which opinions will be fashionable, and which will not. You can reshape the defining myths of the nation to suit your own ends. You can poison the minds of the children and turn them against their own people. You can steal the people's knowledge of their own past from them and thereby be in a better position to steal their future too. You can plunder the nation at will. And that is exactly what the Jews have done to every Gentile society, every White nation, since the Second World War.

Of course, corrupting a nation's soul may turn out to be a fairly large and complex undertaking, and lots of tricks may be required to get the job done. When it comes to tricks, however, the Jews are in their own element. The slickest and most effective trick the Jews have pulled since the war is their famous Holocaust trick. I've spoken with you before about the Holocaust. I've pointed out that the way to see through the trick is to examine it piece by piece, claim by claim, detail by

detail. That's the way to separate the lies from the half-truths that they have skillfully woven together. That's why anyone who refuses to swallow the thing whole, anyone who refuses to bow and genuflect in the presence of the Holocaust, anyone who irreverently says, "Well, let's examine this thing and see what it's made of," is denounced hysterically as a "Holocaust denier."

Today we'll look at what a Jew has to say about the Holocaust trick. The Jew is Norman Finkelstein. He is a professor at the City University of New York, and he's a leftist. Like some other leftist Jews, he's at odds with what he sees as a fascist government in Israel. More than that, I believe, is his concern that the greedier and more ambitious Jews will overreach themselves and bring disaster down on the heads of all the Jews. He's especially concerned that the Holocaust myth will come unraveled and result in an enormous Gentile backlash against the Jews. He would like to defuse the thing before it blows up. And so Finkelstein has just had a book published for that purpose. It is titled The Holocaust Industry, and his fellow Jews are not happy about it. In fact, they are screaming for his blood. It is a dynamite book. It was published last month, and you can get a copy from my company, National Vanguard Books, or from amazon.com, even though you probably won't find it in your friendly neighborhood bookstore.

Finkelstein spends the first few pages of his book documenting the fact that the Holocaust is a Jewish myth constructed more than 20 years after the end of the Second World War. The term did not come into general use until after 1967. Everyone understood, of course, that Jews had died during the war. No one questioned the fact that there were concentration camps where many Jews, Gypsies, communists, homosexuals, and other undesirables were segregated from German society. No one questioned the fact that toward the end of the war, when conditions in Poland and Germany became chaotic, conditions became even worse in the concentration camps, and many concentration camp prisoners, weakened by malnutrition, died from typhus and other diseases. No one questioned the fact that on the eastern front there were mass shootings of Jewish hostages or that Jewish political commissars were separated from Soviet POWs and shot. Many civilians on both the German side and the Jewish side died during the war.

But it wasn't until more than 20 years after the war that Jewish leaders calculated that there was much to be gained by portraying Jews as the principal victims of the war, and so the Holocaust myth was constructed for this purpose. Mixing some facts -- usually exaggerated or distorted facts -- with lots of invention, the skilled mythmakers of Hollywood and New York brought forth the Holocaust, in which innocent Jews became the principal victims of the war, pushed into "gas ovens" by the millions by sadistic Nazis.

Finkelstein notes that the two defining dogmas of the Holocaust were, first, the claim that it was unique, the claim that no other persecution in all of history was even close to the Holocaust in magnitude or severity, the claim that the Holocaust gives to Jews the status of the premier victims of the world. Nobody else has suffered as much as the Jews have -- and so nobody else is entitled to as much sympathy and compensation as the Jews. To suggest otherwise is tantamount to sacrilege.

The second defining dogma of the Holocaust was that it was a completely irrational act on the part of the Germans and was in no way based on anything the Jews themselves had done. The Jews, in other words were wholly blameless victims. To suggest that perhaps it was some

behavior on the part of the Jews which provoked the Germans was to "blame the victim," a very Politically Incorrect sin. It was a transgression against this second dogma -- the dogma of irrationality -- which caused one of Germany's most distinguished historians, Ernst Nolte, to be cast into the outer darkness by the Jews and their Gentile allies. Nolte has pointed out in his writing that one of the reasons Hitler was determined to break the grip of the Jews on German society was their support for communism, and this also was one of a number of reasons the German people shared Hitler's dislike of the Jews. The overwhelming role of the Jews in Soviet communism -- and also in the communist movement in Germany before Hitler became chancellor in 1933 -- was well known in Germany and elsewhere. And the atrocities committed by the Jews against the Gentile populations of those countries under communist rule -- the artificial famine in Ukraine in which millions died and the mass shootings of Ukrainian peasants, for example -- were well known also. So when Nolte received an award last month for his work as a historian, the Jews went into their Chicken Little act, a lot like the act they staged when Austrian Jörg Haider's party entered the Austrian government a few months ago. Nolte was being rewarded for "blaming the victims" the Jews and their apologists screeched.

Finkelstein quotes some of the leading Holocaust propagandists in this regard. They see any form of anti-Semitism as a "Gentile mental pathology" with no rational basis. According to Holocaust high priest Elie Wiesel the anti-Semite is driven by:

. . .irrational arguments and simply resents the fact that the Jew exists.

Wiesel writes:

For two thousand years . . . we were always threatened. . . . For what? For no reason

Daniel Goldhagen, the author of Hitler's Willing Executioners, one of the most outrageously self-serving Holocaust propaganda books, writes that anti-Semitism is:

divorced from actual Jews . . . fundamentally not a response to any objective evaluation of Jewish action . . . independent of Jews' nature and actions.

The Jewish novelist Cynthia Ozick explains it by saying:

The world wants to wipe out the Jews . . . the world has always wanted to wipe out the Jews.

Finkelstein's book is especially valuable because it is so well documented. He cites dozens of other books and gives specific references to a number of especially revealing statements by other Jews. He also spares no scorn in talking about charlatans such as Wiesel and Goldhagen. He shows up Wiesel as a pious fraud whose standard speaker's fee for lying about what happened during the Second World War is $25,000. Wiesel's popularity is based on his ability to look solemn and spout utter nonsense without cracking a smile. He doesn't talk about reality but about the sacred, ineffable mystery which is the Holocaust, a mystery beyond all understanding or explanation, which must never be examined or questioned. And his Gentile audiences just eat it up. I must admit that I thought a Jew couldn't be embarrassed by this sort of fraud, but apparently Finkelstein really is embarrassed by Wiesel.

Finkelstein's explanation as to why the Holocaust was invented is essentially the same as mine: the Holocaust gives the Jews immunity from criticism for whatever they do to non-Jews, no matter how atrocious, and it gives them a rationale for demanding a handout from the rest of the world. Finkelstein does a very creditable job of establishing this explanation by detailing the way in which the Jews have squeezed the Swiss and others for billions of dollars in Holocaust reparations. He writes:

In recent years the Holocaust industry has become an outright extortion racket.

Certainly, Finkelstein's book should be read by anyone interested in what the Jews are doing. It is filled with very valuable information. It does have one extremely serious shortcoming, however. It blames the Holocaust fraud on a few greedy and unscrupulous Jews. Finkelstein writes about the activities of some of these Jews: Edgar Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Israel Singer, the secretary-general of the World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Marvin Hier of the Simon Wiesenthal Center; Abe Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League, and so on. And the greed and pushiness of these Jews is indeed breathtaking. Finkelstein reveals, for example, that Simon Wiesenthal, the famous Nazi-hunter, rents out his name to the Simon Wiesenthat Center in Los Angeles for $90,000 a year. Actually, that's a good deal for Rabbi Hier and the Simon Wiesenthal Center. Hier rakes in millions of dollars every year from guilt-stricken Gentiles by reminding them that they didn't save enough Jews from Hitler during the Second World War.

But the fact is that if there were only a few greedy conspirators involved, the Holocaust industry never would have made a profit. The average couch potato never would have heard of it. The average soccer mom wouldn't feel a twinge of guilt whenever Elie Wiesel invokes the sacred Holocaust mystery. So-called "Holocaust studies" would not be a part of the curriculum for high school students in 17 states. Israel wouldn't be able to build a huge arsenal of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons without a peep of protest from anyone and then demand successfully that Iraq be bombed back into the Stone Age for trying to do the same thing.

The fact is that the Holocaust industry was built first and foremost by the mass media, and literally hundreds of thousands of Jews labor in that particular vineyard. A few ambitious Zionists and greedy Jewish hucksters may have come up with the original idea, but Steven Spielberg has done infinitely more to build the Holocaust myth than all of the greedy Zionist officials together. Furthermore, the Holocaust has been endorsed and supported by nearly the entire Jewish community. Nearly every Jew wants his share of Holocaust profits. Those like Finkelstein who have done anything at all to expose the fraud or even to disassociate themselves from it are a very tiny minority. Finkelstein certainly understands that, but he doesn't admit in his book that he understands it. He doesn't want to indict the Jewish community as a whole for the fraud, but in fact, it is the Jewish community as a whole that is guilty.

I said earlier that the Jews as a whole are destructive, and I used the example of the Holocaust to support this statement. The Holocaust is supported by and benefits Jews as a whole, not just a few of them, and the Holocaust is destructive to us, to our nation, in a thousand ways. The Holocaust shields Jewish organized crime in America, for example. Janet Reno's Justice Department is afraid to tackle the big Jewish gangsters the way it tackled the Italian Mafia. The

White sex-slave trade is able to flourish in Israel, and no politician in the United States will do anything to oppose it because it is a Jewish business. No politician in our government will threaten to cut off aid to Israel. Hillary Clinton can participate in an international conference on protecting women and deliberately and knowingly sabotage any measures that might put a crimp in the Jewish trade in sex slaves, and no one has the courage to criticize her for it. There's really a lot more than crime and money and political corruption involved in this Holocaust racket. We let it control us, we let it rob us of our courage, and it destroys our souls.

Well, I've spoken in earlier broadcasts about many of the issues involved in the Holocaust racket. I'll speak about other Holocaust issues in future broadcasts. It's a big subject, with many facets. What you can do now is read Professor Finkelstein's book, The Holocaust Industry. And then think about what you've read in the book while you watch the Bush campaign dance all around Al Gore's vice-presidential choice Joseph Lieberman, afraid to lay a glove on him. You'll understand why they're afraid to say anything critical of Lieberman.

Joe Lieberman and Judaism

As you know, we spoke about the Jews last week, and so I really didn't plan to talk with you about the Jews again this week, but so many listeners have written to me about Al Gore's Orthodox Jewish running mate, Joseph Isadore Lieberman, that I guess we're obliged to deal once more with this very unsavory subject.

I should say first that I do not share the alarm expressed by most of the listeners who have asked me to speak about the Lieberman nomination. The Democratic Party has been so thoroughly in the hands of the Jews for decades now that I believe it's a good thing for them to be out front where they can be seen instead of continuing to pull the strings from backstage. It would be wonderful if George Bush, in his disgusting scramble to be inclusive, had chosen Elie Wiesel or some other high-profile Jew as a running mate too. How about Massachusetts Congressman Barney Frank? That would be really inclusive, someone who is both a Jew and an open homosexual -- but, then Frank would have to change his party affiliation from Tweedledum to Tweedledee.

I mean, really, our whole electoral process in this television age has become so corrupt and unreal -- such an embarrassing joke -- that it is very difficult for me to take seriously any major party candidate, or even a minor party candidate. Did you see what Pat Buchanan chose as a running mate? And his rival in the Reform Party chose a Jew, just like the Democrats.

And I hope that you don't believe that just because the Republicans are offering us two White males, neither of them Jewish or homosexual, the Republicans are in any way better than the Democrats or the so-called Reform Party. The Republicans just give us a different face out front and a different party line -- a party line a little less disagreeable perhaps to sane, healthy White Americans than the Democratic party line -- but there's no chance at all that the Republicans will make any fundamental changes in the way the country is going. So that's why I say that it would have been good to have a Jew on the Republican ticket too: better for us to face reality now than continue to let ourselves be fooled by the old two-party shell game.

Anyway, throughout the coming presidential campaign you'll be able to observe the amusing spectacle of the Republicans trying to find a way to attack the Democrats without saying anything bad about Joe Lieberman, from fear of offending the Jews. Actually, if you believe the information put out by the mainstream media about Lieberman since he became Gore's running mate, there's nothing bad the Republicans could say about him. Both Newsweek and Time magazines this week are full of fawning praise for him. They call him "the conscience of the Senate" and hold him up as a paragon of virtue. Is that because Lieberman was one of the few Democrats who had the nerve to criticize Clinton for subjecting us all to the Bill and Monica show? No, criticizing Clinton was no display of morality. It was a display of the fact that Lieberman was one of the few Democrats who wasn't afraid of retribution from Clinton. Lieberman belongs to a more powerful gang than Clinton does.

Lieberman is not just a nominal Jew; he is an "observant" Orthodox Jew, a synagogue-going Jew who actually hires a "sabbath Gentile," a shabbos goy, to do the things a Jew is not permitted by

the Jewish religion to do on Saturday. Lieberman is a Talmud-Torah sort of Jew who takes the Jewish scriptures quite seriously. His biographical sketch in the August 8 issue of the New York Times lists "studying the Torah" as one of his principal interests. So what does that mean? What does the Torah command him to do besides not open any doors or flip any light switches on the Jewish sabbath?

Well, you know, I'm not a Talmud-Torah scholar myself, but I have a book in front of me which was written last year by two Jewish professors, one of whom has spent the last 40 years living in Jerusalem and becoming acquainted with such matters. The book is Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel, and the authors are Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky. Their book is not so much about the details of the Torah and the Talmud as it is about the way Judaism actually governs the lives and influences the attitudes of religious Jews, of Orthodox Jews, in Israel.

It's pretty bizarre reading, with many examples of Jewish behavior, dictated by religion, that would be considered quite scandalous if generally known by non-Jews. There are several underlying themes to the behavior and attitudes of religious Jews. The most fundamental theme is that the Jews have been chosen by their tribal god, Yahweh, or Jehovah, depending on how you want to pronounce it, to own and rule the earth. One can see a quite explicit statement of this theme in the book of the Jewish "prophet" Isaiah. In the 60th and 61st chapters of Isaiah, the "prophet" raves that eventually all the wealth of the Gentiles shall be delivered to the Jews, that the Jews shall "suck the milk of the Gentiles" and "eat the wealth of the Gentiles," while the Gentiles all become servants of the Jews -- or to use Isaiah's quaint mode of expression, the Gentiles shall "stand and feed your flocks" and "be your plowmen and your vinedressers."

The Talmud is full of elaboration and explication of this theme of the special nature and status of the Jews, of their being chosen to be the owners and rulers of the earth. It is the Torah, of course, the first five books of the Old Testament, which contains the basic Jewish doctrines -- the doctrine of chosenness, for example, but it is the Talmud which explains exactly how the Torah is to be interpreted. And the Talmud's interpretation often is quite different from the bland and inoffensive interpretation accepted by those Christians, primarily fundamentalist Protestants, who also accept the Jewish Old Testament as holy writ.

When the Great Reformer, Martin Luther, decided to produce a translation of the Bible into German in the 16th century, he wanted to be sure that he got it right, so he consulted the Talmud and was horrified by what he found there. He could not bring himself simply to reject the Jewish Bible altogether, so he clung to the traditional Christian interpretations and denounced the Jews in the strongest possible terms for their chauvinistic and hate-filled interpretations. In his book The Jews and Their Lies Luther wrote:

The sun never did shine on a more bloodthirsty and revengeful people than the Jews, who imagine themselves to be the people of God, and who believe that they should murder and crush the Gentiles. . . . Do not their Talmud and their rabbis say that it is no sin to kill if a Jew kills a Gentile, but it is a sin if he kills a fellow Jew? It is no sin if he does not keep his oath to a Gentile; therefore, to steal from a Gentile (as they do with their moneylending) is a divine service. . . . And they are the masters of the world, and we are their servants -- indeed, their cattle!

Today the leaders of the Lutheran Church, who are as much under the influence of the Jews as the leaders of all the other mainstream Christian churches, ignore the writings of their founder on the subject of the Jews and react with embarrassment when reminded of them. They pretend that Martin Luther didn't really mean what he wrote about the Jews and Judaism. That was nearly 500 years ago, and Luther was merely reflecting the prejudice of his times, they say. But, in fact, the Talmud and the Torah today are exactly what they were 500 years ago. The Talmud and Torah that Joseph Lieberman studies today are the same Talmud and Torah that horrified Martin Luther at the beginning of the 16th century.

The Lutheran officials may be afraid to admit that, but Professors Shahak and Mezvinsky aren't. They cite specific instances of the way in which the same Jewish teachings that Martin Luther preached against 500 years ago govern the lives of Orthodox Jews in Israel today. An outstanding example is that of Dr. Baruch Goldstein. Goldstein, a physician born and raised in the United States, was an Orthodox Jew. He immigrated to Israel and joined the Israeli army as a medical officer. In the army he announced to his superiors that he would not treat wounded Gentiles. In 1985, after an Israeli soldier shot a Palestinian in the legs, the wounded Palestinian was brought to an army clinic in Hebron, where Goldstein was on duty. Goldstein refused to provide medical assistance to the Palestinian, and he issued a statement in which he said:

I am not willing to treat any non-Jew.

Goldstein's refusal to do anything to save the life of a Gentile was not a personal quirk; it was based on an injunction in the Talmud, and Jewish religious authorities prevented the army from punishing Goldstein for his disobedience to orders. Specifically, Jewish religious law permits a Jewish physician to provide treatment to a Gentile only when refusal to do so might cause harm to Jews: for example, by alerting Gentiles to the Jews' true feelings toward them. Despite his refusal to provide medical assistance to Gentiles, Goldstein was permitted to remain in the army as a medical officer, with the rank of captain -- and in fact, he later was scheduled for promotion to major.

On February 25, 1994, the day of the Jews' annual Purim festival, when each year they celebrate a massacre of 75,000 Persians which they organized more than 2,500 years ago, as related in the Old Testament book of Esther, Captain Goldstein entered a mosque in Hebron and murdered 29 Muslims who were kneeling in prayer, shooting them in the back with his army assault rifle. While he was reloading his assault rifle, surviving worshippers seized him and beat him to death. The Israeli government was not able to keep the massacre hushed up, and a major debate erupted in Israel that continues to this day. On one side are the Orthodox Jews, who consider Goldstein a martyr and have made a shrine of his grave. On the other side are the non-religious Jews, such as Shahak, who are embarrassed by Goldstein's behavior and are worried about the Gentile reaction if the Gentiles ever figure out what the attitude of the religious Jews is.

Immediately after the massacre one very prominent Orthodox leader, Rabbi Moshe Levinger, told a writer for Israel's largest newspaper, Yediot Ahronot, that he was sorry for the 29 Palestinians murdered by Goldstein in the same way that he would be sorry for the killing of 29 flies. Another prominent Israeli religious leader, Rabbi Dov Lior, announced:

Since Goldstein did what he did in God's own name, he is to be regarded as a righteous man.

There was a huge funeral procession for Goldstein, and the Israeli army provided a guard of honor at his grave. Jewish children wore buttons with the slogan "Dr. Goldstein cured Israel's ills."

On the day of Goldstein's funeral, one of the eulogists, Rabbi Israel Ariel said:

The holy martyr, Baruch Goldstein, is from now on our intercessor in heaven. Goldstein did not act as an individual; he heard the cry of the land of Israel, which is being stolen from us day after day by the Muslims. He acted to relieve that cry of the land.

A year after the massacre, the Israeli government issued a permit to Goldstein's admirers to build a large monument at the site of his grave. Today, six years after the massacre, Goldstein's grave is one of the most popular sites in Israel for religious Jewish tourists, especially those from the United States. Goldstein already has acquired the status of a saint.

There are other examples in the book by Shahak and Mezvinsky illustrating what Orthodox Jews really believe and how they actually behave. One especially valuable point the authors make is that Jews habitually deceive Gentiles by having a different meaning in mind for the words they use than the meaning understood by Gentiles. When Orthodox Jewish writers use the term "human beings," for example, they are referring only to Jews, because the Talmud specifies that only Jews are "human beings," while Gentiles, not having souls, are non-human animals. But the average Gentile doesn't realize this, and when he hears someone like Lieberman speaking of his "compassion for his fellow human beings" he is fooled into believing that Lieberman is a man who has compassion for Gentiles as well as for Jews.

It's really not possible to overemphasize the importance of this point. The Jews, in order to exercise their influence, must move among us and be regarded as more or less similar to us, whether they are religious or not. There are some exceptions to this: in New York, for example, there are communities of religious Jews who want to have nothing to do with Gentiles -- except, of course, to take our money, sell us harmful drugs, and abuse our women through their involvement in the White slave trade: things which are perfectly in line with their religion. But as I said, some of them want to minimize their contact with us, and they deliberately distinguish themselves from Gentiles through their manner of dress and grooming -- wearing long beards and sidelocks and fur hats, dressing only in black, and so on. To us they look weird; they give us the creeps. We are not surprised to see them spit three times whenever they pass a Christian church or to give us cold, hard stares whenever we wander into one of their neighborhoods by mistake.

But other religious Jews understand that they must mix with us in order to control us, and the ones who mix must disguise their beliefs and their purpose. So they pretend to be like us. They talk about ball games, they smile at us, they dress like us, they make jokes that we will laugh at, they come to our cocktail parties, and they lie to us about the nature of their religious beliefs. They behave like Joe Lieberman. But beneath the deceptive surface they are the same as the greasiest sidelocked, black-clad kikes of New York's Orthodox neighborhoods -- which is to say,

they have the same religious beliefs, and those religious beliefs dominate their thinking and their behavior. There is only one Torah and only one Talmud -- not a harsh, hate-filled Talmud for the Jews with sidelocks and a gentler, kinder Talmud for Jews like Lieberman. Various groups of Orthodox Jews may wear different types of hats, but they all have the same religion. They all believe in the chosenness of the Jews. They all believe that Jews have been promised dominion over the earth and its inhabitants by their tribal god. That's what Joseph Isadore Lieberman really believes.

Both Shahak and Mezvinsky are non-religious Jews, and their book reflects the very real struggle in Israel between religious Jews -- Lieberman-type Jews -- and non-religious Jews The non-religious Jews really are worried that it will be bad for Israel if the behavior of the Orthodox Jews or their hateful and murderous attitudes become generally known. It certainly would be a mistake, however, for us to assume that the non-religious Jews in general are less deceitful or less a danger to us than religious Jews such as Lieberman. Shahak and Mezvinsky really represent only an extremely tiny minority of non-religious Jews. Marx and Trotsky and Kaganovich and all of the other Jewish-communist butchers who killed millions of our people in Europe were non-religious.

And more to the point now, most of the media bosses in the United States are non-religious Jews, but that hardly makes them less deceitful. Have you heard or read any media commentary in the United States about the Goldstein massacre or the cult of Goldstein worshippers in Israel? Have you seen any discussion at all of the significance of Goldstein's choosing the Jews' Purim festival for his massacre? Compare this nearly total lack of coverage of the Goldstein phenomenon with, say, the famous Kristalnacht of November 1938 in Germany. After a Jew murdered a German official at the German embassy in Paris, Germans went on a rampage of retribution, smashing the windows of Jewish shops in Berlin and setting fire to synagogues. A total of 36 Jews were killed in the disorders, a figure not too different from the number of Palestinians slaughtered by Goldstein. Now, Kristalnacht was 62 years ago, and yet every American school child still hears about it every year. It is our non-religious Jewish media bosses who are responsible for this gross distortion of the image of the world and of history, this vast overemphasis of some news and nearly total blackout of other news. That is really much more harmful to us than all of the Talmud-based hatred of the Orthodox Jews.

It is good for our people to understand the nature of Judaism, to understand the beliefs of Orthodox Jews such as Lieberman. The best source for this sort of understanding is the Talmud, but for that very reason the Jews keep it out of sight as much as they can. And unless you are able to read Hebrew you will find only bowdlerized editions, with the most revealing passages left out or deliberately mistranslated. That's why rare Jews such as Israel Shahak, who are willing for their own reasons, to spill the beans on their fellow Jews, are so valuable to us. But we really must go beyond Judaism and understand that even those Jews who reject the Torah and the Talmud -- the non-religious Jews -- are our deadly enemies, although not our deadliest enemies.

Our deadliest enemies are the traitors among our people. Our deadliest enemies are those of our own people who knowingly and deliberately collaborate with the Jews. Our deadliest enemies are the leaders of the Lutheran Church who conceal from their own people Luther's teachings about the Jews. Our deadliest enemies are the few remaining Gentile media bosses -- Ted Turner,

for example, or Rupert Murdoch -- who, understanding what the Jews are like and what they are trying to do, nevertheless collaborate with them. Our deadliest enemies are the Gentile political leaders, such as Albert Gore and George Bush, without whose conscious and willing collaboration Jews such as Joseph Lieberman could pose no threat at all to us.

The Case of Hendrik Möbus

In our program last week we talked about the Jewish campaign to outlaw Politically Incorrect speech: so called "hate speech." Of course, as I mentioned last week, the Jews aren't the only ones trying to abolish the Bill of Rights. The Jews are the principal schemers and the prime movers, but the radical feminists are among their most zealous allies; so is the homosexual lobby. Every group in this screwed-up society of ours that has had special privileges bestowed on it by the government -- every member of the Clinton coalition -- wants to silence anyone who might be inclined to question his group's privileges. And then there are the bleeding-heart liberals, who really believe that the freedom not to be offended by what anyone else says or writes is more important than freedom of speech.

But the Jews are the ones planning the campaign, and the mass media are their principal weapons against our freedom. Two weeks ago a 30-year-old White man, Eric Toews, died in Tacoma, Washington, after being savagely beaten, kicked, and stomped on a Tacoma street by a gang of between 15 and 20 Blacks in what even the local newspapers described as a "thrill killing." Now, the reason Eric Toews was beaten to death by a gang of Blacks is that the local news media had carefully avoided reporting a dozen other vicious, unprovoked beatings of White men walking alone on Tacoma streets during the previous month. And the reason that the news media had avoided saying anything about the earlier beatings is that the victims were White men, and the gang was Black.

You see, the news media in Tacoma weren't waiting for "hate speech" to become illegal. They already had imposed a rule against "hate speech" on themselves, and what could be more "hateful" than reporting the attacks on White men by a gang of Black teenagers? The Tacoma news media were concerned that if they reported the attacks, local Whites might take measures to protect themselves against non-Whites. At the very least, news of the attacks would have caused some Whites to have bad feelings about teenaged Black gangs: the news would have "incited racial hatred," as the liberals like to say. In other words, reporting the attacks and identifying the attackers as Blacks and the victims as Whites would fall within the generally understood definition of "hate speech." So the news media in Tacoma kept quiet about the attacks until Eric Toews was beaten to death. Even then the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* told its readers that the police had "no reason to believe the attacks were racially motivated." Really: no reason. So, you see, the police also have learned not to say anything which might be considered "hate speech" even before the First Amendment has been abolished.

The family and friends of Eric Toews really aren't as understanding of the attitude of the police and the media as they should be. In fact, they are angry: One friend, Jesse Kimmerling, said bluntly: "This wouldn't have happened if he had known about the earlier assaults." One of Eric's employers, Dan Zimmer, said: "Maybe this could have been avoided, and Erik would still be talking to us if he knew it was not safe to walk alone in that area, if the police had made the population aware this was going on." Well, I don't know, but the implication of those statements doesn't sound good to me. I think Mr. Kimmerling and Mr. Zimmer ought to be thankful that we don't have a "hate speech" law yet; if we did, they might be in trouble.

One predictable consequence of police and media restraint in dealing with the Black-on-White gang attacks in Tacoma is that they have spread to other communities in the Pacific Northwest. Last week, on August 31, between 7:00 PM and midnight, a gang of Black teenagers roamed through downtown Seattle, selecting White men at random and beating them and robbing them in at least six separate assaults. The very brief report on these assaults in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* on September 2 mentioned the Tacoma murder of Eric Toews and quoted a police spokesman who said that the Seattle assaults seem to be "copycat" attacks. Seattle's other major newspaper, the *Seattle Times,* neglected to mention the race of either the victims or the attackers in its news coverage. That was the general pattern for the other news media, which described the gang of attackers only as "young men wearing red shirts with shaved heads." There was no mention of race, and many citizens undoubtedly were left with the impression from this description that the attackers were White skinheads.

I'll tell you about another way in which the news media are participating in this Jewish campaign against so-called "hate speech," and that is by attempting to convince the more impressionable members of the public that "hate speech" already is illegal. I'll give you a hypothetical example: A member of the Ku Klux Klan gets in a fight with a Black Muslim over a parking space, and one of the two is killed. When the news appears in a mainstream newspaper, here are the two possibilities for the way it will be headed. If it is the White man who is killed by the Black, the headline will read: "Man charged in parking space slaying." If it is the Black who is killed by the White man, the report will be headed: "White racist charged in unprovoked murder of Black man." And it's not just the newspapers, I mentioned in an earlier broadcast that when John King, one of the three White ex-convicts who killed a Black ex-convict by dragging him behind a truck in Jasper, Texas, was sentenced for the killing last year, NBC anchorman Tom Brokaw announced the sentence on the NBC Evening News with these words: "In Jasper, Texas, today the racist got the death penalty." The subliminal message there is that John King was sentenced to death for his racism, rather than for any specific criminal act.

I've seen even more blatant cases of this sort of media trickery. A man is distributing leaflets that have a racial message by tossing them from his car window onto lawns or driveways as he drives through a residential area. He is observed by a policeman, who arrests him and charges him with littering. The headline of the newspaper report will read: "Man arrested and charged in distribution of racist leaflets." It's clear what the message is that the average lemming will absorb from that. It's not that littering is illegal; it's that distributing racist leaflets is illegal. Now, newspaper people are crooked, but most of them aren't stupid. When they do something like that it's deliberate. They intended to deceive. And it's a very common sort of deception. Keep your eyes open when you read your newspaper, and you'll spot similar cases yourself.

Now I'll tell you about a very recent personal experience I have had in this regard. It's especially interesting, because it illustrates not only the aspect we've just talked about of the media role in the anti-First Amendment campaign, but it also shows us the government's role in this subversive effort. As many of you know, these *American Dissident Voices* radio broadcasts are not the only medium I use for reaching the public with my message. I also use music. In fact, last year I bought two record companies, one in the United States and one in Sweden. Both of them publish and distribute resistance music, which reaches mostly young people. Three months ago I had a visit from a young German musician who has made a name for himself with resistance music in

Europe. He is Hendrik Möbus, and he is 24 years old. I invited him to stay as my guest and help me establish new outlets in Europe for my records. And that's what he did for 10 weeks. He stayed as my guest, and we talked about the role of music in our overall effort.

Hendrik is an extremely intelligent young man, quite serious, and entirely committed to our struggle. When he was a teenager in East Germany, however, he got himself into trouble. At the age of 16 he was involved in a killing. Well, he was tried and convicted as a juvenile, and he served his prison term, using his five years in prison to get his thinking straightened out. Eventually he was released, and after that he devoted himself to his music. But he wasn't as discreet as he might have been: he began telling the mainstream German media what he thought about things. Now, in Germany since 1945 it has been illegal to tell anyone what you think about things, unless your ideas are Politically Correct. That's what happens to you when you lose a war: you lose your freedom. So the German government told Hendrik he would have to go back to prison.

Hendrik decided he'd rather not do that; he'd rather continue producing and promoting resistance music. So he left Germany and came to the United States -- legally, with a passport and a visa. The German government then asked the Clinton government to arrest Hendrik and send him back to Germany, so that he could be put in prison for saying what he thought.

Two weeks ago today, when Hendrik left my place to buy some groceries, a dozen of Mr. Clinton's secret policemen jumped on him, jammed a pistol in his ear, slammed his face down on the back of a car so hard that teeth marks were left in the paint, twisted his arm behind his back with such force that they broke the arm, and hustled him away. Hendrik is a quiet, skinny, non-violent intellectual. He was unarmed and put up absolutely no resistance when he was arrested. And yet they broke his arm.

And the Federal cops who arrested him knew what he was being arrested for. They had copies of the extradition request. They knew that his alleged offense was simply speaking to the press in Germany. And yet they broke his arm when they arrested him. And then, before Hendrik could contact me or an attorney, they shoved a paper in his face and told him to sign it. It would make things a lot easier for him they said. Hendrik, in a great deal of pain from his broken arm and not really understanding the situation, signed an agreement not to contest deportation to Germany for overstaying his visa. That was a mistake, but I believe that it can be undone, so that the government cannot short circuit the extradition process with a deportation.

I'll tell you why the Clinton government would rather deport Hendrik than try to extradite him, and why I prefer to fight an extradition instead of a deportation. The reason why the government prefers deportation and we prefer extradition is that the things Hendrik did in Germany which resulted in the extradition request are not illegal in the United States. In the United States they are constitutionally protected activities. Most Americans don't understand that the Germans have no free speech. They don't understand that in 1945 we didn't liberate the Germans; we took away their freedom and imposed an occupation government on them, from which the present German government is descended. The present German government would like to keep it that way, with most Americans remaining in the dark on this issue. And most Americans also don't understand that their government in Washington collaborates with the German government in punishing

Germans who say what they think. The Clinton government would like to keep it that way, with most Americans remaining in the dark about their government's true attitude toward free speech.

I want to use Hendrik's case to expose the utter hypocrisy of the U.S. government where free speech is concerned. Fortunately for this purpose, Hendrik's case is a matter of enormous public interest in Germany now. The German public is fascinated by the fact that a 24-year-old German has been arrested and brutalized by the secret police here for making a Politically Incorrect statement in Germany. I already have given three major interviews to Germany's largest television networks in the past eight days, and if the German interest in Hendrik continues, the controlled media in this country will have a hard time ignoring the principal issue involved: namely, that the present U.S. government, while pretending to be in favor of free speech actually sympathizes with repressive laws of the sort the Jews have succeeded in imposing on the Germans, so that they can continue using Germany as a cash cow for Israel, and the Germans can't complain about it.

Imagine this: A Jew in Saudi Arabia is arrested carrying a sign that says, "Mohammed was a bed- wetter." The Jew escapes from the Saudi police and comes to the United States. The Saudi government requests that our government arrest him and return him to Saudi Arabia to be tried for sacrilege. Can you imagine the sort of cooperation the Saudi government would receive from the Clinton government? Can you imagine Madeleine Albright sending out the U.S. Marshals to round up the Jew, breaking his arm in the process, and handing him over to the Saudis so they can whack off his head in a public square in Riyadh? Can you even imagine that? But when the German government requests the extradition of a young German musician who composes the sort of music and says the sort of things the Jews and the liberals don't like, the Clinton government falls all over itself in its eagerness to help the German government punish the young man who merely did what any American is free to do. The Clinton government and the Jewish media bosses will tell you that they believe in free speech, but I tell you that it is what they do rather than what they say which reveals to us what they really believe. The officials of the Clinton government take an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic, but in fact they themselves are the greatest and most dangerous enemies of the Constitution.

And the Jewish media have employed the same sort of deliberate deception in their reporting of Hendrik's arrest that they have employed in practically every other case where ideological issues are involved. So far not one media report in the United States has focused on the fact that the German extradition request cited only so-called "offenses" in Germany which are not offenses in the United States. Not one U.S. newspaper had a headline anything like, "German musician arrested in United States for making Politically Incorrect music and press statements in Germany." The headline in the *Washington Post* on August 29 was: "Fugitive Neo-Nazi from Germany Is Captured in West Virginia." And the lead paragraph in the *Washington Post* story is: "After secretly trailing a German neo-Nazi fugitive on his journey . . . to West Virginia, the U.S. Marshals Service arrested the convicted murderer near the 200-acre property of White separatist William Pierce, author of *The Turner Diaries,* authorities announced yesterday."

Now, you can read the fine print for more information on the arrest, but the message that will stick in the mind of the average newspaper reader is what is in the headline and the lead

paragraph: Hendrik was arrested for being a neo-Nazi, and he also is a fugitive murderer. The pattern was the same for the other U.S. media.

The Associated Press story, also on August 29, was headed, "German neo-Nazi fugitive arrested in West Virginia." The story in West Virginia's terminally liberal *Charleston Gazette* the next day -- that's August 30 -- was headed, "Police catch up with neo- Nazi in Lewisburg."

Again I stress that not one report of Hendrik's arrest in the mainstream media focused on the fact that he was arrested only for what he said in Germany. Instead they all implied that his real offense is being a neo-Nazi and that it's perfectly reasonable to arrest people for that in the United States. And of course, they dragged in the red herring of his juvenile offense and then tried to associate the ideas of "fugitive murderer" and "neo-Nazi" in the minds of readers. And not one of them -- not one -- mentioned that the U.S. Marshals broke his arm when they arrested him, despite the fact that he was unarmed, offered no resistance, and was not believed to be violent or aggressive. And I should mention in this regard that Hendrik was examined by a physician after his arrest, his arm was x-rayed, and it was determined by the physician to be fractured -- but not a word of this appeared in the mainstream media here. They didn't want the public to have any sympathy for a "hate speech" criminal. Again, imagine what they would have had to say about a broken arm in the hypothetical case of that Jew committing sacrilege in Saudi Arabia. You would never hear the end of it. It would have been another Elian Gonzales story, with televised images of the bruises and swelling, with hourly updates on his condition from the prison physician, and so on, day after day. But in Hendrik's case, not a word.

Well, I hope that I have made my point that neither the politicians in the Clinton government nor the media bosses really believe in free speech, and they're lying when they say they do. They believe in free speech only for those people with whom they agree ideologically, those people whose interests are the same as theirs. And they definitely do not want people who disagree with them to be able to express themselves. That is why they're pushing so hard now for so-called "hate speech" laws and trying to make the lemmings believe that they already can be prosecuted and sent to prison for saying anything that is "racist." That's why the Clinton government collaborates so enthusiastically with the German government in persecuting Germans for Political Incorrectness.

My aim in telling you all of these things is to alert you to the danger we are facing from those who want to take away our liberty and to try to galvanize you into speaking out yourself and alerting others. My aim is not to discourage you or to make you feel that all is lost because the forces arrayed against our freedom are so powerful. So let me end our program today on a positive note. The German government is not desperate to make an example out of a 24-year-old kid who smarted off to the media because it is confident that history is on its side. On the contrary, the German government is bent out of shape by Hendrik because it's scared to death of him -- and thousands of others like him. The German government senses the instability in the air. It knows that the whole structure on which its power rests is rotten. It is afraid of dissent, afraid of where dissent may lead.

And the Clinton government and the Jews behind the government are afraid of dissidents for exactly the same reason. They don't send a SWAT-team of trigger-happy goons after a skinny,

unarmed, 24-year-old musician with Politically Incorrect ideas and break his arm because they're filled with confidence in the historical inevitability of militant lesbianism, or whatever it is the Clinton government stands for.

They do it because they are afraid. Let's help make their nightmare come true.

Behind America's Moral Decay

Today I want to talk with you about a topic that I believe is extremely important. It's a topic that I have been thinking about for a long time but have hesitated to talk about because it's a big, complex topic, and I don't have much in the way of scientific data on it: I don't have a lot of hard statistics, just a number of general observations and a good bit of specific anecdotal material. Because this topic is so important, however, I have decided just to plunge into it. Perhaps our listeners will be able to contribute to this subject if we discuss it more than once.

The subject is the general decline in moral fitness of White Americans. In fact, I believe this moral decline is an affliction not just of Americans, but of White people nearly everywhere. I don't want the word moral to be misunderstood here. I'm not talking at all about the same thing some Christians refer to when they lament the decline of morals in America. I'm not talking about sex, for example.

By moral fitness I mean such things as strength of character, toughness, degree of self-discipline, willingness to endure hardship. But moral fitness is more than that. Being morally fit also means having an internal code of behavior and sticking to it. It means having values and standards that one applies in a systematic way to guiding one's own behavior and to judging the behavior of other people. It means having some purpose in one's life and directing one's life in accord with that purpose.

What I see around me in America today are very few people with much moral strength -- fewer, at least, than we had 50 years ago: fewer men, for example, of whom we can say with confidence, "he is a man of his word"; fewer men and women who are willing to work really hard over a long period for the achievement of a goal. And I see many more men and women -- especially young men and women -- who are soft, self-indulgent, undisciplined, and with neither moral standards nor purpose in their lives.

Well, that's a bit too general to have much meaning, I'm afraid. Let me try a few specific examples to illustrate my point. I'll begin with glassblowers. Before the Second World War every chemistry department and every physics department at a university large enough to sustain any sort of scientific research had a glassblower on the staff for making specialized glassware. Glass is not especially easy to work with, and learning how to make glass scientific apparatus with it, and make it well, requires much training and much practice. But before the war there were enough young Americans willing to spend several years in apprenticeship to an experienced glassblower in order to learn the necessary skills. They could then count on secure employment at a university or at a company engaged in scientific research or in manufacturing scientific apparatus. By the 1950s, however, good glassblowers were becoming hard to find in America, even though more jobs were available and salaries were going up. Some large companies had their own training programs, but universities who needed glassblowers generally had to import them from some place such as Germany, where apprenticeship programs for skilled trades were still the rule.

I mentioned the shrinking supply of glassblowers, because that is something with which I had personal experience, but my impression is that the phenomenon is more general than that: young men are less willing to enter trades which require long periods of training before they are fully qualified and can earn more than an apprentice's wages. I'll generalize even further: Americans are less willing -- in fact, less able -- to postpone gratification than they were half a century ago. Of course, we all would like instant gratification -- but we used to have the willpower and self-discipline to postpone it a bit when that was advantageous. In talking with young people especially, I get the definite impression that there is much less willingness to focus on long-range goals.

Another example of this is to be seen in the spending habits of Americans. Before the Second World War young families went to a bank to borrow money to buy a house, but that was about it; everything else required cash. If you wanted to buy a piece of furniture or a radio or a new suit, you had to have the money first. Even in buying a car, the common practice was to save the money from one's salary, and when one had enough one purchased the car. Credit cards may have been around, but they certainly weren't as common as today. In order to acquire the things they wanted, Americans had to plan ahead and exercise some self-discipline.

In today's age of plastic credit, that is much less the case. And it seems to me that there has been a real loss in self-discipline. The average American today ends up paying much more for things simply because he not only can't wait until he has earned the money for the things he wants, he can't pay off his credit card debt at the end of every month and avoid interest. He just doesn't have the willpower. He can't control his desire to have more shiny junk and to have it now, and so a good bit of his income goes to paying interest. If he had the willpower to wait, he could avoid interest and actually own many more things.

Of course, we always had people without self-discipline and who were unwilling to postpone gratification. There always were people who had to be paid every week. If you paid them only once a month they would spend their whole paycheck in the first two weeks, and then they would starve during the next two weeks until another payday. It just seems to me that the problem is worse today than it used to be.

Here's another example for those of you who are employers. I've had many people who are in business for themselves complain to me about how difficult it is to find young Americans who are good for any kind of work. And I've noticed the same thing myself. A young employment prospect seems eager and enthusiastic; he talks a good line. But if you give him a real job to do, you will quickly discover that he has no conception of what work is. He really believes that a plausible excuse is a satisfactory substitute for performance. He believes that going through the motions and putting on a good show of working is the same as working. He never accepts responsibility for the results of his work. Responsibility is an alien concept to him. It is as if the work is not quite real, and he doesn't quite grasp that the consequences of adequate work or inadequate work, of success or failure, are real too.

Poor work habits are part of this problem. Young Americans these days have not had much experience at real work as they were growing up. Most of them have not had to deliver newspapers or mow lawns or wash cars or do anything else to earn their own money from the

time they were 11 or 12 years old. Delivering morning newspapers is an especially good discipline: it forces a young boy to crawl out of his warm bed at three o'clock in the morning and go out into a dark, often cold or wet, world and do hard work by himself for a couple of hours. And he must do it every morning, whether he feels like it or not. It is inevitable. Most young White Americans never have been faced with the inevitable choice of no work, no money; they've always had a way around it, and not having had to face that inevitability has stunted their moral growth.

Well, it's worse than that. I refer to these young people who can't cope with real work as members of the *Star Trek* generation. On *Star Trek* a meteoroid hits the spaceship and knocks a big hole in it. The air is rushing out into space. Electrical wiring is arcing and sparking. Fires have broken out all over the ship. Vital systems have stopped functioning. So the crew members grab fire extinguishers and screwdrivers and run around for a few minutes fixing things up, and pretty soon everything is more or less back to normal -- whereas in reality everyone would be dead. Kids raised on television have been given a grossly distorted conception of reality, a distorted reality in which there are no really painful consequences for failure, a distorted reality in which every problem has an easy solution.

And it's not just television. It's also a welfare system, which protects people from their own folly and weakness and vice and keeps them aware that if they fail at whatever they're trying to do, there's something to fall back on, so they don't really have to succeed. And it's an educational system that has shifted away from rigor and hard rules and performance toward fuzzy concepts and lots of verbalizing and social conditioning. Problem solving, with exact answers required, is out; being able to wave your hands and talk about a concept is in. Using language with precision and understanding the structural functions and relationships of words, are out; that's too masculine and analytical. Studying the history of our people and our civilization and learning the values and traditions that gave us strength in the past are out; that doesn't mesh with multiculturalism.

In fact, the schools in America have abandoned completely the task of building character and instilling values in young people. If you think I'm exaggerating, go to your library and check out a set of the *McGuffey's Readers* that were used widely in American public schools in the latter part of the 19th and the early part of the 20th century. *McGuffey's Readers* not only taught young Americans how to use their language far more precisely and elegantly than young Americans are taught today; they also taught children values. Every anecdote and story and reading selection in the *McGuffey's Readers* taught a moral lesson: a lesson about courage or honesty or perseverance or loyalty or correct behavior. Compare the quality of the language in the *McGuffey's Readers* and their content with the reading material in America's elementary schools today.

None of these aspects of moral decay I've mentioned is new -- with the possible exception of the loss of a sense of reality resulting from watching thousands of hours of television. We've always had soft, lazy, self-indulgent, irresponsible people with a short attention span who had insufficient self-discipline to postpone gratification. But the problem is substantially worse today than it was 50 years ago. There's more hedonism and less responsibility, more softness and less perseverance, today than in the past. There's less purposefulness in young people's lives and less

willingness to work long and hard and carefully to achieve what they want. Of that I am certain, even though I don't have hard statistics to prove it.

So what are the causes of this moral decline, other than television, and what can we do about it?

Undoubtedly the sustained material prosperity of the past half-century has been a significant contributing factor to our moral laxity. The natural conditions of life that kept us hard and morally tough in the past have been abated to a large extent by our relative material wealth. Soft and ill- disciplined individuals who would have perished a century ago and who would have been kept at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder 50 years ago are so sheltered from Nature's selective forces today that they are able to thrive almost as well as more fit individuals.

The morally debilitating effects of wealth have been recognized for a long time. The Roman patrician, Cato the Censor, railed against the moral decay of the citizens of the Roman Republic 2200 years ago, and he directed most of his criticism against his fellow aristocrats and their self-indulgence. He called upon them to return to the Spartan ways of their ancestors and to raise their children with the same rigor and austerity that had prevailed during the time of their grandfathers. Cato undoubtedly had some effect, but he lacked the authority to enforce measures sufficiently severe to stem the tide of decay. Then as now, most people, rich as well as poor, were inclined to take the course of least resistance, with little thought for the consequences; as long as they could indulge themselves they did. Nevertheless, the Republic lasted another two centuries -- which is a lot longer than America is going to last.

The destruction of the American family certainly is a major cause of our moral decay. Before the Second World War the nuclear family was the norm among White Americans, with the mother at home to take care of the children. That was true in working-class families as well as in the middle class. There were no daycare centers for preschool children, and when the kids came home from school their mother was waiting for them. Children, in other words, got vastly more parental guidance and influence then than now. And they got a lot less permissiveness.

You know, it used to be that there was a clear distinction between childhood and adulthood. A child was fully under the control of his parents, and he was completely dependent on his parents. An adult, on the other hand, was on his own. He was independent; he could do whatever he wanted; but he was completely responsible for himself. As a child approached the magic age of 16 or 17 or 18, he looked forward with eagerness to becoming an adult and having his freedom. He looked forward to other things too: sex, being able to choose a mate, being able to buy things for himself and choose his own life-style, being able to have a car. But he understood that he would be responsible for himself. He would have to support himself, and he would be held accountable for what he did. His parents no longer would be there to support or to shield him.

This distinction between childhood and adulthood is a very fundamental distinction, and among humankind it has been nearly universal, from every European society of which we have records down to the most primitive non-White tribes -- until now. Among White Americans the distinction really has become blurred since the Second World War. On the one hand the parental control and the restrictions that formerly were characteristic of childhood almost have disappeared. Nowadays young kids have money, sex, freedom to do almost anything they want --

but no responsibility. And on the other hand far too many young men continue to be supported by their parents well into their 20s or even into their 30s. They shun independence. It's an unhealthy situation all around.

There's another reason, in addition to the softening influence of too much wealth and television's loosening of the grip on reality and the lessening of parental guidance, for the decline in moral strength of Americans today. That reason is a deliberate policy of moral destruction that has been implemented with increasing effectiveness during the past half century. In every society there are factions who want to push social or political changes in particular directions. There are egalitarians, for example, who really believe that people ought to be equal even if Nature didn't make them that way. They have combined forces with the feminists to reduce competition in the lives of children at school and at play. They have downgraded the idea of winning or losing, of success or failure, of excellence or mediocrity. They have instilled into children's minds the notion that cooperation is better than competition, that working in a group or on a committee in which no single person is responsible for the outcome is better than individual striving, that a uniform level of achievement is better than having some individuals excel and some fail. In addition, the feminists have played a major role in the destruction of the family, not just by teaching that the family is a repressive institution which is unfair to women, but by using their political influence to push policies which have undermined the family.

Then there are the multiculturalists, who are absolutely determined that we must integrate Blacks and Vietnamese and Mexican mestizos into our society in a way in which the various non-White minorities will be happy and successful. They are determined to change White social institutions in any way necessary to facilitate their goal of a happily integrated society. Lowering achievement standards in the schools and performance standards in the workplace and in the armed forces in order to accommodate Blacks, for example, seems to them a small price to pay for successful integration. Likewise, they are happy to phase out the teaching of history to young people in order to weaken their sense of European identity and make them more willing to accept multiculturalism. The fact that people with a weak sense of identity tend to be people without strong values is not half as important to them as achieving integration.

There are people -- White people -- who actually prefer the moral situation we have today to the one we had before the Second World War. They feel more comfortable with weak, indecisive, self-indulgent, and irresponsible people around them. They don't like strong, self-confident, independent people.

We've always had this interplay of ideological factions in our society. What's really new is the role of the mass media in favoring some factions over others. In the past the factions with really nutty and destructive ideas didn't have much influence over policy. A faction that believed the family repressive and wanted to weaken it, for example, would have a hard time prevailing over the general feeling that the family ought to be kept strong -- unless Hollywood began backing the anti-family faction. A faction that wanted to lower performance standards so that Blacks could do better relative to Whites wouldn't have made much headway -- without media backing.

When the Jews began gaining control over the mass media of news and entertainment early in the 20th century, they began using their growing influence over public opinion to favor the

factions with the most destructive ideas and goals. The Jews not only backed feminist policies, for example; they actually supplied most of the feminist writers and propagandists themselves. They not only supplied most of the money and brains behind the postwar drive for a multicultural society, they also launched programs to weaken the opposition by undermining the character of the White population. In the 1960s, during the drive to weaken and discredit the forces of tradition, the Jews were the prime movers, and the mass media were their indispensable weapons.

I apologize for this crude and unscientific explanation of the fact of the moral decay of White America. I believe, however, that if you look soberly and carefully at the evidence all around you, you will find that there is much truth in what I have said. Think about it.

What's Important

A couple of weeks ago we talked about the case of a young German musician, Hendrik Möbus, who was arrested by the Clinton government's secret police while he was my guest in West Virginia. I told you that the reason for the arrest was an extradition request from the German government. The "crimes" cited in that extradition request all were what George Orwell would call "speech crimes" and what the Jews, feminists, and liberals in America call "hate speech": he made some statements to the press in Germany that the German government didn't like, and he was seen giving the Roman salute at a music concert. Of course, those aren't crimes in America; in fact, they are activities which are activities specifically protected by the Constitution. Nevertheless, Hendrik was arrested by the Clinton government's thugs, with such force that his arm was broken, for making a Politically Incorrect statement to the press in Germany.

Well, Janet Reno and the rest of them thought about the implications of that for a few days and decided that they'd rather not have extradition hearings in which I and others surely would raise the "speech crime" issue. That might alert some members of the American public to the fact that the Clinton government is helping the German government lock people up for having Politically Incorrect opinions; that might raise some opposition to the plan to enact similar "hate speech" legislation here. So they dropped their extradition claim against Hendrik and turned him over to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to be deported back to Germany for overstaying his tourist visa. We helped him file a petition for political asylum in the United States, on the grounds that he would be persecuted for his political beliefs in Germany. In fact, we cited in the petition for asylum the charges for which the German government wanted to send him to prison, as listed in the extradition request, as proof that he would be persecuted for his beliefs and denied freedom of speech and freedom of association.

The situation in Germany today really is quite grim; it's about what we can expect in the United States in five to ten years if the liberals and the Jews have their way. There were police raids all over Germany just a few days ago against Germans who were suspected of listening to the wrong kind of music. The police kicked in people's doors before dawn and seized their collections of Politically Incorrect CDs. The police regularly raid concerts and arrest everyone in attendance if the government doesn't like the lyrics of the songs being played. Any political party the government doesn't like can be banned, and anyone who is a member can be sent to prison. Hundreds of Germans are in prison today because they belonged to Politically Incorrect organizations, were overheard making Politically Incorrect statements, or were caught with Politically Incorrect books or CDs. All of this repressive activity by the German government is done to "protect democracy." The Germans in prison have been charged with "anti- democratic speech" or "anti-democratic associations." It's really like something right out of Orwell's *1984*, and it's becoming worse by the month over there -- and our government is helping the German government in this repressive activity and is moving in the same direction itself.

Well, I'll certainly do what I can to publicize this state of affairs during the fight to keep Hendrik from being deported, but I'll tell you what's a bigger obstacle in this fight than either the German government or the Clinton government: that's the lack of understanding on the part of so many of

our own people about what's really important in the world around them and in their lives, and what isn't important.

I'll give you an example: We need to obtain the services of the most competent and aggressive immigration attorney we can find. We have our own staff attorney here at the National Alliance, but immigration law -- like most other branches of law -- is very specialized, and to have any chance at all of beating the government one needs a specialist who knows all of the tricks the government is likely to use. The typical reaction we get when we talk with these high- priced specialists about Hendrik's case is: "Hey, so the guy's going to be deported; so what? He's just one guy. People get deported all the time. I'll work on it if you want me to, but I'll need ten grand up front. I've got an $1800 BMW payment due next Friday, and I haven't paid my bar bill at the country club yet this month."

I'm exaggerating, of course, but only slightly. We'll find a competent and aggressive attorney, but it's a bit like finding a needle in a haystack. Most lawyers are far more interested in making their BMW payments and having an open account at the country club than they are in the sort of fundamental issues that are involved in Hendrik's case. Which is to say, most lawyers are not really interested in things like freedom of speech and freedom of association. When you begin explaining to them that the German police regularly raid concerts that play the sort of music Hendrik is involved with and lock all of the concert-goers up; that the political organizations Hendrik belonged to in Germany have been banned by the government, and that Hendrik is subject to arrest just for meeting peacefully with other members of a banned organization, the lawyers don't care; you can see them begin to get fidgety and their eyes begin to wander. They really don't care. What's important to them is that Germany still makes good cars and good beer and that they themselves make enough money to buy these good things.

And you know, it's not just lawyers. Look at the popularity polls in the current presidential campaign in America. They're sickeningly reminiscent of Clinton's popularity polls during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. People didn't care: at least, not about the important things, such as the dignity of their government and the integrity of their elected officials. What they cared about was that the economy was keeping them comfortable, and their buddy Bill still had a nice, friendly smile for them.

You know, I'm certainly not a fan of George Bush. The man is obviously a crook. But at least he doesn't hang around with Bill Clinton. He doesn't have quite as many Jews in his campaign -- or in his family -- as Al Gore does. But at the moment Gore is making the voters feel a little warmer and fuzzier, and so he's ahead in the polls -- at least with the women and the Blacks. God, what a mistake this country made in 1920!

I always catch hell from my female listeners when I say something like that, so let me assure you now that I love and respect and admire and appreciate them -- as women -- but collectively they are a disaster when they become involved in politics. This is not to say that there aren't a lot of very foolish men who also vote for whoever gives them a warm and fuzzy feeling. But it is the female vote that gives the edge to filth such as Bill Clinton and Al Gore.

The problem of not caring about the important things, however, is a problem I see in both sexes. Most of the lawyers who are far more interested in making their BMW payments than in whether or not the government in Washington respects our Bill of Rights are men. And I spoke last week about how a couple of clever shysters from the Southern Poverty Law Center, Morris Dees and Richard Cohen, stole Richard Butler's church in Idaho from him. I mentioned that the mainstream Christians and the media people and the politicians in Idaho are beside themselves with joy about the verdict.

Why is that? It's because they were embarrassed by Butler's brand of Christianity. More accurately, they were embarrassed about having Idaho described by Dees and Cohen and the media Jews as a "haven for hate" because Butler's church was there. Now they can feel good about themselves again. What the Butler verdict means for the First Amendment is of far less importance to them than being able to feel good. I mean, really, the mainstream Christian preachers were saying about Butler's loss of his church, "Good riddance." It seems to me that that's a bit shortsighted. My thought is that being embarrassed because your neighbor believes something that is ridiculed and criticized by the media is not half as important as the right of your neighbor to be as ridiculous as he wants -- because that's your right too. Well, I guess Christian preachers these days are as worried about their standing in the country club as lawyers are.

I am reminded of what another preacher once said. He said, "What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his immortal soul?" I believe that preacher had a better understanding of what is important and what is not than the mainstream Christian preachers of Idaho.

Well, I'm not one to talk much about immortal souls, and so I'd say it a little differently myself. I'd say, keeping your freedom is more important than having the Jewish media say nice things about the state you live in. I'd say that helping our fellow Europeans in Germany regain their freedom of speech and association is more important than making your BMW payment. I'd say that restoring dignity and integrity to our government is more important than any sort of scheme to lower the cost of prescription drugs or keep the Social Security system solvent a while longer. I'd say that ensuring that our grandchildren are able to grow up in a White world, where they will be in the majority and their values will prevail, rather than growing up in the sort of multicultural jungle America is becoming now, is more important than feeling good about yourself.

The future of our race, the survival and advancement of our race, the quality and the security of our race -- these things are far, far more important than our individual or collective comfort today.

We used to understand that sort of thing. How did we forget? How did so many of us lose our understanding?

I believe that I see part of the answer to that question when I look at the way schooling has changed in America since the Second World War. In the past the schools not only provided a more structured and disciplined learning environment, they also provided moral guidance. I'm not talking about school prayer. I'm not an advocate of school prayer. But we used to learn about our history and our traditions in school. We used to have White role models that we could

identify with. We learned to a large extent what is important just by learning about the behavior and attitudes and accomplishments of our ancestors. Anyway, we got a lot more useful moral guidance then than the kids get in the glitzy, multi-culti, hip- hop, consumption-oriented schools today, where it's tantamount to a "hate crime" to teach White kids about White history or White traditions or White values.

A bigger part of the answer is the excessively soft life-style most Americans have today. When we lived on the land and had to deal with life-or- death problems on a frequent basis, we were more aware of fundamentals than we are today. Nature gave us less leeway for mistakes, and so we really had to know what was important in order to survive. Behaving badly could have very serious consequences, and it was essential for a man to have a good set of rules to live by. A sense of personal honor was not a luxury: the man without one was considered a scoundrel and shunned, whereas today the man with one is likely to be considered a fool and shunned.

Today having too many luxuries and comforts tends to cloud our vision and distract us from the basics. Being shielded from the consequences of our bad judgment and our bad behavior makes us careless.

Personally, I believe that success and prosperity need not ruin our values or make us less fit -- provided we compensate for the absence of Nature's discipline with an artificially imposed but no less rigorous discipline. Lacking such a discipline, however, we must expect decay. And certainly, no democratic system is capable of imposing such a discipline upon itself. It will be imposed either naturally, by a drastic change of circumstances, or artificially, by a non-democratic government motivated by a concern for the long-term quality of the race.

A collapse of the American economy to the point where urban populations are starving, rioting, and hunting each other on the streets for food would be a blessing, in that it would teach us forcefully that there are more important things than making the next BMW payment. And perhaps it would make us fit enough to overcome the long-term threats to our race: perhaps it would make us fit while there's still enough of the right stuff left in us to become fit. Unfortunately, I don't have the ability to cause a collapse of the American economy. About all I can do at this time is talk with you about the important things that we ought to be thinking about: the important things that we ought to be guided by instead of the unimportant things that so many of us are preoccupied with today.

Here's a guideline: the things that are important are the things that endure, the things that last, the things that are immortal. A thousand years ago our ancestors in Europe didn't have quite the same notion of the immortal soul that the mainstream Christians do today, but they believed in immortality nevertheless. One of their most often quoted religious sayings, which expresses very concisely their idea of immortality, comes from that part of the Elder Edda known as Havamal. The saying is: "Cattle die, and kinsmen die, and so must one die oneself, but there is one thing I know which never dies, and that is the fame of a dead man's deeds."

Well, that's a little poetic, but it expresses clearly the notion that more lasting, and therefore more important, than our possessions and our friends and our pleasures in life -- even than life itself -- is the reputation that we make for ourselves and our lasting accomplishments. Many things are

implied by this single idea: for example, the conviction that it is better to live an honorable life, to live nobly, than it is to be rich. Or the conviction that it is better to live a useful and purposeful life than merely a comfortable life, and that one's purpose in life -- the purpose or cause to which one consecrates his life -- ought to be something which lasts beyond the life of the individual.

One can consecrate his life to the service of an idea -- an ideology -- and many have done that in the past. But it is better, I think, to serve the race in which an idea is incarnate, the race which gives life to the idea, the immortal race of which the individual is only a mortal part. Much more important than paying our bar bill at the country club is having some influence on the type of world our people will live in a thousand years from now, making some contribution now to that world. That's what gives our lives lasting value. That's what gives us immortality.

What am I saying? This is the Clinton era. Notions like that are entirely out of place in this era of democracy and equality and multiculturalism and feminism. This is the era of Morris Dees and Richard Cohen and the fast buck; the era of the hip-hop culture and Political Correctness. Can you imagine anyone who would vote for Al Gore -- or for George Bush -- having even the faintest understanding of what I've been talking about? This country already was sunk when Bill Clinton was elected President, and no riots or political assassinations resulted. The approval ratings Clinton has had prove that most Americans have no clue as to what's important and what isn't. The idea of consecrating one's life to something which is immortal is wholly alien to them. The average American in the Clinton era believes that if you can't eat it, spend it, or have sex with it, it isn't important. Perhaps he wouldn't state it quite so starkly, but deep inside that's what he really believes. He neither understands nor values anything else.

I don't want to overstate this point. I know that there are many non-average Americans who do understand what I'm talking about, who do value the important things. I receive letters from them every day. These non-average Americans may make up as much as two per cent of the White population. But I also receive letters from some of the other 98 per cent -- from some of those who think of themselves as Democrats or as Republicans. I have had some of these average Americans tell me that I am wrong to be against "diversity" and multiculturalism. Some of them tell me that multiculturalism is a good thing because it adds spice and variety to their lives; they appreciate multiculturalism because it gives them a choice of Vietnamese, Korean, Mexican, Taiwanese, Cantonese, Thai, and various Middle Eastern cuisines all within a block or so the office where they work. Life would be so dull if all they could choose from were American and European cuisines. Others tell me that "diversity" is good for America because it strengthens our economy. Having all of those Mexicans and Salvadorans and other mestizos here to do our farm labor and our dishwashing and all of those Pakistanis and Indians and Chinese here to do the high-tech jobs in Silicon Valley keeps our economy strong and our shopping malls full.

And really, I am sure that these Gore and Bush supporters really believe the things they tell me in their letters. To them it really is more important to be able to titillate their palates with all sorts of exotic cuisines than it is to have a healthy, homogeneous White population, a healthy European culture in America. And keeping the stock market up and the shopping malls full now is more important to them than maintaining White autonomy: more important than being dependent only on our own people in every phase of our economic activity.

So we shouldn't be surprised that nearly all of our lawyers are far more interested in their standing at the country club than they are in things such as freedom. We shouldn't be surprised that the Christian ministers of Idaho are glad to be rid of Richard Butler.

It's a very sad situation for America -- but we still do have that two per cent out there. And let me tell you, whenever I have any sort of interaction with the other 98 per cent, I really appreciate the two per cent who do have some understanding of what's really important. If our race is to survive, it will be because of you. And by the way, if any of the two percent listening now happens to be a lawyer, I'd especially like to hear from you right away. I have something important for you.

Feasting on the Sheep

Well, I knew it was coming -- in fact, I predicted it when I spoke with you more than a year ago about the Jewish extortion campaign against Switzerland. I told you that if the Jews succeeded in sucking the blood they were demanding out of the Swiss, eventually they would come for our blood too. And now they're here, demanding that Americans also pay them back for their losses during the so-called "Holocaust," just the way the Germans and the Swiss and the French and the Dutch and others have been forced to pay them. I made that prediction because I know the Jews. I know that they always will be looking for more victims until they have sucked all of the blood there is to be sucked from this planet, and then they will turn on each other and begin sucking their fellow Jews' blood. They cannot help it. It is their nature to be deceivers and destroyers and bloodsuckers.

And there is some justice in their coming for our blood now. I could even call it poetic justice -- because, after all, we are the ones who helped them suck the blood from others. We held their victims at gunpoint for them. We threatened their victims. It was our government that said to other countries, "Give these poor, innocent, deserving Jews whatever they want from you, or we will make you pay even more." That's what our government said to the Swiss a couple of years ago, when the Jews were demanding Swiss blood. Worse than that, it was America that destroyed the best part of Europe at their behest a little over half a century ago and then turned the rest of Europe over to them so they could suck it dry.

The Germans were the only people in Europe who had pulled the Jews' fangs from their necks and were booting them out of Germany, and so we destroyed Germany for them. And then we turned Poland and the Baltic countries, and Hungary and Serbia, and half a dozen other European countries over to communist rule for 50 years. Every one of those countries behind the Iron Curtain was saddled with a government bureaucracy swarming with Jews, and they sucked the blood of the people for half a century, until there was almost no more blood left to suck and the economies had been dried up. Ten years after the collapse of Jewish communism each of those countries is still dirt poor, still trying to rebuild itself. And the Jews still are sucking blood from Eastern Europe, by forcing thousands of young Russian and Ukrainian girls into the White slave trade, making them work as prostitutes for their Jewish slave owners.

Do you remember how it was a couple of years ago when they began demanding billions of dollars from the Swiss? Swiss banks had kept the money that some Jews had squirreled away in Swiss accounts before the Second World War and then died before they could reclaim their loot, and the big Jewish organizations and the Jewish media were complaining that the money should now be turned over to the Jewish organizations so that they could distribute it to "Holocaust" survivors.

The Swiss were responding, sure some of the dormant accounts in our banks undoubtedly belonged to Jews, but we follow the same rules for dormant Jewish accounts that we follow for dormant non-Jewish accounts. Just prove to us that you are the legitimate heir to an account holder, and we'll give you the money, which in any case totals no more than a few million dollars for all of our dormant Jewish accounts.

So the Clinton administration began applying pressure to the Swiss, threatening to cut off trade with Switzerland and not permit Swiss banks to operate in the United States unless the Swiss coughed up all of the billions of dollars the Jews were demanding. Politicians elected by the American people were falling all over themselves to help the Jews squeeze as much blood as possible from the Swiss. Do you remember that despicable, toadlike Senator Alphonse D'Amato from New York, who was the Jews' principal *shabbos goy,* their principal Gentile step'n'fetchit in applying pressure to the Swiss? Do you remember the threats against the Swiss coming from the White House? You know, it was we who elected every one of those politicians, we who voted for Alphonse D'Amato and Bill Clinton and all the rest who were helping the Jews squeeze the Swiss.

And it was the same thing when the Jews turned on Germany. The Germans already had paid the Jews more than 60 billion dollars in blood money, but the Jews then began yammering that Jews who had been forced to work in the German defense industry during the war still were owed billions of dollars in back wages. So we helped the Jews squeeze the Germans once again.

And then the Jews turned on France. The Jews wailed that when they were chased out of the part of France that was occupied by the Germans during the war, the French government had collaborated with the Germans. So now the French people owed billions of dollars to the Jews to atone for that wartime collaboration. And our government told the French that they had better pay. And then it was the Dutch. And then it was the big multinational insurance companies.

I was quite certain that eventually the Jews would get around to us, and now they have, and no one should be surprised. Do you expect a vampire to give up his diet of fresh blood and begin drinking milk instead, just because the only remaining source of blood happens to be his next-door neighbor?

You know, some people criticize me because I am not polite enough in talking about the Jews. They believe that it is very vulgar of me to refer to the Jews as vampires or bloodsuckers or parasites. They remind me that most Jews wear nice suits and drive nice cars and live in expensive condos -- so they couldn't really be as bad as I say. Many Jews are polite, well educated people -- lawyers and businessmen -- and I really should just stick to the facts, they say, and not resort to name-calling. That's not polite. That's not gentlemanly.

Well, listen, I just wish that some of these gentlemen who think I'm not polite enough would talk about the Jews themselves. They can be as polite as they want. They can stick to the facts and avoid name-calling. I'd love to hear them do that. There are thousands of gentlemen out there who know the facts and also have access to the media. But they're all keeping their mouths shut. They're all afraid that they may be kicked out of the country club if they say anything the Jews don't like, no matter how politely they say it. And since that leaves the burden on me, I'm obliged to try to get the message out as effectively as I can.

I deliberately use colorful language. I deliberately use provocative phrases that I hope will stick in the minds of my listeners. It may be offensive to the gentlemen when I refer to Jews collectively as deceivers and destroyers and bloodsuckers, the way the Great Reformer Martin Luther did, for example. But I believe that the language I use is appropriate and accurate, even if

it is colorful sometimes. Anyway, I'll just give you a few facts and let you decide whether or not "deceiver" or "destroyer" or "bloodsucker" is an accurate description of the Jews as a whole, as a race.

I'll read you just a few sentences from an Associated Press story which came out a little over two weeks ago, on August 28: "In the coming weeks Jewish organizations plan to push for payments from dozens of U.S. corporations that they accuse of using forced labor. . . . 'It's their turn,' said Steinberg." The Steinberg referred to is Elan Steinberg, executive director of the World Jewish Congress. The U.S. corporations are those that the Jews claim had some business relationship with Germany before or during the Second World War, more than half a century ago. Now the Jews are demanding that these companies give money to the Jews because the companies may have made a profit 55 or 60 years ago that came in part from Jewish labor.

That's astounding, isn't it? Listen to what Gideon Taylor, the head Jew in an organization called the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, has to say about it. I quote again from the August 28 Associated Press report: "We are looking at this as an issue to bring up with these companies in September, and we intend to bring it up very firmly and very decisively. The issue is really whether American companies will face up to their responsibility in a way that is moral and proper."

These Jews turned communism loose on the world and destroyed 60 million of our people in Europe -- not to mention the 100,000 young Americans who were killed by communists in Korea and Vietnam. They bled Eastern Europe dry.

They gave gangsta' rap and the hip-hop culture to American kids. Every time you see a 14-year-old White kid wearing baggy shorts and a backward baseball cap, listening to a Black rapper on his Walkman, and trying desperately to act Black, you can thank the Jews in Hollywood.

They gave us race-mixing and multiculturalism and open borders. Whenever you see a White woman with a Black man, remember that it was Jewish lawyers who campaigned against miscegenation laws and eventually overturned them. Whenever you see a group of swarthy Mexican mestizos lounging on a street corner, keep in mind that it was Jews who pushed for the changes in our immigration laws that opened our borders to the Third World.

Jews gave us the 1960s with Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin and Mark Rudd and his Students for a Democratic Society. And at the deepest level they gave us Bill Clinton too. From Jewish Hollywood and Jewish Madison Avenue and the Jewish agitators on our university campuses in the 1960s and 1970s came the values, the attitudes, the mores that made it possible for someone like Bill Clinton to become President of the United States. . . . And they are demanding compensation from us! Can you imagine? That's what they call *chutzpah.*

And if any tender-hearted soul believes that it's unreasonable of me to blame all of them collectively for what their Red Brigades and their Hollywood propagandists have done to our people, just look at the other side of the coin for a moment. When the Jews suck 60 billion dollars in so-called reparations out of Germany, that's a collective tax on all Germans for the benefit of the Jews. When they extort money from the biggest corporations in America, all of us

end up paying for it. If they suck a billion dollars in blood money out of Ford or General Motors -- and you can bet they'll get a lot more than that -- that's just a cost of doing business. Prices go up to compensate, and we pay the Jews: ten dollars from every White American household. When they suck three billion dollars out of our taxes to provide military and economic support for Israel, that's $30 from every White American household.

So it is a collective thing. It is them against us. In fact it is them against the world. The problem is that they understand that, but the world doesn't.

Well, I promised you facts today. I'll give you the facts of a recent court case that illustrates how their system of bloodsucking operates. In Idaho, near Coeur d'Alene, there's a church. It's called "Church of Jesus Christ Christian." Its minister is an 82-year- old retired aircraft engineer named Richard Butler, who came from California to Idaho in 1973, bought 20 acres of rural land, and built a church on it. He's held Sunday services there for the past 27 years. Better known than the church itself is its outreach program, Butler's "Call to the Nation," which is also known by the name "Aryan Nations" and has members in many places outside of Idaho.

Butler preaches a brand of Christianity generally known as "Christian Identity." It's a brand that is at odds with most of the mainstream brands, in that it preaches that Jesus wasn't a Jew and that today's Europeans are related to the Israelites of the Old Testament. It preaches also that today's Jews are interlopers who have no claim on either the Old Testament or the New Testament. Needless to say, this doctrine is not looked on with favor, either by the Jews or by those Christians who believe that the Jews are "God's chosen people." To counter Butler's preaching, the Jews have used their media to demonize Christian Identity and its adherents, portraying them as violent and dangerous "haters."

Now, I don't want to argue religion today. I believe in neither Christian Identity nor any of the mainstream brands. I don't really know Reverend Butler, although I did meet him once 14 or 15 years ago. I have met enough Christian Identity believers over the years, however, to know that most of them are not violent and dangerous. They're a bit more tightly focused on their religion than most mainstream Christians are, but other than that they're pretty normal people.

The Jews' use of their media to create a climate of hate against people like Richard Butler, however, has led to some violence. People incited by this Jewish hatred have made problems for Butler and his church. Two years ago someone tried to burn his church down. Someone shot and then disemboweled his pet German shepherd. People have tried to disrupt his church services. Sometimes hostile crowds incited by Jews with megaphones have gathered outside the gate to the church property. And sometimes Butler's church members have overreacted to this hostility and done foolish things.

On the night of July 1, 1998, a car drove past Butler's church, and two security guards heard what they thought was a shot fired from the car at the church. They hopped in their own car and gave chase, firing several shots from a rifle into the back of the other car in a Wild West scenario and eventually forcing the other car to stop. The man and woman in the car claimed that what the guards thought was a shot was just their car backfiring. After some discussion, the guards let the man and woman go, and the latter promptly went to the police and filed assault charges against

the guards. The guards were arrested, tried, and convicted. And if Reverend Butler had been a mainstream Christian preacher -- or almost anything but a Christian Identity preacher -- that would have been the end of it.

But a badly misnamed organization supported by Jews and leftists, the Southern Poverty Law Center, heard about the case and saw it as a way to silence Butler's preaching and make a lot of money for themselves at the same time. On behalf of the man and woman whose car had been chased, the Southern Poverty Law Center filed a civil suit against Butler and his church, claiming that the pair had been so frightened by the chase that they were suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome, a fancy name for what used to be called shell shock, and that since the security guards had been acting to protect the church, Butler and the church were responsible for their shell shock.

The two principal actors in the Southern Poverty Law Center are Morris Dees and Richard Cohen. They make their living by filing ruinous lawsuits against organizations and individuals that their Jewish supporters hate, and then collecting donations from those supporters. I ought to know: five years ago they sued me, and although they won only an $85,000 judgment for their purported client, they raised for themselves nearly $10 million in donations from their supporters by sending out fund appeals while they were suing me. This sort of behavior is called "barratry" by the legal profession, and it used to be illegal. Today barratry is winked at by our corrupt and politicized courts if it is for a Politically Correct cause.

Nine days ago a jury in Coeur d'Alene decided that Butler and his church must pay more than $5 million to the man and woman who were frightened by the security guards. The value of Butler's church and his other property is estimated at $200,000. After the verdict Morris Dees crowed to the media: "We intend to take every single asset of Aryan Nations now and forever. We even intend to take the name of Aryan Nations and close that sad chapter in the history of Idaho." Really, there was never any pretense during the trial that it was a claim for damages; everyone understood that the aim was to bankrupt Butler and his church, to stop Butler's preaching, and to intimidate other Christian Identity churches. All of the statements of the politicians and the media people, and the spokesmen for Idaho's various "human relations councils" and other leftist organizations, both during and after the trial, also expressed the same view: it is good that Butler has been silenced, they all said. He is a "hater" according to Morris Dees and the Jewish media. His religion is not Politically Correct. So let's shut him up. That's what the trial was about.

So how did this happen in America, where we're supposed to be free to express our opinions and to preach any religion we want, whether anyone else likes it or not? I'll tell you how.

First, it wasn't just Morris Dees and Richard Cohen. They're a couple of bottom-feeding shysters, a couple of barrators always on the prowl for opportunities to enrich themselves, but they couldn't do any damage in a healthy society. This happened because a corrupt judge in a totally corrupt court system and a totally brainwashed and feminized jury -- a nearly all-White, though mostly female jury -- were eager to prove their Political Correctness. They all were eager to show their agreement with the lynch mob rather than risk having the lynch mob turn on them. And the lynch mob are the people who decide what is Politically Correct and what is not and then use their finely honed psychological skills to persuade the TV-bred lemmings that all of

their peers already are on the bandwagon and will think ill of them if they don't climb on too -- you know who those people are.

I'll just hit the key elements here once more: First, we have a population of lemmings, unable to think for themselves, who always follow the crowd. There's not much we can do about that. Human populations everywhere consist mostly of lemmings. That's the way Nature designed things.

Second: the strong individuals among our people who should be shepherding the lemmings in healthy directions and setting the moral tone for all of us have themselves gone astray. They have become soft and self-indulgent. They have forgotten their responsibility to provide leadership. We need to awaken them and remind them of their duty.

And third, seeing that the shepherds had left their posts or fallen asleep, the vampires moved in to feast on blood. The Jews took over Hollywood, over Madison Avenue, over television, over our popular music industry, over our principal newspapers and magazines; and, using this media weapon to control the lemmings and corrupt our government, our courts, and our other institutions, they began feasting. We need to begin shooting vampires.

But we haven't yet done what we need to do. That's why the lemmings think it's just fine that the Jews were able to silence Richard Butler and take his church away from him. That's why the Jews certainly will succeed in bleeding Ford and General Motors and dozens of other American companies of billions of dollars in reparations for the Second World War, while the lemmings look on approvingly. So let's get started on what we need to do.

The Corrupters

May I be cynical for a few minutes? I hope you don't mind, but with the great democratic ritual of choosing a new President coming up in just a few days now, I can't resist the urge to make a few cynical comments.

Of course, it's not just the current Presidential campaign which is the cause for my cynicism. Have you been watching the senatorial campaign in New York? Have you noticed how Mrs. Clinton and the Republican candidate, Rick Lazio, have been falling over one another in their eagerness to apply their lips to the posterior of the Jewish vote?

You certainly have seen what's been going on in Palestine during the past few weeks. Even on American television, which always censors out the most atrocious behavior of the Jews and tries to present the news in the light most favorable to them, the basic pattern has been clear enough: Palestinians have been throwing rocks at the Jews, and the Jews have been shooting and killing Palestinians. Nearly all of those killed over there have been Palestinians. The Jewish news media over here portray the conflict as "Israelis responding to Palestinian violence," in the sense of cops responding to robbers, but it's clear to anyone with eyes and a brain where most of the violence is coming from.

And it's clear how the violence got started again. The most hated Jewish politician over there, Ariel Sharon, deliberately provoked it. When he was in the Israeli military, Sharon used to send his troops into Palestinian villages and refugee camps to butcher unarmed civilians. That sort of behavior helped win him the votes of the raving-mad Orthodox Jews, who bob their heads up and down while praying at the "Wailing Wall" for their tribal god Yahweh to kill all the Gentiles and turn the world over to them, as he promised them 3,000 years ago.

Sharon is no longer an active-duty Israeli general, but he still knows how to win Jewish votes. He showed up at the Temple Mount in Jerusalem back at the beginning of the month with a huge contingent of armed bodyguards and Jewish secret police thugs, who chased away the Moslems who were praying in the mosque there. He swaggered around a bit, expressed his contempt for Moslems in general and Palestinians in particular, and left, but that was enough to infuriate Palestinians and provoke Palestinian boys into throwing rocks at Jewish soldiers, who responded by shooting them dead. Sharon's popularity among religious Jews immediately shot up.

During the fighting a Lebanese militia took three Jewish soldiers as prisoners, and the Jewish media over here immediately began talking about "kidnapped" Jews. When armed soldiers are captured by an opposing armed force in a combat situation, the proper term is "prisoners of war," not "kidnap victims," but the people who put the spin on our news figured "kidnap victims" would be more likely to get sympathy from Americans. They want us to feel sorry for the Israeli soldiers who are shooting Palestinian children rather than for the children who are being shot.

Well, all of that's a pretty transparent situation, and, even if it keeps the couch potatoes fooled, certainly both Mr. Lazio and Mrs. Clinton are smart enough to see through it. They understand what's going on over there in Palestine. They know who the aggressors are; they know who the

thieves, the butchers, the torturers, the child killers are. And yet they both grovel for the votes of the Jews over here, who support the activities of the Jews in Palestine. They pretend to believe whatever the Jews tell them. They pretend to be indignant when the United Nations asks the Jews to stop killing Palestinian children. They pretend to believe that the Jews are inoffensive and innocent and are being picked on by wicked Palestinians.

And, really, Rick Lazio and Hillary Clinton are not atypical. The fact that these two are campaigning in New York brings the Jewish issue to the fore in their campaign, of course, but the truth of the matter is that every politician in Washington also would grovel for Jewish votes in the same way. The whole system has become corrupt in its very essence.

Now, I'll tell you what I was thinking about while watching a recent Lazio-Clinton debate. Of course, I felt a certain sense of shame, of embarrassment. Neither Rick Lazio nor Hillary Clinton is a Jew. They are, unfortunately, a part of our people. We are responsible for them. But -- and this is the important point -- the Jews are responsible in a very general sort of way, for the fact that people so lacking in character and integrity are political candidates, and that one of them will end up in the U.S. Senate.

We always have had both bad and good men and women among our own people. We always have had crooks and swindlers and con men and liars and traitors. We have had manipulators and fast-buck artists and lawyers and child molesters among our own people. But it wasn't often that we chose the fast-buck artists and the swindlers to govern us and make our laws. At least, we were less likely to choose such people before we let the Jews take over our news and entertainment media and begin controlling the opinions and attitudes of the lemmings, of the electorate. Before that, not every candidate for public office was a crook.

One other thing for which we ourselves are responsible is having a type of government which is a natural breeding ground for con men and liars. The Jews didn't do that to us. In fact, all Jews were banned from Britain during the period when the parliamentary form of government developed there, during the 14th, 15th, 16th, and first half of the 17th century. Edward I sent them all packing in 1290, because they were causing too much dissension and were involved in too much mischief in his kingdom, and it was more than 350 years later when Oliver Cromwell, deranged by a Puritan infatuation with the Old Testament, permitted them to start trickling back in. And, of course, the rat's nest of a system we have in Washington now grew out of the English parliamentary system.

And so we cannot blame the Jews for the fact that we have many fools and many knaves among our own people, and we cannot blame them for the fact that we have a system of government which is so susceptible to corruption: a system in which fools are allowed to vote and knaves are allowed to hold office. So this weakness, this susceptibility to manipulation and corruption, was inherent in us even without the intervention of the Jews. But you know, the Jews have an amazing talent for sniffing out weaknesses in others and then figuring how to turn those weaknesses to their own advantage.

And really, that is what makes the Jews special. That is what has made them more hated than any other race by all the peoples among whom they have dwelled throughout recorded history. Jews

aren't hated just because they think they're God's chosen people. There are other tribes which also have delusions of grandeur. The Chinese, for example, believe that they are racially superior to the other Asiatic peoples around them. And perhaps they are, but who cares, except the Chinese?

And the Jews aren't hated just because they shoot Palestinian children or go on throat-cutting rampages in refugee camps. Other tribes also have murderous reputations: the Turks, for example. And the Jews aren't hated just because there are even more fast-buck artists among them than among us, or because they have stickier fingers than most. The Gypsies have a similar reputation, and although no one wants to have Gypsies around, they don't often inspire the intense hatred that Jews do.

Jews are hated, first and foremost, because they are corrupters. They are hated, by those who are aware of what they are doing, because they involve us in their dirty business. They are hated because, instead of doing their own dirty work, like the Chinese or the Turks or the Gypsies, they deceive and manipulate us into doing it for them. They get us to support them in their murder of Palestinian children. They make us pay for it, they make us supply the weapons, and they make our government express approval of it.

The Chinese or the Turks or the Gypsies may endanger our property or our security or our economic well-being, but the Jews endanger our souls. Other aliens exploit us only externally; the Jews, like an especially insidious disease organism, get inside us and change the way we think and behave in order to make us easier prey for them to exploit.

A few days ago someone sent me an excerpt from a Jewish book published in 1988 by Basic Books in New York. The title is *Born Guilty: Children of Nazi Families.* It was written by a Jew in Germany, Peter Sichrovsky, and it is in effect a survey of the extent to which the compulsory brainwashing program imposed on Germans after the Second World War has been successful. It consists of the transcripts of a series of interviews with young Germans conducted by the Jew. Unfortunately, the brainwashing program has been very successful, and between the lines of the book one can read the author's gloating over the Jews' accomplishment in making young Germans hate their parents and grandparents and feel guilty for being German, although in typically Jewish fashion he complains that the Germans don't feel guilty enough.

It was Jews, of course, who designed the truly satanic, soul-destroying programs of so-called "denazification" and "reeducation" which were imposed on the German people. It has been at Jewish insistence that laws have been enacted in Germany and Austria making it a penal offense to contradict or even question any detail of the Jewish "Holocaust" story or to suggest that the Jews themselves were in any way to blame for their lack of popularity in Germany before the war. Making it illegal to oppose the brainwashing has been a factor in its effectiveness, of course. Locking people up for reading the "wrong" sort of books or listening to the "wrong" sort of music helps to keep other Germans in line. Banning political parties in Germany that fail to follow the Jewish party line helps too. And all of this has made it a little easier, no doubt, to suck the 70 billion or so dollars in reparations the Jews have extracted from the Germans since the war.

But this uniquely Jewish mode of parasitism has robbed the Germans of infinitely more than money. It has corrupted their souls -- and deliberately so. In the old days when someone won a war he collected tribute from the conquered nation. He made them pay. But he didn't meddle with their souls. He didn't try to corrupt them spiritually. He left them free to be themselves, to feel and think whatever they wanted, so long as they paid the tribute demanded of them. But with the Jews, corrupting the victim is the ***main*** thing. And they are uniquely equipped for corruption by having a faculty for deception that is so far above that of any other people that it really must be considered different in kind as well as in degree.

In the book I just cited, *Born Guilty,* the Jewish author Sichrovsky writes:

It is no accident that I, a Jew, someone not burdened by past guilt, should have tackled the question of how these descendants of the perpetrators came to terms with the problem.

The arrogance of that statement -- "I, a Jew, someone not burdened by past guilt" -- is really breathtaking. Sichrovsky, like most Jews, accepts the idea of collective guilt, of racial guilt passed from one generation to the next: "Your Nazi grandparents persecuted us Jews, so you owe us!" Which is to say, the Jews accept the idea of ***other*** races being guilty; they certainly don't accept the idea of their own guilt. You know, one of the principal reasons the Germans didn't like Jews and wanted them out of Germany in the 1930s was based on the Jews' support of communism, on the Jews' espousal of the doctrine of their fellow Jew, Marx. The Germans knew what the Jews were doing to the Ukrainians and the Russians under communism, and they didn't want the Jews doing it to them too. They knew that the communists were implementing the Jewish doctrine of egalitarianism -- they were equalizing Ukraine and Russia -- by murdering wholesale the best Ukrainians and the best Russians. The Germans knew about the mass executions being carried out in Russia by the communists. They knew about the death camps, the slave-labor camps. They knew who were running these death camps. They knew who the commissars were. And believe me, Sichrovsky knows too -- and yet he piously writes, "I, a Jew, someone not burdened by past guilt. . . ."

Pious fraud: that is something for which they have a unique talent. The chief actor in the pious fraud racket in the United States is the professional "survivor" Elie Wiesel. Wiesel gets $25,000 plus expenses each time he consents to lay a little collective guilt on a Gentile audience, and he does it fairly often. With a sad -- really a mournful -- expression on his terribly Jewish face, he spins his fairy tales about how those awful Nazis persecuted and mistreated him and all of the other innocent, inoffensive, sensitive, caring Jews: people not burdened by past guilt. And he never cracks a smile or shows a trace of embarrassment. And the hypnotized idiots in his audience lap it all up. Wiesel is a corrupter of souls. And he is only one of many.

For decades the most influential and revered Orthodox Jew in New York was Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson: the so-called Lubavitcher Rebbe and hereditary leader of the Chabad movement. Every politician in New York, Jew or Gentile, genuflected to the good rabbi. Schneerson died in 1992, but Hillary and Rick and the rest still pay tribute to him, expressing admiration for his wisdom and his piety. As a matter of fact, throughout his career Schneerson preached the hatred of all non-Jews that is inherent in Judaism. Other Orthodox Jews, such as Al Gore's vice-presidential candidate Joseph Lieberman, are reticent about the more invidious aspects of their religion; in fact, they will simply lie to you about it if you question them. But

Rabbi Schneerson wasn't reticent at all. He spelled it out for his followers in his lectures and his writings. He taught that non-Jews are sub-human, that they are like cattle, created by the Jewish god Yahweh only to serve the Jews. He taught this explicitly, openly, over a period of many years.

I'll quote directly from one of Rabbi Schneerson's lectures. This is taken from a book of his lectures published in Israel in1965. The English title of the book is *Gatherings of Conversations:*

This is what needs to be said about the body: the body of a Jewish person is of a totally different quality from the body of a member of any other nation of the world . . . . The Jewish body looks as if it were in substance similar to the bodies of non-Jews, but . . . the bodies only seem to be similar in material substance, outward look, and superficial quality. The difference of the inner quality, however, is so great that the bodies should be considered as completely different species. This is the reason why the Talmud states that there is an halachic difference in attitude about the bodies of non-Jews. . . . Their bodies are in vain. . . . An even greater difference exists in regard to the soul. Two contrary types of soul exist. A non-Jewish soul comes from three satanic spheres, while the Jewish soul comes from holiness.

And there's much, much more in the same vein, although reading Rabbi Schneerson's lectures is not easy. Like the Talmud, they are full of hair-splitting, lawyer-like quibbling and references to obscure authorities. If you spend much time reading the Talmud and ask yourself what kind of people could be governed by such a strange religion, you'll likely come to the same conclusion both Rabbi Schneerson and I have come to: the Jews and we really are completely different species.

The Jews of the *New York Times* and all of the other Jews covered for Schneerson, of course. No one ever denounced his teaching or called him a "hater." Instead, he always was praised as a sort of living saint. And as I said, the Gentile politicians like Hillary Clinton and Rick Lazio, who really know better, still genuflect whenever his name is mentioned. And the Jews play right along. What contempt they must have for us! How easy it is to deceive us!

And how easy it is to bleed us! When a U.S. Navy destroyer, the USS *Cole,* was attacked in the Red Sea last week and nearly 20 American sailors were killed, not one government official was willing to place the blame where it belonged. Mr. Clinton's Jewish secretary of defense was on television promising that he would search to the ends of the earth to find and punish the people responsible for the attack.

Hey, Mr. Cohen! You don't have to search that far to find those responsible for the deaths of our sailors. The Jews have been murdering Palestinian children for the past three weeks, with the support of your government. The Jews have been firing rockets into Palestinian apartment buildings from helicopter gun ships supplied to Israel by your Defense Department. Last week 70 U.S. senators signed a resolution of support for this sort of Jewish behavior. That was the Senate of which you used to be a member before you became Secretary of Defense. It was you who sent the USS *Cole* into harm's way in order to maintain a blockade of Iraq: a blockade which in no way serves American interests but which is demanded by Jews because Iraq is an enemy of Israel. Mr. Clinton came on television and said that our ship wasn't on a hostile mission. You certainly understand, Mr. Cohen, even if Mr. Clinton doesn't, that blockading

another country with a warship is a hostile action: it is an act of war. Did you really expect all of the non-Jewish people of the Middle East being victimized by the United States acting on behalf of the Jews to simply sit on their hands forever and let themselves continue to be victimized?

No, you really didn't expect that, did you, Mr. Cohen? You knew that eventually the victims of your government's policies would fight back. But you didn't really care, so long as Jews didn't get killed. You and your fellow Jews, both in this country and in Israel, are responsible for the attack on the USS *Cole*, and you know it. But still you go on television and refer to the attack as an act of terrorism and the attackers as cowards. Two brave men stand at attention as they willingly sacrifice their lives in order to strike a blow for their people in the only way they can, and you call them cowards and terrorists!

Ah, Mr. Cohen, you and your fellow Jews really do have contempt for our intelligence, don't you? One of these days we will make you understand that there are a few of us who aren't lemmings, a few of us who can see with our own eyes and hear with our own ears and figure things out for ourselves. That will be the day when we begin settling the score with those who have been deceiving and corrupting and bleeding our people for so long.

There Will Be Hell to Pay

I've spoken with you on several occasions about the international White-slave trade: that is, the enslavement of White girls and women from eastern Europe who are lured to Israel under false pretenses and forced into prostitution by Jewish organized-crime gangs from the former Soviet Union. I have pointed out that the White-slave business flourishes in Israel because in that country slavery is not illegal, as long as the slaves aren't Jews. White slavery is, in fact, sanctioned by the Jewish religion.

There are several aspects of this Jewish trade in White women in addition to forced prostitution in Israel that we still haven't discussed: child pornography, for example. And a few weeks ago I mentioned the child-prostitution operation in Brazil being run from the Israeli consulate there. Brazilian girls as young as 10 years old were being recruited to entertain Israeli tourists at sex parties in the consulate. That, fortunately, got excellent coverage in Brazilian newspapers, although there wasn't a word about it in U.S. newspapers. The Jews have a tighter grip on the news media in the United States than almost anywhere else in the world and are quite successful at keeping most Americans from hearing about their shenanigans.

One affair that has been getting some news coverage in Italy and a few other places in Europe during the past few days, though not at all in the United States, is the breakup of a child-pornography ring operating in Moscow, which sells videotapes, CDs, and digital video discs to wealthy customers around the world through the Internet. On Wednesday of last week Italian police raided 600 homes of wealthy Italians and seized child pornography that had been purchased from suppliers in Moscow. At the same time, the three Jews who ran the business were arrested in Moscow.

Child pornography is an almost unimaginably filthy business. I'm not talking about videos of well-developed 15- or 16-year-old girls having sex. I'm talking about things so perverse and sickening that most Americans can't imagine them. I'm talking about men being filmed having sex with two- and three-year-old girls. I'm talking about small children -- White children -- being sexually tortured and raped to death in front of a camera for the titillation of the sick freaks who are sexually excited by such horrors.

The freaks, I am sorry to say, are not all Jews, although Jews are disproportionately represented among them. The majority of them, in fact, are Gentiles. I don't know what makes people become so perverse that they enjoy watching a film of a five-year-old girl being raped and sexually tortured. I think that in many cases, perhaps the majority of cases, it is not so much a sexual thing as it is a manifestation of the extreme individualism which has been promoted by the media ever since the Second World War: that's the egoistic mind-set which holds that the individual can and should do whatever gratifies him, that he has no obligation to anyone or anything but himself, that he is the only thing in the universe that matters, that his gratification should not be limited by any moral or community or racial considerations. These jaded, individualist freaks get a buzz out of seeing or doing what is beyond the pale. If they can pay $20,000 for a video of a little girl being raped to death, they have proved to themselves that they

are special, that they are like gods, that they are not held back by the moral constraints that bind ordinary mortals.

My view is that such people should simply be killed on the spot whenever and wherever they are found. More than that, the people who promote and encourage this extreme individualist mind-set through their control of the media should be exterminated root and branch as a class. Does that sound extreme?

Well, let me read you a few sentences from a Reuters news dispatch. This is datelined Naples, Italy, September 27:

Police said on Wednesday they had arrested eight Italians suspected of belonging to a child-pornography ring that traded videos over the Internet, including films of Russian children who were abused to death. Police specializing in Internet crime told reporters that their 19-month investigation had given them enough information to begin investigations into 1,700 people suspected of buying the material over the web. . . .

They said three people in Moscow ran an operation to kidnap children from orphanages, circuses, and public parks and film them while they were forced to commit sexual acts. Police said they had intercepted some 3,000 tapes and CDs and digital video discs of child pornography, including some involving children only several months old. The packages were intercepted at the Italian border when they arrived by mail and were repacked. They were then delivered to the addressees by undercover police officers disguised as postal workers and carrying hidden cameras.

"Three people in Moscow" ran the operation: three members of a Jewish organized crime gang. And because they were Jews, you didn't see the news on American television or read about it in most U.S. newspapers. In fact it was just a fluke that any news at all of this Jewish operation was allowed to be published. A few courageous Italian newsmen -- and I mean real Italians, not Jews residing in Italy -- took the extraordinary step of televising some horrifying excerpts from the Jewish videos the day after the raids. In a news report viewed by 11 million Italians the newsmen bypassed the regular TV news directors and broadcast on prime-time television video footage showing Russian children being raped, tortured, and killed. This was on Thursday of last week. Have you seen or heard even a word about it here in the United States? I doubt it.

Immediately after the Italian TV broadcasts last Thursday, the Jewish TV news director of the government-run television network, Gad Lerner, came on the air and apologized to the powers that be, explaining that the material had been included in the news program without his knowledge, and the Italian news executives who had made the decision to broadcast the shocking video footage were forced to resign. But the beans had been spilled, and after that even the Associated Press felt obliged to report something about the affair.

I'll read now from an Associated Press report of September 29, two days after the police raids and the day after the Italian TV news exposure of the affair:

. . . [P]olice said they had broken up an online international child pornography ring, arrested eight Italians and three Russians, and seized thousands of videos and photographs. The Russian-run ring, which distributed an explicit catalog on the Internet, catered to clients in the United States, Germany, and Italy. Its inventory included films of children being tortured and killed. . . . Investigators say the pornography ring produces and distributes images showing children as young as two years old being sexually abused. Some of the victims reportedly were stolen from orphanages, others from families. Its catalog offers films of killings for about $20,000 and images of people having sex with children for about half that.

Twenty thousand dollars for a film of a little blonde, blue-eyed Russian girl being raped to death; 1,700 customers for such films. Well, I guess there must be some pretty rich Jewish filmmakers in Moscow. And you haven't heard a word about any of it before my broadcast today, have you? Can you imagine what it would have been like if real Russians instead of Jewish gangsters had been kidnapping and murdering little Jewish children in Moscow so they could film the murders and sell copies of the film to rich Gentile perverts? It would have been non-stop news through every news medium in America. Bill Clinton and Madeleine Albright would have been on television grimly warning the Russian government that it must do more to catch the Gentiles responsible and to protect the Jews from them. The Jews would be moaning about the "Holocaust" again and holding out their hands for reparations from the Russian government.

You know, the Jews have complained for centuries about what they call the "blood libel." "Blood libel" is the blanket name they have applied to all the many reports which have repeatedly cropped up, over hundreds of years, in every nation of Europe, from England to Russia: reports of Jews kidnapping Gentile children and ritually murdering them. The 14th century English writer, Geoffrey Chaucer, told in his *Canterbury Tales* the story of little Hugh of Lincoln, reportedly kidnapped and ritually murdered by Jews in England 150 years earlier. Shortly after that murder, King Edward I expelled all of the Jews from England. The reports of Jewish ritual murders were still coming in from other countries throughout the 19th century, 600 years after the murder of Hugh of Lincoln.

The Jews have denied all of these reports, claiming that they were the work of Christian anti-Semites who just wanted to stir up hatred against them. And I must confess to you, I have tended to believe the Jews rather than the Christians in this matter of "blood libel." I have asked myself, "What would the Jews have to gain by ritually murdering Gentile children? Why would they take such a terrible risk of being found out and punished, as they were in England?" Well, of course, that's not taking into account the absolutely breathtaking arrogance of the Jews: *chutzpah* they call it. And now I am forced to reconsider my former judgment on the matter of Jewish ritual murder.

I mean, what is this business of Jewish gangsters kidnapping Russian children from orphanages or snatching them from public parks in Moscow or St. Petersburg when their parents aren't looking and then sexually torturing them to death in front of a camera if not ritual murder? Of course, these days the Jews usually don't have to scream about "blood libel" when they're caught committing these horrible atrocities, because they usually are able to keep the news suppressed. I suspect that if you ask your favorite Jewish media boss why this report of the police raids in Italy

and the arrest of the child-pornographers in Moscow didn't get more news coverage in the United States, he'll tell you that such news would only generate hatred against the Jews.

And you know, he'd be right. If there's any group of people on this planet who have valid reasons for hating the Jews it's the Russians: the real Russians, not the so-called "Russians" you occasionally hear the media here mention when they're reporting on organized crime in Russia. Those aren't Russians; they're Jews living in Russia. The Jews bled Russia dry with 70 years of Marxist rule and murdered tens of millions of Russians -- the best Russians -- in the communist slave labor camps or in the basements of the secret police headquarters or beside the shooting pits in forests all over Russia and Ukraine; they have forced thousands of the prettiest young Russian women into prostitution and slavery after the fall of communism; and now they kidnap Russian children and rape and sexually torture them to death in front of a camera in order to make child-porn films for rich perverts in the West. The Jews are lucky they still control most of the television and other mass media in Russia -- because if the Russian people ever are fully awakened to what the Jews are still doing to them, they will rise up and kill every Jew in Russia -- every Jew -- and they will be fully justified in doing so.

And I'll tell you what I'm going to do without waiting for that to happen. I'm going to gather, publish, and distribute every piece of historical evidence I can find relating to Jewish ritual murders during the past 800 years or so. I'll publish a book on the subject. It'll be the best, most accurate, and most complete account of Jewish ritual murders I can make it. I'll advertise it and sell it in Russia and everywhere else. It might take me two or three months to get the book into print, but I'll tell you when I do. And meanwhile, those of you who have access to the Internet or to a large library, look up for yourself the news reports I've cited today about this Jew-run ring of child pornographers in Russia. That's the September 27 Reuters report and the September 29 Associated Press report. Read them and tell everyone you know about them. You might also send a letter to both these news agencies and ask them why they persist in referring to Jewish organized criminals in Russia as "Russians" instead of as Jews.

You know, there are some things I really get steamed about, and this business of kidnapping and raping and murdering little White children for the amusement of rich perverts and the enrichment of Jewish filmmakers is one of those things. And listen: don't try to tell me that this is just a few Jews who do such things, that most Jews aren't responsible for such horrible atrocities.

But they certainly are responsible, because the ones who don't run the child-porn business cover for the ones who do. This latest story of the child-porn raids in Italy last week will never be generally known in the United States, of course. The lemmings won't know about it, because they won't hear about it from Tom Brokaw or Dan Rather, and Oprah certainly won't be talking about it. Only those of you who listen to these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts, and a few tens of thousands of other independent thinkers, out of 275 million Americans, will ever hear about it.

But if by some miracle this affair were pounded into the consciousness of the American lemmings -- if, for example, some of those 11 million Italians who saw on television last week a few unforgettable images from the seized child-porn films have enough contact with Italians in America to make it difficult for the media bosses here to keep the lid on the news -- if that

happens, the mainstream Jews will cover for their brethren in the child-porn business. Jewish solidarity will prevail, and we'll be hearing all of the respectable Jews, from Al Gore's buddy Joe Lieberman, "the conscience of the Senate," down to the Jewish news director at your local television station, moaning about "blood libel." They will cover for each other, and that's why child pornography is still a billion-dollar business.

That's why tens of thousands of the prettiest young White women from eastern Europe are still forced to work as prostitutes in Israel and elsewhere. It's because the Jews cover for each other. That's why little Russian girls are being kidnapped and raped in front of video cameras. It's because the Jews who are not actually in the child-porn business themselves cover for the ones who are. It's why little Russian girls will continue to be kidnapped and raped to death in the future, even after the arrest of the three Jewish ringleaders in Moscow last week.

If the people in the news media gave this affair the coverage it deserves, just as a news story, the public would demand such severe action that child pornography no longer would be a profitable business for Jews or anyone else. Even the politicians would insist on a crackdown. But the bosses of the news media will not give this affair any coverage at all, because they know who the guilty parties are, and they are determined to protect those guilty parties, who are their fellow Jews.

I'll say that again: instead of news coverage we get only silence from the media here in the United States. The rich perverts in the United States who were among the customers of those Jews in Moscow will be permitted to continue building their video collections of child pornography without interference or publicity. And you know as well as I do why there has been only silence from the mass media in the United States: it's certainly not because the breakup of this operation in Italy last week isn't newsworthy; it's not because the American public wouldn't be interested; it's not because there's any doubt about the facts: it is because child pornography is essentially a Jewish business, and the news media who should be exposing it are controlled by Jews who cover for their fellow Jews. That is why I hold them all responsible -- and not just the Jews, but also those of our own people who collaborate with the Jews and make excuses for the Jews.

And it's why I recently have begun reexamining the whole subject of Jewish ritual murder -- because, you know, it worked in the past the same way it works today. Some little group of Jewish perverts or Jewish religious fanatics carrying out some hate-filled injunction in the Talmud gets caught for murdering a Gentile child, and the other Jews try to buy off the authorities. That's the way it was in 1913 when Leo Frank raped and murdered little Mary Phagan in his Atlanta pencil factory. He was caught, tried, convicted, and sentenced to die, but his fellow Jews paid off the governor of Georgia and had his sentence commuted. I have no doubt at all that if the citizens of Georgia had not taken the matter into their own hands and hanged Frank themselves, he eventually would have received a pardon and been released.

Well, despite their bad luck with Mary Phagan and perhaps also their bad luck with little Hugh of Lincoln, the Jews are surprisingly confident about their ability to get away with everything. Certainly, they have gotten away with vastly more than they have been punished for. But, you know, their luck will change one of these days, and then there will be hell to pay. They thought

they had Italian television news safely under their control, and then a few rebellious Italian newsmen blew the whistle on them last week and gave 11 million Italians an eyeful of what the Jews in Moscow have been up to.

They believe they have the news media in America so tightly under their control that the American lemmings never will have a clue. Well, they have kept the American lemmings from learning anything at all about the child-porn bust in Moscow last week, but they also had a bit of bad luck in Palestine last week, when a courageous French cameraman caught on film their deliberate, cold-blooded, sadistic murder of a Palestinian child. That made such a ruckus in Europe that even some of the Jewish media in the United States felt obliged to carry it -- briefly.

Did you see it? A 12-year-old Palestinian boy, returning from the market with his father had the misfortune of passing near a group of Israeli soldiers who were shooting at some young Palestinians who had thrown rocks at the soldiers. The rock-throwers were able to take cover, so the Israelis took out their hatred of Palestinians on the boy and his father. As the two unarmed Palestinians crouched against a concrete wall and begged for their lives, the Jewish soldiers deliberately pumped four bullets into the boy, killing him. They also shot the father, who survived. And when a Palestinian ambulance arrived on the scene, the Jews shot and killed the ambulance driver. And the French cameraman filmed it all.

And you know how the news media in America reported last week's clash between the Palestinians and the Jews? They said: "Israeli soldiers responded to Palestinian violence." Really! "Israeli soldiers responded to Palestinian violence."

Well, as I said, one of these days there will be hell to pay, and that day can't come too soon.

Down the Slippery Slope

I've had many comments on the program in which I told you about the breakup of a child-pornography ring in Moscow which kidnapped Russian children, raped and sexually tortured them in front of cameras, and then sold videos of the activity to wealthy perverts in the West. In some of the videos, children were raped and tortured to death. Many listeners who contacted me were frustrated because they were unable to locate the news sources on the Internet which I cited during my broadcast. I myself was surprised at the almost total blackout of this important story in the United States, especially in view of the fact that many of the customers of this child-pornography ring live in this country -- or perhaps that's why the blackout was so nearly complete here.

But information is available to those who know how to look for it. In addition to the media sources I cited earlier, there were a couple of other reports, which I have become aware of since my broadcast. There was a September 29 Reuters report from Moscow, revealing that two of the three men arrested there already had been released by the police. Can you imagine turning people loose who were involved in that sort of activity? It certainly sounds as if the people who kidnapped, raped, and tortured Russian children have some powerful friends. That September 29 Reuters report, by the way, is in addition to the September 27 Reuters report from Naples I quoted during the broadcast.

And in London the October 1 issue of the *Guardian* published a reasonably detailed story. The *Guardian* newspaper has a web site -- guardianunlimited.co.uk -- where you can view the story. The *Guardian* news report contains one interesting piece of information of which I previously was unaware: most of the kidnapped Russian children, says the *Guardian*, were little boys rather than little girls. I had just assumed that they were all little girls. So if the *Guardian* is correct, then most of the wealthy perverts in the West who kept this filthy business going with their money are homosexuals. That may be another reason, besides the Jewish domination of organized crime in Russia and the Jewish domination of the media here, why this story was blacked out so thoroughly.

One of these days I'll have to do a broadcast on the homosexual brotherhood, the homosexual mafia -- and on the phenomenon of homosexuality. If homosexuals were merely men confused about their sexuality, such a broadcast wouldn't be worthwhile. But there is, unfortunately, much more to it. Homosexuals are profoundly abnormal people, and their abnormality, their sickness affects much more than their preference in sexual partners. They have an abnormal way of looking at the world, an abnormal way of thinking, in which sexual sadism and other things that are abhorrent to normal people become attractive. They really aren't just like normal people except for their sexual orientation. People who believe that homosexuals ought to be allowed to be scout leaders or school teachers need to be worked over with an oak table leg and then sentenced to 20 years of hard labor in order to straighten out their thinking. Well, we'll talk about that another time.

Sometimes when a person is suffering from a disease it may be helpful to him if he can examine another person who has had the same disease for a longer time and is showing the symptoms to a

greater degree. In this way he may at least have some forewarning of what to expect as his own disease runs its course.

Britain -- the United Kingdom -- is probably between five and ten years further down the slippery slope of Political Correctness than the United States is. Three hundred years ago many of the independent-minded types left Britain and came to the North American colonies, while the more docile and obedient folks stayed in Britain. This is reflected today in a greater degree of authoritarianism among the descendants of those who stayed home than in the descendants of those who came to the colonies. Which is to say, there is an even higher percentage of lemmings in England today than in the United States.

In view of this, it is not surprising that the program initiated 60 or so years ago to convert the entire planet into a global plantation under the benevolent dominion of the Chosen few and their superrich allies in the multinational corporations has made a little more progress on some fronts in the United Kingdom than in the United States. On the political front, I suppose we've sunk to about the same level. Over here we have Bill Clinton, and over there they have Tony Blair, who is approximately as great an embarrassment to real Englishmen as Bill Clinton is to real Americans. Over here our government is packed full of Jews, but the same is true over there.

On the demographic front we seem at first glance to be worse off than they are. About 30 per cent of our population is non-White compared to only 7 per cent of theirs. But that's deceptive. In 1950 our population was only 10 per cent non-White, and virtually all of those were descendants of Black slaves we failed to dispose of properly when slavery was abolished here after the Civil War. So the percentage of non-Whites in the United States has tripled since the Second World War. But there were practically no non-Whites in Britain before the Second World War. They all have come flooding in since the breakup of the British Empire in the 1950s. Many urban areas in England today are as heavily polluted by non-Whites as the worst urban areas in America, and the growth of multiculturalism in England probably has been more of a cultural and psychological shock for the English than the equivalent phenomenon has been for Americans.

At the same time, however, many of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom are taking to multiculturalism with a disgusting degree of lemming like enthusiasm. There is a limp-wristed variety of very fashionable educated English ladies and gentlemen whose principal aim in life is to be on the cutting edge of every degenerate and destructive trend and fad that comes along. The latest fad is to redefine what it means to be "English" or to be "British." The trendies are raising a hue and cry about the "racism" inherent in those designations. Those terms aren't inclusive enough, they believe. Some of the newer residents of the United Kingdom may feel left out and have their feelings hurt.

I'll read you the first sentence -- and a couple of other sentences -- from an Associated Press report of October 11 from London:

"Britishness" and "Englishness" are racially coded terms with a Whites-only connotation, an independent commission said Wednesday in a report that called for a rethinking of the nation's self-image. . . . "Britishness, as much as Englishness, has systematic, largely unspoken, racial connotations," the report said. "Whiteness nowhere features as an explicit condition of being

British, but it is widely understood that Englishness, and therefore by extension Britishness, is racially coded. 'There ain't no black in the Union Jack,' it has been said.'"

This report was commissioned by an outfit called the "Runnymede Trust," described by the Associated Press as "an independent organization devoted to promoting racial justice." Unfortunately, we have outfits like that in the United States also, but they seem to be a little more obnoxious and a little more of a problem in England. Typically they are made up of the very fashionable liberal trendies I mentioned earlier, a token member or two of the royal family, a handful of wogs and Blacks, and a few churchmen. The Christian church in England has become at least as malign a force as in America and has its hands in every racially destructive business that comes along. And the royal family has been a joke for several generations now. But to the authoritarian-minded English, the church and the royal family lend credibility to outfits like the Runnymede Trust, and the recent report undoubtedly has even more Englishmen than before feeling guilty about the fact that Alfred the Great wasn't a Rastafarian and Henry the Eighth wasn't a Pakistani.

The chairman of the committee that wrote the report is a wog, one of the millions who came flooding into England with the dissolution of the Empire after the Second World War and now wants to be considered an "Englishman." He is Professor Bhiku Parekh, and he was bold enough to say:

There is a very important role for a common national culture and a common civic nationality. But we are requesting that this common culture . . . be discussed and renegotiated.

So Professor Parekh believes that the meaning of Englishness needs to be renegotiated. Sounds a bit Orwellian, doesn't it? But, believe me, the English lemmings are willing to go along.

And so are those Chosen few who tell the lemmings which way to go. One of these Chosen few who has been heard from in connection with the report is "Lady" Kate Gavron, wife of the filthy-rich and very Jewish publisher, "Lord" Gavron. She is the vice-chairman of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, the committee of the Runnymede Trust, which produced the report. "Lord" Gavron became a lord, by the way, by donating 500,000 pounds -- that's three-quarters of a million dollars -- to Tony Blair's last election campaign. That's the way one becomes a "lord" or a "lady" in England these days.

When the report was released two weeks ago "Lady" Gavron remarked that Prince Charles should have married a Negress as a symbol of his support for multiculturalism. The Royal Family, she announced, should take the lead in promoting racial integration. Last week she repeated herself when she told the London *Telegraph:*

It would have been great if Prince Charles had been told to marry someone black. Imagine what message that would have sent out.

Yes, imagine! That's in the October 17th issue of the *Telegraph.*

"Lady" Gavron also told the *Telegraph.* that the present Royal Family sends out "the wrong message about Britain today." She complained that "they're all white. It is part of a very unattractive hierarchy." She had a similar complaint about the aristocracy in general, which she believes is "too Anglo-Saxon." She said, "Anything hereditary is completely anachronistic and illogical." Her views on Britain's history were similar:

We need to acknowledge that there are different ways of looking at history. The problem with the Empire was the inequality of power. It was something we did to the Indians and Africans, not with them.

Well, despite the eagerness of the lemmings to go along with the report, there has been some dissent. A few tradition-minded Englishmen are offended by the whole idea of redefining what it means to be English, but they are being kept in their place by the more progressive-minded politicians and bureaucrats, as well as by the twitterings of the fashionable set, for whom "Lady" Gavron is an ideological arbiter. The *Guardian*, a very liberal London newspaper, in an October 12 editorial, sniffed at those Englishmen who failed to appreciate the report's recommendation for more inclusiveness:

They evidently do not understand what it means to feel excluded: don't feel the individual pain, don't reflect on the social consequences.

Well, the author of that editorial, a Hugo Young, is one of those very fashionable, limp-wristed Englishmen I mentioned.

Trevor Phillips, who is the chairman of the Greater London Assembly and also is one of the authors of the report, dismissed the dissent as "knee-jerk reactions of little Englanders." By "little Englanders" he means those who are fond of the idea of England by itself, rather than as an integral part of the New World Order. Phillips also said:

St. George was a Palestinian, and Richard the Lionheart didn't get around to learning English.

To call St. George a "Palestinian" is as misleading as the effort to label the Greek Cleopatra a "Negress," because she was a queen of Egypt. Oh, and, by the way, Trevor Phillips is an "Englishman" of the Caribbean/African variety, another result of the breakup of the Empire.

So guess who entered the dispute as a peacemaker, reconciling the traditionalists and the progressives? None other than Tony Blair's very Jewish Home Secretary Jack Straw. Said Straw:

I do not accept the arguments of those on the nationalist right or the liberal left that Britain as a cohesive whole is dead. Britishness has become inclusive, with people happily defining themselves as black British or Chinese British.

And now you really should not be surprised when I tell you that it was Jack Straw himself who in early 1998 launched the committee of the Runnymede Trust that produced the report. As in America, also in Britain Jack Straw's tribesmen have their hands up to the elbows in every piece of destructive filth which comes along. That we should expect from what we know about his

Chosen tribe. What is disappointing and maddening is that we have so many trendy fools among our own tribe who are ready to follow with mindless enthusiasm wherever the Jew leads them.

Well, in Britain this sort of thing has been coming for a long time. For more than a century now English monarchs have been appointing Jews to the House of Lords. At the beginning of this sorry process in the 19th century, it was necessary that they first declare themselves Christians, as in the case of Benjamin Disraeli, for example, but eventually all that was necessary was that they make themselves useful to the monarch in some way, and monarchs all too often found that a little extra cash was very useful. So we have had the ridiculous spectacle of "Baron" Rothschild and "Lord" Disraeli, "Earl" of Beaconsfield, and the camel-faced "Lord" Gavron and all too many others without a trace of Englishness in them declaring themselves to be English aristocrats. These days the process of becoming an aristocrat has become even more degraded because it is the prime minister rather than the monarch who chooses the new lords and ladies, and prime ministers usually are even more in need of ready cash than are monarchs.

Well, as I said, although many Englishmen are not happy about the concept of Chinese Englishmen and Negro Englishmen, they have left themselves open to the present situation. In the first place, they not only fought enthusiastically on the wrong side of the Second World War but were to a large degree responsible for there being a Second World War, which for a while after the war they actually believed they had won, just because they had participated in the destruction of their hated economic rival Germany. That was the war, remember, which sanctified the notions of "equality" and "democracy" and made the dissolution of the British Empire a logical necessity.

And in the second place, the English, because of their somewhat greater tendency toward conformity and ideological fashionableness than those of us on the other side of the Great Water have been easier victims of the Jewish racket to make "racism" a greater sin than child molesting. The average Brit today is even more terrified of being thought a "racist" than is the average American and also is more willing to go along with whatever destructive foolishness the fashion-conscious lords and ladies, led by the likes of Jack Straw and Kate Gavron, are pushing at the moment.

Well, unfortunately, we over here are on the same slippery slope that the Brits are on. We also fought on the wrong side of the Second World War and then blindly began implementing the ideas inherent in the

slogans we mindlessly parroted during that war. A more serious and troubling aspect of all this than the gullibility and lemming-like nature of the masses of our people on both sides of the Atlantic is the decline in morale on the part of our more aristocratic elements: our stronger, prouder, and more independent-minded elements, who in less democratic times used to provide our people with genuine leaders and keep the lemmings from going too far astray.

The British aristocracy -- that is, the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy, the Anglo-Celtic aristocracy, the Anglo-Norman aristocracy -- really has gone downhill since the time of Henry the Eighth, and the decline hasn't been entirely due to lax breeding habits. We've suffered the same sort of decline in leadership morale over here since the time of Patrick Henry and George Washington

and Thomas Jefferson. It's not that our leaders have been tricked into believing the egalitarian claptrap promoted by Jews like Jack Straw and "Lady" Gavron. It's more that they are willing to tolerate the sort of wickedness now that they wouldn't have tolerated a couple of centuries ago. They're less willing to stand up and speak out against evil. They've lost most of their civic courage. How long has it been since there has been a much needed assassination of a prime minister over there or a President or congressional leader or media boss over here? We tolerate every sort of treason and destructive wickedness imaginable rather than rebel against it.

Well, you know, I probably rage against this sort of thing too much. I complain too much about the growing worthlessness of the lemmings and the growing lack of responsibility on the part of those who should be leading them in a healthy, positive direction, but aren't. I suppose my comments are useful to some degree if they help people think about the problems we face, but on both sides of the Atlantic we need to do more than think about our problems and complain about them. Where leadership is lacking we need to step forward and provide leadership.

Lemmings behave the way they do because they have been persuaded that that's the way they're supposed to behave, that that's what is expected of them. They are not consciously evil or consciously depraved. They just don't have minds of their own. They always let other people decide for them what is right and what they should think and what they should do. And the wrong people have been deciding these things for them. We need to begin taking the responsibility of deciding away from the media bosses and the politicians. We can't do this all at once, and we certainly can't do it for all of the lemmings now, but we can begin affecting the way some of the lemmings think and behave. And we can do this by standing up and speaking out and by setting the right example with our own behavior.

When you make a public statement of any kind, never apologize for being White, never apologize to non-Whites for anything, never disclaim racism, never seem weak, never compromise on fundamentals, never waffle. Be strong and sure and self-confident. Do right and fear no one. The lemmings will begin following.

Why Do They Do It?

I have an update on what we talked about two weeks ago: that was what happened to a lawsuit a group of aging American veterans of the Second World War filed in a Federal court in California against some of Japan's biggest corporations, who had used the veterans as slave laborers during the time they were prisoners of war of the Japanese. The American veterans were asking the Japanese corporations to pay them compensation for their slave labor.

Well, Madeleine Albright's State Department asked the judge to rule against the veterans and in favor of the Japanese companies which made them do forced labor during the war. This was the same Madeleine Albright who has vigorously supported the claims of Jews who want compensation for the work they did during the same war. But the American veterans aren't Jews, and different rules apply for Jews and non-Jews. And so last month the Federal court did as our Jewish secretary of state asked and threw the veterans' lawsuit against the Japanese corporations out of court. That court ruling was on September 21.

The very next day, on September 22, a group of elderly Poles learned exactly the same lesson the American veterans had learned: if you're not a Jew you're out of luck when it comes to World War Two reparations.

Here's what happened: In August 1998 a group of Swiss banks were pressured by the Jewish media and the threat of boycotts into agreeing to pay $1.25 billion to Jews -- and others -- who claimed to be victims of Nazi persecution during the Second World War. If you remember, I had several radio broadcasts about this extortion racket against the Swiss at the time. Those besides the Jews who were supposed to share in the loot from this racket were Gypsies, homosexuals, Jehovah's Witnesses -- and Poles. Well, in January 1999 the Jewish organizations who were behind the racket managed to get the Poles kicked off the beneficiary list. That wasn't difficult, because the whole affair was being arranged by a Federal court in Brooklyn, New York, and the judge in charge was a Jew, Edward Korman.

Well, of course, the Poles complained long and loud, but Judge Korman and the Jewish lawyers involved in the settlement with the Swiss banks ignored them. Finally, in October of last year the Poles filed a motion to intervene in the settlement. Judge Korman denied their motion, telling the Poles that if they were allowed to share in the loot, there wouldn't be enough left for the Jews. Really! "If we share it with you, there won't be enough left for us."

"Go file your own lawsuit," Judge Korman told the Poles. The Poles appealed to a higher court, and on September 22 of this year -- three weeks ago -- the appeals court ruled against them too, allowing Judge Korman to proceed with the plan of giving the bulk of the money extracted from the Swiss banks to the Jews and leaving the Poles with nothing: not a cent. I think that's funny. People who collaborate with the Jews and expect the Jews to show them the same consideration deserve to be left out in the cold.

I also have an update on last week's broadcast, when we talked about the breakup of a child pornography ring being run by an organized crime gang in Moscow. I complained that despite

the fact that many of the perverts who are customers of this Jewish gang in Russia live in the United States, there was absolutely no news about it published here, and I explained that this was another case of the "respectable" Jews, the establishment Jews, the media Jews, covering for the Talmud-Torah Jews. Well, I've received responses from around the world concerning that situation. People from New Zealand to Denmark have told me that they are vaguely aware of what's going on, but that the mass media in their countries refuse to say anything about it.

The two countries where the breakup of the child-pornography ring in Moscow two weeks ago was give substantial publicity were Italy and Sweden. In fact it was the news coverage in Sweden that first brought the matter to my attention. The big Stockholm newspaper *Aftonbladet* actually gave pretty good coverage to the news, even getting into the horrifying fact that some of the child-porn films showed little Russian children being raped and tortured to death -- except, of course, the Jewishness of the child-pornography business wasn't mentioned by *Aftonbladet.*

And nearly everywhere except Sweden and Italy the news was totally blacked out. Even in Denmark, next door to Sweden, the newspapers and television refused to say a word, and Danes were able to learn the news only from the Internet. There is somewhat more awareness of the Jewish slave trade in adult women from eastern Europe, but even people who are aware of this slave trade are afraid to talk about it; they are afraid they will be labeled "anti-Semites" if they do.

I should mention now that if you don't have Internet access, or if you have been unsuccessful in finding the child-porn news reports on the Internet to which I referred last week, you can get them directly from me. I'd much rather you do the research yourself, but if you can't or don't want to, you can send me $25 for my time and trouble, and I'll mail you copies of the Reuters report of September 27, the Associated Press report of September 29, and the *Aftonbladet* story of September 28.

Well, we soon may have some help in dragging the slavery issue into the light. As you already may be aware, Black organizations for some time have been watching with envy the success of the Jews in extorting "reparations" from the rest of the world for wrongs supposedly done to the Jews long ago. The Blacks have been complaining, "Hey! What about us? When do we get reparations for 400 years of slavery?" For the most part no one paid any attention to these Black complaints -- until recently. Things have been getting nuttier and nuttier in the United States as liberals have pushed their loony theories about equality and White guilt to the limit. Two weeks ago a law was passed -- where else but in California? -- that opens the door to Black claims for reparations for slavery. The new law really only applies to insurance companies which sold policies to slave owners more than 140 years ago, but you can be certain that getting reparations from insurance companies will be only the first step. Once they have their foot in the door, there will be no stopping Blacks in their greedy scramble for more and more and more.

I think it's a wonderful thing. There are approximately 30 million Blacks now in the United States, and virtually all of them are descended from Blacks who were slaves prior to the Civil War. What is fair compensation for them? If I were a Black, I wouldn't settle for less than $25,000. Well, that's nearly a trillion dollars altogether: a tidy sum. If we apply the burden equally to the approximately 45 million White households in the United States, that's nearly

$20,000 per household. But you know, that's not a bad price to pay for absolution from White racial guilt, is it? What do you think?

I think that a lot of the White liberals who have been loudest in whining about White racial guilt will suddenly find something else to whine about when presented with their personal $20,000 demand for reparations to the Blacks. I think it will be amusing to watch the expressions on their faces.

Of course, it is unlikely that the situation will develop quite that way; real life usually is a little more complicated. But it is a fact that Gray Davis, the terminally trendy governor of California the most multi-culti state in America, signed into law two weeks ago a bill opening up America's oldest and largest insurance companies for Black reparations claims. Demands already are being made, and many more demands will be made in the future. America's largest insurance company, Aetna, already has begun apologizing for being a White company, hoping to mollify some of the Blacks looking for reparations. And as I said a moment ago, the smell of reparations money soon will have every Black organization in America in a feeding frenzy. And you can bet that Jewish lawyers will be the ones filing the class-action suits against every White institution in sight, while Jewish publicists lead the chorus in yelping and howling for more money. The show will be hilarious and certainly will do wonders for race relations!

I said I think that this will be a wonderful thing for two reasons: First, it's good for everyone to see just where the nuttiness of egalitarianism and multiculturalism is taking us. At this time most of what we hear is the feminine whining of the "oh, why can't we all just learn to love each other and get along together" crowd. Those are the folks who believe that if we could just get some "speech crime" laws to shut up those awful heterosexual White males and some more gun control laws to disarm them, then we could all live together in multicultural bliss forever. I think it will be better when that whining gives way to the snarling of the crowd whose message is "pay up now, Whitey!"

Second, it would be good for the soccer moms and all the other White suburban liberals to have a big bite taken out of their comfort if they're forced to pay reparations to the Blacks. Actually, I would like to see all the White liberals turned out onto the street in mid-winter, shivering and wondering where their next meal is coming from. These are the folks who for decades now have been willing to give up everything but their comfort. As long as they could hang onto their incomes, their material possessions, their comfortable life-styles, their financial security, they were happy to throw away their freedom, their honor, and the future of their people.

It has been said that people willing to give up freedom in return for the promise of more security deserve neither -- and ultimately will have neither. I believe that to be true, and I also believe that it will be good for middle-class White America to have the truth of that statement rubbed in their faces sooner rather than later: sooner, while it still is possible for them to find whatever is left of their manhood and revolt, rather than later, when revolt is no longer feasible.

Of course, I'm not the only one who has thought about that. The people who are destroying America -- the people whose ultimate aim is to destroy us -- have been concerned that even soft, spoiled, unmanly White Americans might react violently if their comfort is threatened. And they

have been preparing for that possibility for a long time. They want to be sure that if there ever is a revolt it won't be able to go very far. And the way to assure that is to guarantee that the nation's military and police forces won't join in on the side of the Whites. The same motive is behind their drive to abolish the Second Amendment, of course, but they are much more concerned about keeping America's armed forces out of it.

A much bigger nightmare for them than a few thousand citizens armed with hunting rifles roaming the streets and shooting individual Jews is a helicopter gun ship showing up over Manhattan and taking out the CBS building -- or one of the U.S. Navy's missile cruisers in the eastern Mediterranean sending a few hundred cruise missiles with nuclear warheads toward Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem and converting the whole rat's nest into a huge, self-illuminated, glass parking lot.

As I said, they've been worried about that sort of thing for a long time, and they've been working hard for decades to guarantee that America's armed forces never will be used on behalf of White America. They've already gotten the percentage of Whites in the U.S. Army down to 59 per cent, and 15 per cent of those are women -- which means that only 50 per cent of the Army now consists of White males. They're doing everything they can to push that percentage even lower, by offering all sorts of incentives to non-Whites to join the armed forces. Not only do you not have to be a citizen to be in the U.S. Army these days, they're even advertising in Spanish for illegal aliens to join the Army. Mr. Clinton's director of the Selective Service System, Gil Coronado, advises his fellow Hispanics in Spanish-language recruiting ads that he is in no way concerned with the immigration status of enlistees.

Although America's internal enemies are having great success at darkening the complexion of the enlisted ranks of all of our armed forces, they are making a big fuss now about the relative Whiteness of military officers and the members of the elite combat units: Army Special Forces and Rangers, Navy SEALs, and Air Force Special Operations Command. A lengthy report in the *San Diego Union-Tribune* last month complained that only 1.3 per cent of the Navy's SEALs are Blacks, for example. In the Army only 4.5 per cent of the Special Forces and Rangers personnel are Blacks. That's really shameful, isn't it? It sounds racist to me.

But don't worry: they're working hard to fix that little problem. Training standards are coming down, minority recruitment efforts are going up, and the campaign to root racists -- White racists, that is -- out of the armed forces is intensifying. In another ten years there won't be a military unit left in America that is likely to turn against our internal enemies or to take the White side in a race war. What the Jews and their allies are guaranteeing is that when the war does come, it will be long, very bloody, and extremely destructive, instead of short and sharp.

One question many people have is, why do they do it? Jews are clever and generally successful; so why do they insist on boring holes in the hull of the boat in which they also are passengers? Why can't they simply enjoy the fruits of their own labors and let other people enjoy theirs? Why do they always engage in activities that result in hatred against them? Why do they try to wreck every Gentile society in which they live as a minority? Why don't they control their own worst elements and avoid the stigma of White slavery and child pornography? Isn't there enough money for them without getting into filthy businesses like that? Why do they always promote

destructive ideologies such as Marxism and feminism and egalitarianism and push destructive programs such as affirmative action and multiculturalism? Why do they monopolize the news and entertainment media and try to control the attitudes and opinions of the non-Jewish majority? Why do they promote racial mixing, miscegenation, gun control, and open borders? Why can't they just try to live among us in peace instead of always trying to control and destroy?

Well, you know, I can't give a complete answer to that question on this half-hour program, but I have answered parts of it on earlier programs. Part of the answer is that the Jews do what they do because that is their nature. We ought to understand that when we look at their history and observe the consistency of their behavior over thousands of years. They do what they do today because that's what they've always done. The pattern is inborn.

And part of the answer is that they exploit us and try to destroy us because we're such easy victims. There is not a more gullible race on the planet than we. We're too easily tricked, too easily deceived, too easily lied to. And there is hardly a more individualistic, disunited race than we, hardly a race less able to combine against a common enemy than we. We're easy picking.

I said we're gullible. Look at the game the Jews are playing with us in Palestine right now. It's the same game they've been playing with us for more than 50 years. How many times have you heard the same, old baloney about the so-called "peace process" in the Middle East? Isn't that phrase getting a little shopworn: the "peace process"? The Jews don't want peace; they want more of our money, more of our military equipment, more Arab land, and our backing in their next war against their neighbors. That's what they want, and the "peace process" is just a trick phrase to keep us from understanding the truth of the situation.

You know, there are about 5 million Jews in occupied Palestine. That's about a million Jewish families, and each of those families has been getting two or three thousand dollars every year from us by pretending that they're all hot to get the "peace process" going, if we would just help them pay for it -- again. And we keep giving them money, year after year after year, and they keep murdering Palestinian children because that's what they like to do. And then their toad-like little prime minister, who used to be a professional assassin before he became prime minister, announces that unless the Palestinians, whose children the Jews are murdering, stop the violence -- got that? -- unless the ***Palestinians*** stop the violence -- he'll start another war. And both George Bush and Al Gore pledge their unconditional support for him. Wonderful!

I mean, when you've got a Middle Easterner's way of looking at things, when you've got a Levantine view of the world, a sideshow barker's view of the world, and you've got a bunch of rubes like us at your disposal, why shouldn't you exploit us to death? Bleed us! Take everything we've got! Then destroy us before we figure out what happened and ask for our money back. Get rid of us. Destroy our society so that you can build one more to your own Middle Eastern tastes.

Of course, it doesn't have to be this way. Whenever enough of us decide that our honor and our freedom and the freedom of our grandchildren are more important than our comfort and whether or not the liberals and the Jews call us names, we can change things. We can clean up America. We can toss out those who have been deceiving us and exploiting us. If anyone demands reparations from us, we can shut him up and send him back where he came from. And if we ever

catch anyone in the White slave or child-porn business, we can string him up on the spot without worrying about being called "anti-Semites." We can have honest news media and White entertainment media.

Really, it's not impossible to have a clean, decent, White society in America again. But it depends on us. It depends on our values, on whether we prefer comfort or freedom. If too many of us remain too afraid of being called "anti-Semites," too afraid of losing our jobs, for standing up for what we believe, then little Russian girls will continue to be raped to death for the amusement of rich American perverts, our armed forces will continue to become darker and less American, and we'll continue to be easy pickings for the rest of the world.

Personally, I don't want that. Personally, I prefer freedom. If you also prefer freedom, then you should be working with me to help other Americans make the right choice.

Corrupting Our Police

There's certainly much more that I could say about this sorry spectacle of a presidential election we've been experiencing than I said last week -- and later we will talk more about the significance of the election -- but today I want to return to a subject about which I've spoken on earlier programs, a subject of great urgency. That subject is the ongoing erosion of our civil liberties and the gradual conversion of the United States into a police state, so that multiculturalism and the New World Order can be rammed down our throats with less danger of our rebelling.

Certainly, most of you who listen to my broadcasts already are concerned about the growing intrusion of the government into the lives of all of us and about the proliferation of so-called "hate crime" and "hate speech" laws, which penalize a person for what he thinks or what he says, or even what he reads or what sort of music he listens to, rather than for what he does. I believe that every decent, thinking American is concerned about this tendency, this trend toward less and less freedom in America and more and more enforced conformity. I also believe that very few of those who are concerned understand what is behind this trend and how extraordinarily dangerous it is. That's what I want to talk about with you today.

I'll start with a specific example. About ten days ago my office received a telephone call from a woman who identified herself as a Sergeant Schweitzer with the Northern Kentucky University Police Department in Highland Heights, Kentucky. Sergeant Schweitzer asked for me, and when I got on the line she told me that she had an envelope on her desk which had in it what she described as "hate mail." "So why are you calling me about it?" I asked her. "Because the return address on the envelope is yours," she replied. "All right," I said; "tell me what's in the envelope."

She began describing the contents of the envelope. It consisted of several pieces of printed material. There were three or four printed sheets, some containing photographs, with information about racial differences between Whites and Blacks: anatomical differences, as seen in different cranial shapes and jaw configurations; intellectual differences, as seen in differing scores on standard IQ tests; and behavioral differences, as seen in crime statistics. And there was a small pamphlet on an investigation of alleged "gas chambers" at the Auschwitz concentration camp, published by the Institute for Historical Review in California.

I told the female police sergeant that none of the items she described was published by my organization, the National Alliance, although a member of my organization may have mailed the materials. I asked her about the postmark on the envelope. She said it had been mailed from east Texas and asked me whether or not the National Alliance has members in east Texas. "Yes, we have many members in east Texas," I told her. "Tell me their names," she demanded. "Of course, I won't do that," I replied. "Well then," she threatened, "I'll turn this over to the FBI, and they'll find out who mailed it."

I was becoming a little exasperated by her tone, and so I asked her: "Sergeant Schweitzer, from what you have told me so far I don't understand why this mailing you have is a police matter. Do you believe that a law has been broken?"

"Oh, yes, a law certainly has been broken," she replied. "You can't send hate material like this through the mail. It's illegal."

"All right," I said, "fax me what you have, including the envelope, and I'll get back to you." And I gave her my fax number. A few minutes later the material arrived in my office, pretty much as she had described it, with a cover sheet bearing the official seal of her police department. A quick glance was all it took to see that there was nothing at all illegal about the mailing: no death threat, no extortion attempt, no attempt at fraud, not even a request for money. But I must admit that I was disheartened by this affair, because Police Sergeant Schweitzer of the Northern Kentucky University Police Department really believes that it is illegal to send through the mail information about racial differences or information about the so-called "Holocaust" which is at variance with the version presented by Steven Spielberg and Elie Wiesel. That's not only disheartening; it's also frightening. It's frightening because thousands of other law enforcement people in America share Sergeant Schweitzer's mistaken belief that it is illegal to write or say or mail anything that is not Politically Correct. They know Politically Incorrect material when they see it, and although they cannot cite a specific statute which has been violated, they believe that there must be such a statute. They believe it because that's what they have been taught.

And they have been taught that because for the past two decades some of the most powerful Jewish pressure groups in the country -- the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the Simon Wiesenthal Center -- have been working day and night to subvert our entire law-enforcement system in America. From the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington all the way down to one-horse outfits such as the Northern Kentucky University Police Department in Highland Heights, Kentucky, Jewish organizations have been lobbying, bribing, infiltrating, corrupting, subverting.

Here's the way it works: Imagine that you're the chief of police in Highland Heights, Kentucky. One morning the leading politician in your community, the mayor of Highland Heights, shows up at your office, and he has the two wealthiest Jewish businessmen in the county with him -- and Mr. Cohen, a representative from the Louisville, Kentucky, office of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The Jews are dressed in thousand-dollar suits. They are cordial toward you, but they obviously consider themselves to be very important people, and you, being a bit of a politician yourself, are suitably impressed. The agent from the Louisville office of the Anti-Defamation League, Mr. Cohen, explains to you that his organization, the ADL, is a public service organization that works with other police departments all over the country to help them deal with the growing threat of terrorism and "hate crimes." He explains that the ADL has an extensive information-gathering network with many covert agents who collect information on terrorists and "hate criminals" and then share the information with law-enforcement agencies so that they can do a better job of protecting the public and enforcing the law. He is here to offer the services of the ADL to your police department.

If you are like most police chiefs, you are flattered and pleased. You don't stop to question the propriety of Mr. Cohen's proposal. You don't waste any time inquiring into what sort of organization the ADL really is. The mayor and the local fat cats have endorsed it, and that's good enough for you. After all, you are a policeman, and if there's one characteristic that most policemen have it is respect for authority. You simply don't question people who are rich and important and have powerful political connections. When people show up in your office in thousand-dollar suits and act important, you genuflect. In the real world there are very few cops like Inspector Harry Callahan -- Dirty Harry -- in the Clint Eastwood movie by that name, who are contemptuous of authority. Most of them are dyed-in-the-wool authoritarians. So Mr. Cohen sets up a schedule for a series of training seminars for the members of your department to be conducted by ADL instructors -- for a reasonable fee, of course. In these seminars your policemen learn that there is a new type of criminal afoot who is much more dangerous, much more a threat to society, than the drug dealer or the rapist or the child molester or the burglar or the armed robber. This new and more dangerous criminal is the "hate criminal," and the helpful ADL instructor will teach all of your policemen how to recognize "hate crimes" and "hate criminals."

They will learn that a heterosexual White male who doesn't like Jews or Blacks or Asians or Mexicans or other non-Whites, or who opposes the Clinton government's open-borders immigration policy, or who is against more gun control laws is very likely to be a "hate criminal." If a heterosexual White male says that he thinks there's already too much "diversity" in the country, or expresses his disapproval of homosexual couples or of White women who have Black boyfriends, then he's definitely someone to keep an eye on. And if he distributes any sort of printed material expressing his Politically Incorrect views, then he should be regarded as a potential Oklahoma City bomber. Now, as usual, I'm oversimplifying things a bit. The instructors the ADL and the other Jewish groups send around to brainwash police personnel are sophisticated enough and indirect enough so that it all seems irreproachable to the naïve cops. Are the Jews telling them to ignore the constitutional rights of people with Politically Incorrect views? Oh, my goodness, no! Oh, no, no, no! Certainly not that! The Jews let the cops know that they respect everyone's constitutional rights -- but, of course, the Constitution was never meant to protect "hate criminals." The First Amendment was never meant to protect all forms of speech, just as the Second Amendment is really only about government militias and bestows no individual right to keep and bear arms.

Anyway, despite the sophistication, the results are crude enough. Sergeant Schweitzer of the Northern Kentucky University Police Department is a clear example of that. The Jews already have managed to persuade a lot of cops in addition to her that to question any detail of the official "Holocaust" story or to assert that Blacks and Whites are different in any way except skin color is "hate," and that "hate" is illegal, even if they cannot cite a specific statute that is being violated.

So, since there actually is no statute being violated, why is it important that Jewish groups have convinced Sgt. Schweitzer and others to the contrary? Since these confused cops can't actually file charges which will stand up in court, what difference does it make? Well, you know, I believe that most people who take that attitude -- what difference does it make? -- would not be so complacent if it were the Mafia cozying up to the police and teaching them how to tell the bad

guys from the good guys. Why? Because, as everyone knows, the Mafia is a criminal organization. We don't want criminal organizations infiltrating and corrupting our law-enforcement agencies, for obvious reasons. But the fact is that the ADL also is a criminal organization -- and a far more dangerous one than the Mafia. Throughout its existence the ADL has maintained intimate affiliations with Jewish racketeers and gangsters of every type -- loan sharks, drug dealers, White slavers, contract killers, illegal gambling den operators, smugglers, illegal weapons dealers, you name it -- and the ADL has received substantial amounts of money from these Jewish gangsters.

One of the ADL's principal contributors during the 1980s was the notorious Jewish crime boss Moe Dalitz, the "godfather" of Las Vegas. Dalitz gave the ADL so much money from his various criminal operations that in 1985 the ADL gave a tribute banquet for him and presented him with its annual "Torch of Liberty" award for that year. Shortly afterward Dalitz was killed in a shootout with a rival gang that left seven other gangsters dead as well.

More recently the ADL had its offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles raided by police with search warrants who found thousands of stolen confidential police files which the ADL had acquired illegally by having its agents inside California law-enforcement agencies. One might think that with a record like the ADL has, law-enforcement agencies would scrupulously avoid any contact with the organization. The unfortunate fact is that most law-enforcement agencies aren't even aware of the ADL's history of criminal affiliations and activities. They aren't aware of these things because the controlled media to a large degree have avoided saying anything about them. Cops tend to be the sort of people who believe what they are told by the mass media, because of the media's aura of authority. Cops are authoritarians. If they see it on TV they believe it; if it's not on TV then it's not real. And the Jewish bosses of the mass media protect Jewish organizations such as the ADL. The media don't talk about the criminal nature of the ADL; instead they always refer to it in glowing terms as a "public service organization" or a "human rights organization," and the cops accept this description without asking questions.

Beyond the impropriety of having a criminal organization teaching our policemen who the bad guys and the good guys are is the effect organizations such as the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center have on police attitudes and behavior. This is far more serious than a confused female police sergeant wasting her time and her department's money trying to find out who made a perfectly legal mailing of information about racial differences and "Holocaust" exaggerations. Cops instinctively dislike boat-rockers and dissidents. They may be contemptuous of Bill Clinton as a person, but they are not contemptuous of the system of which Clinton is a part. They are naturally hostile toward anyone who questions authority or speaks out against the system. That's why a lot of Black and Jewish so-called "civil rights" demonstrators got thumped with nightsticks or bitten by police dogs or sprayed with fire hoses back in the 1960s.

Today's cops have been taught that they aren't permitted to thump Blacks who demonstrate with Jesse Jackson the way they used to thump Blacks who demonstrated with Martin Luther King 35 years ago. It was bad to have thumped King's demonstrators, they are told, but if they want to thump someone today they should thump White "hate criminals." And that's what they do.

Dozens of members of my organization, the National Alliance, while engaged in perfectly legal distributions of printed material to the public have been stopped by police and questioned, harassed, intimidated, had their printed material confiscated, even been arrested -- because the police involved had been told by the ADL or some other Jewish organization that the National Alliance is a dangerous terrorist organization and that its members are likely to be "hate criminals."

Ten years ago a 22-year-old New Jersey member was arrested for posting a National Alliance sticker which bore the message, "Earth's most endangered species, the White race: help preserve it." That's all the sticker said, but the young man who posted it was arrested and charged with "ethnic terrorism," a felony offense under a "hate crimes" law which the ADL and other Jewish pressure groups had rammed through the New Jersey legislature. Ten years ago the Alliance didn't have the resources it has today. At that time we didn't even have an attorney on our staff, and the local cops were able to terrorize our young member with the threat of a long prison term. Of course, they couldn't send him to prison for posting our sticker, but he didn't know that, and it cost him a $5000 attorney fee to get the charge against him dismissed. Today he is the Coordinator of the National Alliance's Northern New Jersey Local Unit and is stronger and more committed than ever as a result of his experience ten years ago.

But our people shouldn't have to go through experiences like that. We should not be harassed and intimidated for exercising our constitutional rights. And it's perfectly clear that the reason we often are harassed is that our law-enforcement agencies have permitted criminal, anti-American organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the Southern Poverty Law Center to misinform and brainwash police personnel. By doing so these Jewish groups often are able to persuade policemen to behave as if the sort of laws the Jews are attempting to have enacted already had been enacted. The Jews are able to persuade law-enforcement agencies and all too often the courts as well to behave as if they already had succeeded in abolishing the First and Second Amendments.

This cozy relationship between criminal Jewish organizations and law-enforcement agencies, to the point where the Jewish groups have been given quasi-official status, is a growing problem. It's a danger for all freedom-loving White Americans, not just members of the National Alliance. It's a danger we must confront and deal with. If we attempt to ignore it and hope that it will go away, it won't. It will only become worse, because the nature of the Jews is such that nothing is ever enough for them; they always keep reaching, grasping, for more and more and more.

Our way of dealing with this problem is not to fight the police. It's not to attack the police for being too authoritarian. In a healthy society, without Jewish corruption, it's not a bad thing for the police to be authoritarian. What we must fight is the ability of the Jews to corrupt our law-enforcement agencies without exposure, without public scrutiny. Since the Jews' own media won't expose them, it's up to us to do it. We don't have the media resources of Time Warner or CBS or the *New York Times* or the other Jewish media giants, but we do have a growing ability to reach the two per cent of the White population which is capable of seeing what's happening in their world and coming to their own conclusions about it.

It doesn't take too many of us shining a spotlight on the Jewish corruption of our law-enforcement agencies for a few of the more astute and far-sighted police chiefs to start backing away from Semitic entanglements. It doesn't take many more of us exposing the nature of the ADL and the Southern Poverty Law Center and their subversion of our policemen for most law-enforcement agencies to change their policies about dealing with these criminal and un-American organizations. And listen! There are many, many Americans besides me and the members of my National Alliance who don't want America to continue becoming a police state. Speak out about these things yourself, and you'll be surprised by how many others will be encouraged to speak out too.

Conditioning for Death

Are people -- let's be more specific -- are White Americans less intelligent today than they were a century ago?

An impartial observer -- someone from Mars, say -- might sample the sort of television entertainment that keeps most White Americans occupied in their leisure time these days and then compare that with the penny romances the masses read in 1900 for relaxation and conclude that the IQ level has indeed gone down a bit. He might take a look at the nonstop circus of the current presidential election, and he would be even more inclined to think that we aren't quite as smart as we used to be.

The real clincher for the Martian observer, however, would be an examination of the way American public policy, as manifested in our laws and our public behavior, has changed. I mean, we did some stupid things and had some really dumb habits in the latter half of the 19th century, but they were nothing compared to the inexcusable foolishness which characterizes our behavior today. In the 19th century we decided that slavery wasn't a good policy, and so we put an end to it, and that was a smart thing to do, because we never should let ourselves become dependent on another race. But then we just turned four million former Black slaves loose in our society. We didn't send them back to Africa or otherwise get rid of them. We didn't even sterilize them. We just turned them loose. That was a really stupid and irresponsible thing to do. But at least we didn't let them vote. There were a few criminally insane people in Washington who thought they should be permitted to vote and even managed to change our Constitution to that effect, but as a practical matter we didn't let our former slaves meddle in the business of choosing our legislators and judges and other public officials to any substantial degree. And of course, we didn't let Blacks get near our women. We had laws against miscegenation nearly everywhere, and the laws were enforced, either by the authorities or by our people.

Today we have more than 30 million Blacks running loose in our society, and we not only let them vote and copulate with our women, but we encourage them in this behavior. We have welfare programs that allow them to breed faster than we do. We give them food stamps and free medical care. We give those of them who are willing to work preferential treatment in hiring and promotion. We bus their children to the schools attended by our children. Our colleges and universities have special recruitment programs to entice more Blacks into becoming students, and we bend our admissions requirements to get them into college and lower our academic standards to keep them in.

In magazine advertisements, on television news programs, in professional sports, and in half the movies coming out of Hollywood, Blacks are held up as role models for our children and as objects of romantic fantasy for our women, and we don't even speak out against it. Black faces on our television screens advise us about our health, analyze the news of the day for us, and tell us how we should invest our money, and we act as if everything is as it should be. All of that is not only more stupid than anything we did in the 19th century, it's insane.

So are we dumber than we used to be? The Martian probably would think so, but I'm inclined to believe that it's not just a lower average intelligence that causes us to behave so stupidly today. What has happened is that the way White Americans are conditioned to think and behave has changed. Let us remember that most people don't think and behave the way they do, don't have the opinions and attitudes they do, as the result of any rational process. They don't examine the world around them, independently analyze the data, and then decide what attitude to have about what they have observed. Instead in nearly every case they let themselves be told what to think; they let themselves be told what their attitudes and opinions should be.

That's nothing new, of course. That's the way the bulk of the population always has been, in good times and in bad times. The really important thing in determining what most people think and how they behave is the sort of conditioning they receive. Children are conditioned in the home by their parents when they are small. Later they are conditioned by their playmates and then by their schools. As adults they are conditioned by the marketplace, the public square, the church, the village store. They absorb the attitudes and opinions of their peers and of their betters.

At least, that's the way it used to be in past centuries. The new element in this lifelong conditioning process is the influence of the mass media: first and foremost of television, but also the cinema, radio, magazines and newspapers and comic books and popular music. Well, I've talked before, more than once, about the role of the mass media in conditioning the public, in shaping their attitudes and opinions. I've talked about how the Jews infiltrated and then dominated and controlled the mass media of news and entertainment during the past century, and how they used their control of the media and of public opinion to transform our whole society in order to suit their own interests and schemes.

Today I want to talk with you about another element in the conditioning of our people which makes them behave in the self-destructive manner we see all around us. I want to talk with you about the role of the schools. It's not an independent role, of course. The way in which our schools, from kindergarten all the way up through the universities, condition our children and young people is determined by the way in which the teachers and professors themselves have been conditioned. And in a centralized, bureaucratic society such as we have in the United States today, there is a high degree of centralized control over the way in which schools condition students. It's not just the conditioning of the teachers and professors; it's also the program that they are required to follow, regardless of their own beliefs and attitudes.

Now I'll jump ahead a bit and tell you what the purpose of that program is; then I'll back up and fill in some of the details. To the extent that there is a single program governing public education in America today, a single purpose behind education in America, it is to condition White children and young people to accept without resistance a multicultural society, a multiracial society, in which they have no more important or dominant role than the descendants of their Black slaves, or mestizos who have recently come across the border from Mexico, or Hmong tribesmen fresh off the boat from Southeast Asia. And it also is to condition heterosexual White males to embrace a society in which the rules are as likely to be made by homosexuals or by women wearing trousers as by men, a society in which White men are neither expected nor permitted to protect White women, in which men no longer are the heads of their households or the decision-makers for their nation.

Now, I've tried to state the governing principle behind education in America today objectively, even though I know there are listeners who will think I've soft-pedaled it because they are familiar with many aspects of our present educational system which are blatantly anti-White or anti-male. In response to this objection I assert again that the governing principle is egalitarianism. It is not to put women above men or homosexuals above heterosexuals or Blacks above Whites, but rather to condition everyone into accepting a society in which neither race nor sex nor sexual orientation is important. That's the theory -- but because heterosexual White males have had the leading role in building and governing our society in the past, they are seen as the enemy by many of the egalitarian enthusiasts. They are seen as the people who have to be put down before we can have a truly egalitarian society.

Anyway, an egalitarian society is the ideal, and of course, that is absolutely crazy. It is nuts. It is suicidally insane.

The aim of our educational system is to produce citizens who have been conditioned to believe -- or to act as if they believe -- that men and women are interchangeable, essentially the same except for the configuration of their genitalia, and should be treated exactly the same by society and have similar roles. And this means suppressing the old belief that men and women are fundamentally different -- physically, intellectually, and emotionally -- that their natural roles in society and in the family are not the same but instead are complementary, and that they should be treated accordingly -- which means differently.

The aim of our educational system is to produce citizens who have been conditioned to believe -- or to act as if they believe -- that homosexuality is as natural a condition as heterosexuality, that homosexuality is in no way undesirable or reprehensible, that the only difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals is in their choice of sexual partners, and that homosexuals and heterosexuals should be treated exactly the same by society.

And the aim of our educational system is to produce citizens who have been conditioned to believe -- or to act as if they believe -- that racial differences are the most unimportant, superficial, and inconsequential thing in the world; that the only real differences are in pigmentation; that Blacks and Whites and Australian Aborigines and Chinamen have the same way of viewing the world, the same intrinsic values and behavioral patterns, the same capacity for self-discipline, the same type and degree of intelligence, the same problem-solving ability, the same aptitude for building civilizations and maintaining them; and that to believe otherwise is not only wrong but sinful and shameful. In fact, the gravest possible sin, the most shameful possible error, is racism, and the severest means should be used to exorcise it and the severest penalties imposed to punish those who adhere to it.

That, I think, is a fair and objective statement of current American educational policy. I believe that even those who think it is a good policy will agree with my statement. But as you know, I do not think it is a good policy, and certainly a Martian observer can be excused for thinking that we are either stupid or crazy to have such a policy, because it will lead us to our extinction.

A minute ago I said that the theory of current American educational policy is egalitarianism; that the purpose is to produce Politically Correct citizens. Actually, that's a bit naïve. The people

most responsible for the current policy, the people behind the scenes who use egalitarianism as a nation-destroying and a race-destroying weapon to serve their own ends are not egalitarians at all. They believe not only that they are superior to all the nations of the world -- to all the Gentiles of the world -- but also that they are more deserving. They believe that it is right and proper for them to deceive and demoralize the Gentiles, to destroy the Gentiles' sense of racial identity and racial pride, to feminize Gentile men and masculinize Gentile women, in order to make easier prey of the Gentiles.

And so they go beyond egalitarianism in the schools. They teach our children and our university students about their special status, about why they deserve more than others. "Holocaust" studies, they call it. It's already mandatory in the public schools of many states, and they're pushing hard to make it mandatory everywhere. The reason for requiring the teaching of the "Holocaust" story to Gentile children, they say, is to warn them what terrible things may happen if people are permitted to be racists or anti-Semites. The "Holocaust," they say, was the most terrible thing which ever has happened, and it was perpetrated by racists and anti-Semites.

Actually, that's not the reason for "Holocaust" studies at all. The "Holocaust" may be the worst thing that's happened to the Jews, but what the communists did to our people -- to Gentiles -- in Russia and Ukraine and Poland and the Baltic countries and Germany was far worse. The communists murdered at least 30 million of our people in those countries alone. The communist movement which committed those murders was inspired by the Jew Karl Marx and was heavily staffed by Jews. The death camp commissars in the Soviet Union during the 1920s and 1930s, the brutal commissars of the "gulag" about which Alexander Solzhenitsyn has written, were mostly Jews. Jews were vastly over-represented among the Soviet secret police and elsewhere in the Soviet bureaucracy. A Jew headed the murder squad that butchered the czar of Russia and his family. It was a Jew, Lazar Kaganovich, who supervised the murder of millions of Ukrainians. Jews headed the communist parties in many European countries outside of the Soviet Union in the time between the two world wars, and when they were given the opportunity they committed horrible atrocities against the populations of those countries, selectively murdering the best and the brightest people. That's what they did in the Baltic countries and in Poland, for example.

So if the aim is to teach children about the terrible things which can happen when the wrong sort of people acquire power, why not teach them about what the Jewish communists did? Why is there practically no teaching at all in the schools about these things?

Well, you already know the answer: it's because Jews weren't the victims but were to a large degree the perpetrators. It's because if the kiddies learn about what the Jews did to the peoples of eastern and central Europe before the Second World War, they might begin to think that it was quite reasonable for the Germans to want the Jews out of Germany, so that the Jews couldn't do in Germany what they had done elsewhere. That would put the so-called "Holocaust" in quite a different light, wouldn't it?

My point is that egalitarianism is the theory behind education in America today, but in fact the schools are used to a growing extent to brainwash students in whatever manner best serves the people who control the educational system. It's not just the Jews who are responsible for the conditioning going on in our schools. It's also feminists and homosexuals and egalitarians of all

sorts. And just as they lie about the "Holocaust" -- just as they conceal the crimes of the communists -- in order to serve the purpose of the Jews, they also lie about other things to serve other purposes. They lie about the nature of homosexuality, for example, because that serves the purpose of the homosexuals. They lie about the differences between men and women, because that serves the purpose of the feminists.

And they lie about race because they do want to encourage more miscegenation, and they do want to deceive and disarm Whites who might otherwise put up a resistance to racial mixing and miscegenation. They tell the public school students that we're really all the same and that to think otherwise is wicked, and they try to convince university students that the concept of race is meaningless, that it has no scientific basis. They teach them that there has been so much genetic mixing among the races in the past that there is no such thing as a pure race today, and so the whole idea of trying to preserve one's race is pointless: just give up; it's too late.

Using the schools to condition as well as to educate is not new, of course. In the 19th century it was assumed that everyone in school was at least a nominal Christian, for example, and it also was assumed that it would be a good thing to condition everyone to be even more Christian in his beliefs. This was true in most of the universities as well as in the public schools. If you take a close look at the most widely used instructional materials -- at the *McGuffey's Readers,* for example -- you'll recognize these built-in assumptions. Christianity was not treated simply as one religion among many; it was treated as the religion.

In the first half of the 20th century, students were conditioned politically to believe that democracy was the best possible form of government, and that the United States was the ideal embodiment of democracy. American history and the functioning of the American political system were idealized for the students.

Now I personally am neither a Christian nor a democrat. But let me tell you, the Christian conditioning and the democratic conditioning of the past were nothing compared to the egalitarian-feminist-Jewish conditioning in today's schools. The old conditioning may not have been the sort of thing of which all of us would approve, but it was relatively harmless. Most of the people who formulated the old conditioning at least meant well. They weren't trying to destroy us. That cannot be said of the people behind today's conditioning. Today's conditioning is aimed at making Politically Correct lemmings out of everyone who passes through the schools: lemmings who will not question or oppose any of the policies of the conditioners, lemmings who will not put up a fight against those who deliberately are destroying our country, our civilization, and our race.

And the conditioning, unfortunately, is doing the job it was intended to do. It is recruiting a substantial portion of our young people in the universities today into the camp of our enemies and using them to help with the destruction of our race. More than a decade ago I gave a talk to a mostly White group of students at the University of Maryland. After the talk a pretty girl about 19 or 20 years old came up to me and asked me if I thought that the present conflict between the races might develop into a shooting war. I told her that if the government continued its policy of trying to forcefully integrate the races, I thought a race war likely. She told me, "Well, if the

shooting starts I'll be with the Blacks shooting at you." And she looked really proud of herself when she told me that. She knew that she had said the Politically Correct thing.

A few days ago a computer vandal managed to break into the natvan.com web site which hosts my programs. He trashed the site, and he left a message saying that he had done it because the site encourages White supremacy. He spouted a lot of the pseudoscientific nonsense I mentioned a moment ago about there being no such thing as separate races -- the sort of nonsense the egalitarians are conditioning students with in the universities -- and he summarized it all with the statement:

No matter if you're black/white/asian/whatever, you are related to every other human on the face of the earth. This means, of course, that no race can be deemed 'superior' to another, as we are all a mixture of each other.

How's that for logic? Really, that is exactly the sort of fuzzy thinking which passes muster at our universities these days, so desperately eager are the egalitarians to support their insupportable position.

Well, it's going to be a long and bloody war, a very painful and destructive war. Meanwhile, it might behoove you to pay more attention to the sort of conditioning your kids are getting at school. Do whatever you have to do to make sure that they are on the right side of the war.

A White World

In these talks I have with you every week, I try to choose topics of current interest, topics that are in the news -- or that should be in the news -- because it's important for all of our listeners to understand that the things we talk about in these broadcasts are real and relevant, and they demand our attention now; they are things that listeners can check on for themselves if I tell them where to check. Even when I choose to talk more about ideas than about current news, I try to tie the ideas into events, either current or historical, in order to keep listeners aware that the ideas are relevant, that they have consequences in the real world.

I want everyone always to have in mind that the essence of these broadcasts is not entertainment, and it's not even education: it's survival. It's our whole future. It's the continuation of the process of life that began on this earth hundreds of millions of years ago and is now on the brink of disaster. The reason I make these broadcasts is to move people -- our people -- to accept responsibility for where the process is going, to help pull it back from the brink, to deal decisively with those people and policies which pushed it to the brink, and then to help guide it back onto an upward path again.

But sometimes listeners tell me, "Yes, that's important, but please tell us more about the direction in which we should guide things after we overcome the enemies of our people and repair the damage done by their policies. Show us the path ahead. Tell us a little about where we want to go after we are able to plan the type of world we want."

Well, I believe that's a reasonable request. I don't like to build castles in the air. I don't like to spend too much time planning things that we aren't yet able to implement. But I think it is reasonable to think sometimes about the future even beyond those things that we have the power to implement now. What sort of world do we want to strive for? Let's dream about that for just a few minutes today.

We cannot, of course, ever return to the past, but we can compare various periods in the past with each other and with the present in order to make decisions about institutions and lifestyles, decisions about social structures and fashions and types of behavior. Different people, of course, will judge the past differently, will make different decisions about which institutions and lifestyles in the past were desirable and which were not. For example, I have one occasional listener who thinks that it would be good to return to a time when his church ruled everything, and witches and heretics were burned at the stake by the thousands. And he thinks that I should be the first to be burned.

So the type of world we strive for depends upon our values, upon what we think is important. The person who believes literally in a Biblical picture of heaven and hell and whose primary motive is to avoid being cast into the fires of hell will want a different sort of world from the completely self-indulgent person whose ideal is to be able to amuse or entertain himself in any way he chooses, and neither of these people is likely to be attracted to a vision of a world that is best for our race. So before we begin describing our ideal world, let's be sure about what is really important to us. I can only tell you now what I believe is important, but I think that many

listeners will agree with me and so will share my vision of the sort of world for which we should strive.

I am a very race-conscious person, a person who is very conscious of the profound spiritual and psychical differences between my race and other races, and the world I want is one that provides the maximum scope for the spirit of my people to soar, a world that matches their inner nature, a world in which they are at home and can roll up their sleeves and go to work as if they were remodeling their own castles, a world in which they can unleash the full power of their imagination and of their creative spirit, a world in which the Faustian spirit of my people can exult in its striving to find and conquer new worlds, to perform noble deeds, and, in the words of Tennyson's Ulysses, "to follow knowledge like a sinking star beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

A world that matches our inner nature will be a world not too different from that in which our nature was shaped over thousands of generations in Europe. That was a world of mountains and forests and rivers and lakes and fjords and seacoasts. It was not the Semite's world of desert and bazaar or the Negro's world of jungle and dung-plastered huts, nor was it a world of asphalt and concrete and neon and billboards and diesel buses and fast-food drive-throughs and pollution-spewing factories and mile after dreary mile of tenement houses.

Well, in contrast to what I just said it seems that there is a portion of the nominally White population of the United States whose nature has been shaped during the space of three or four generations by concrete and asphalt and billboards and subway trains and trash-filled vacant lots. One sees a lot of these people in places like New York City, but I'm not convinced that they should be counted as White any longer, these raceless urban lemmings.

So we might begin our description of the sort of world we want by talking about the natural environment and the way in which our people should fit into that environment. We need, for one thing, a much lower average population density than we have now in North America and in Europe. Instead of a North America with a rapidly growing population of 300 million featherless bipeds of every known ethnicity, I have a vision of a continent with a stable population of 50 million European Americans -- saner, healthier, stronger, better-looking, and more intelligent European Americans than is the norm for most parts of the continent today -- and no non-Whites at all. And I have a vision of these 50 million White North Americans living and working in a land of regrown forests and unpolluted rivers and lakes and clean air: a land without litter along its roads and pathways and with bears and wolves and mountain lions and eagles returned to their natural habitats and forming once again a natural part of our environment. And in my vision a substantial part of these regrown forests and unpolluted rivers and lakes are in the public domain: in fact, a continuous public domain stretching from coast to coast between and around private holdings. And I envision no cities -- certainly, none of the sprawling, noisy, congested, asphalt-and-concrete monstrosities surrounded by smoke-belching factories, clogged freeways, and honky-tonk strips with which we are all too familiar today. Towns with populations of no more than 10,000 should be adequate for commercial centers, manufacturing centers, educational centers, and any other sort of facility requiring the cooperative efforts of a couple of thousand people. I am assuming, of course, modern transportation, communication, and manufacturing methods. Even plants for smelting ore, producing steel, or making ball bearings, if designed and

operated to take advantage of modern technological developments, should be able to do without the huge concentrations of labor used today.

In fact, I believe that ultimately we can do without an urban proletariat altogether. Inevitably there will be dirty and unpleasant jobs to be done, jobs requiring a strong back, jobs that are boring and repetitious, even after we've automated and modernized and streamlined and computerized our industry and our agriculture and our transportation system as much as we can. But we won't need a huge, blue-collar class of Joe and Jill Sixpacks doing that sort of labor all their lives. And we certainly won't have non-Whites in our society to do our dirty work for us.

It is unrealistic to try to plan things in too much detail now, but a good approach to the problem of who does the dirty work is the sort of thing the Germans did in the 1930s, with every young person going through a period of a couple of years of labor service, regardless of whether he was destined ultimately to be a poet or a factory owner or a farmer or a research scientist. That not only gets the garbage collected and the tomatoes picked, but it pulls the community together and minimizes inter-class hostility.

The Germans had many other excellent ideas which were put into practice in the 1930s: ideas about housing and transportation and industrial management and labor relations and community structure and the raising of children and the training of young people and public health and so on. We can learn much from a study of what they accomplished before we all were tricked into a horribly destructive and unnecessary war that switched the whole world off the track of racial progress and onto the ruinous track of multiculturalism.

All of these aspects of the world we want in the future -- the way in which we raise and educate children, the types of communities we live in (for those who choose to live in communities) the ways in which we do our work -- all of these are very important things, but they must not be planned on the basis of esthetics alone or on the basis of our whims as to what an ideal world should be like. Every aspect of our future world is adapted to a central purpose: the purpose of human quality and human progress.

You know, the way in which Mother Nature ensured human progress and human quality in the past was through a high birthrate and a high death rate in a hard and selective environment. Many were born, but only the strongest and brightest lived long enough to have children of their own. In Europe, with its strongly differentiated seasons, the family that did not plan well for the winter and save for the winter did not live until the spring. In the tropics, the grasshopper could afford to fiddle away the summer because it was always summer, but in the North only the industrious ants survived, and the grasshoppers perished.

Unfortunately, we who evolved in Europe and learned how to control our environment outsmarted ourselves by short-circuiting Nature's selective process. Medical science is a wonderful thing, but applied indiscriminately and combined with a welfare system that protects the foolish and the improvident, it has led to a serious decline in human quality in recent centuries. We must reverse this trend, and we should design the reversal of the trend into our future world. Certainly, appropriate legislation can be a part of the design. For example, anyone who remains on welfare for as long as a year must be sterilized; if a child is born to a mother on

welfare, both mother and child must be sterilized; if a congenital defect is corrected by medical intervention, then the intervention must be accompanied by sterilization.

It is dangerous, however, to rely entirely on something as artificial and as subject to the whims of fashion as legislation. Legislation served to maintain the racial quality of the ancient Spartans for a while, but it didn't last. People -- even intelligent and moral people -- will choose comfort and ease over a more demanding and selective lifestyle when comfort and ease are available. That's the problem we've always had with material progress: it tends to oppose human progress. Avoiding that fundamental opposition is the biggest challenge we face, and it needs to be addressed not only by enlightened legislation but also by education, from children in kindergarten up through students in the universities, and also by popular entertainment through the mass media.

Beyond legislation and education and propaganda, social institutions and lifestyles should be designed with human quality and human progress in mind. It's not really possible to say now how this may be implemented in detail, but I can give a couple of suggestive examples. Young people should be raised in a competitive environment. They should compete athletically: in gymnastics, in track and field events, in the exercise of outdoor survival skills, in armed and unarmed martial arts -- and at least for girls, in esthetic contests, in contests of beauty and grace -- which more than anything else are dependent on good genes and good health -- and in contests of song and dance and musical performance. And they should compete intellectually, with recognition and scholarships and admission to the best schools given to the best scholars, to the best problem-solvers.

Children raised in such a competitive environment will grow up valuing performance and quality and achievement. When the time comes for them to engender children of their own they will better understand the need for having the best possible children. And the institution of marriage, properly designed, can serve that purpose.

In the first place, children raised competitively and rewarded or recognized according to their achievements, will tend to sort themselves according to quality, so that superior boys are more likely to be in the same schools or the same workplaces as superior girls, and are therefore more likely to marry superior girls.

In the second place, producing children can be encouraged or discouraged according to the quality of the parents. The best parents can be given the greatest social and economic incentives for having large families. And the economy can be structured, the job market can be tailored, so that the brightest and healthiest women have very few career choices and therefore are more likely to choose marriage and motherhood, while attractive careers outside the home are much more available to less gifted women, so that they are less likely to become mothers.

I think that with intelligent planning we can achieve the desired results with a minimum of governmental intrusion into private lives. And, really, this is a very important aspect of the sort of world we want for our people in the future: we want a world where the environment and the shape of the society itself and the lifestyles which naturally flow from that environment and that society are what give us our racial progress, rather than governmental compulsion or

regimentation. And the reason for this preference is not so much a dislike of governmental compulsion as the fact that governmental compulsion tends to be uncertain and transitory.

I envision a world of White families, of White schools, of White communities: clean and orderly communities, with lots of healthy White children, hiking and camping and learning crafts or folk traditions instead of hanging around shopping malls in baggy shorts or cruising and drinking and throwing beer cans out the window: obedient White kids who say "yes, sir" and "yes, ma'am" to their parents and don't smoke or listen to non-White music or join urban street gangs, because there won't be any urban street gangs. And I envision a world with fewer limits and constraints, with a lot more possibilities for the individual to follow his own inclinations, a world in which most of the people feel that they can have almost any sort of future they want within the general framework of their responsibilities to their race, if they're willing to take chances and work hard.

I'm afraid that the part about taking chances and working hard won't appeal to all racially conscious White people today: certainly not to those on welfare and probably not to those who have become accustomed to living comfortably even as their world goes over the brink. They might prefer a world without Blacks and Mexicans and Jews and Vietnamese, but they want it to be a world of total comfort and safety, a world in which technology increases the capacity for self-indulgence without limit. They would balk at sacrificing comfort and luxury and personal safety for racial progress.

And I know that most of these people also will balk at the hard methods required to get from here to there. They would like for all of the non-Whites to just go away. They would like for all of the racially mixed couples and their mongrel offspring to disappear without any fuss. They would like for all of the Jews to sell out their interests in the media and head for Tel-Aviv and stay there. They would like for all of the White capitalists and liberals and feminists and politicians who have been collaborating with the Jews because they are getting some advantage from it at the expense of their race to wake up one morning and realize the error of their ways and henceforth put the interests of their race first.

But none of that will happen. Without struggle life sinks back into the slime. It always has been only through hardship and struggle and the shedding of blood that life has advanced. Increasing our level of comfort through our technology is not the same as increasing human quality; in fact, throughout history technology has resulted in a lowering of the average human quality in our own race by contravening the process of natural selection -- although our technology also gave us an advantage in our conflicts with other races. What we have done in the past century is foolishly to give away much of that latter advantage while keeping the disadvantage.

Well, our technology need not be used so foolishly in the future, even if it has been so far. It is possible for us to continue reaching for the stars without trying to halt the beneficial effects of AIDS in Africa, for example. We can continue developing new microelectronic gadgetry and at the same time prevent dysgenic breeding among our own people, if we have the will to do so. But when we are sinking comfortably back into the slime we don't have that will; in fact, we don't even like to think about these uncomfortable things, but they are nonetheless true.

We can envision a new White world of strong men and beautiful women and bright children; a greener world of regrown forests and unpolluted air and water; a cleaner world, without Jewish television or non-Whites; a progressive world, in which each successive generation of our people is a little healthier and a little brighter than the last. That new White world can only rise out of hard and bloody struggle, however. It will not be presented to us as a gift, and no one will devise a nice, painless way of getting from here to there. We must have the will to build that world and to overcome every enemy who will try to stop us along the way. Acquiring that will will be the real achievement for us. Once we have the will, we can win the struggle.

In this soft and feminized age it is much easier to continue sinking comfortably back into the slime. So our task for now remains to continue talking to our people about real things, to keep the perceptive minority of our people aware that we are indeed sinking, to help them develop the proper attitudes and the hard, realistic modes of thought conducive to racial survival; and in its own time the comfort will end and the bloodshed will begin, as it always has.

Meanwhile, it doesn't hurt us to daydream occasionally about that cleaner, greener, White world we want to build for our people.

I Need Your Support

How are we doing? How do we judge how we are doing?

Most people, I believe, judge themselves by the reactions of those around them. Certainly, that's true of lemmings, who have no inner standards for judgment at all. They evaluate their own qualities, their own behavior, their own accomplishments entirely on the basis of the reactions of those around them. They are entirely social animals, herd animals.

But really, all of us, not just the lemmings, do that to a greater or lesser degree. When the major Jewish organizations declared my organization, the National Alliance, to be the most dangerous organization in America, my response was, "Hey, wonderful! We must be doing something right." Every time I see a shrill newspaper headline reference to me, or read an editorial with some editor shrieking that I am a "hater," I know that I have earned the hatred of an enemy of my people, and I cannot help but feel a little twinge of pride because of it.

Of course, we have to be careful about that sort of thing. When a bunch of Jewish organizational leaders and media bosses declare that I am "dangerous," I never know whether they really feel threatened by the ideas and the truths that I bring out in these broadcasts or whether they've just sent out a fund appeal and are trying to frighten the little Jews into sending them money by holding me up as a bogeyman. Perhaps it's a little of both.

It's a similar situation with governments. The media, the liberals, and the politicians in Germany are trying to outlaw any groups there that are opposed to multiculturalism, opposed to more non-German immigration, or opposed to the re-Judaizing of Germany. Is this effort, which is orchestrated by the media, simply an attempt to sell more newspapers by raising sensational issues, or is it based on a real fear that German patriotic groups are gaining strength and may derail liberal and Jewish plans to multiculturalize Germany?

I'm inclined to believe that there is a certain amount of fear behind these efforts, both in America and in Europe: efforts to muzzle heterosexual White males in general and patriots in particular. The people who are the primary beneficiaries of current government policies -- feminists, homosexuals, non-Whites of all varieties, especially Jews -- don't want anyone to upset their apple cart. They want to hang onto the unnatural policies and quotas being enforced by the government for their benefit. Feminists really would like to be able to lock up any man who laughs at their silly notions of equality. These are basically very intolerant and narrow-minded people. They don't believe in free speech except for those who agree with them. I used to get letters from them that started off:

Unfortunately, the First Amendment allows people like you to spout your hateful sexist and racist and homophobic ideas, etc.

These days I get letters from the same sort of people, who now tell me:

You should be locked up. The First Amendment was never intended to protect speech like yours, which hurts people's feelings.

Anyway, the more shrill letters I receive from haters, the more I'm inclined to believe that I'm making progress. But it's much better to judge ourselves by an internal standard than by the way in which our enemies react to us. We set our own goals and we judge ourselves on the basis of the progress we make toward those goals. In my own case, I know that I feel much better when I see credible evidence that I'm reaching more normal, healthy people with my message every week and that I'm having more of an effect on the people who listen to me -- I feel better about this than I do when some bunch of Jewish snake-oil salesman like the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith declares me the most dangerous man in America: flattering perhaps, but not really a standard to judge myself by.

Here's what I judge myself by: I received a letter from a listener a few days ago. He told me that he buys audio cassettes of all of my broadcasts, and he plays them in his car. He plays them loudly, with the windows down, so that other people can hear them too, or at least can hear parts of them, when he's stopped at traffic lights. That's the way he does his bit. But he was astounded, he told me, when one day recently he reached over to turn on the cassette player in his car and realized he already was hearing one of my broadcasts. It was coming from another car! That's what I call progress.

I told you last week about a book that a professor at the University of Vermont, Dr. Robert Griffin, has written about me. None of the big New York publishers would touch it. They all told him it wouldn't sell. So he published it as an e-book at MightyWords.com, which is a division of Barnes and Noble, the world's biggest bookseller. And Dr. Griffin's book immediately moved to the top of the best-seller list: the number-one best-seller among all of the thousands of e-books sold by MightyWords.com. And that's where his book still is: the top of the best-seller list. That's progress, because just five years ago something like that couldn't have happened. The Jewish control of the publishing industry was too tight.

I get letters every day from people who are really angry about the Middle East situation: not just about what is happening in Palestine, but about the absolutely disgusting way the media and the government over here are responding to that situation. When the Jews shoot another Palestinian child, the media here portray it as, "oops, sorry, another Arab was killed in the crossfire between Palestinian terrorists and Israeli Defense Forces." But more and more Americans over here are realizing that it's not a matter of crossfire at all. It's a matter of trained Jewish marksmen sitting safely behind barricades and carefully picking off unarmed Palestinian children with sniper rifles fitted with bipods and telescopic sights. It's cold-blooded murder. It's the Jewish method of crowd control. More and more Americans are becoming angry about the way the news is slanted and distorted to favor the Jews -- to portray the Jews always as the innocent victims -- and about the way every political candidate in America is licking the hands -- or some other part -- of the chief murderers and aggressors and liars in the Middle East.

When I see evidence of this anger I feel good. When people write to me and tell me that they agree with me that it is these same murderers that our politicians so slavishly serve who ultimately are responsible for the murderous attack on the USS Cole, regardless of who actually

delivered the bomb, I feel good. When I see more and more people understanding that it is not Osama bin Laden who is responsible for Americans being unsafe in the Middle East but that it is the people in Washington who support Israel, who support the murderers, who support the aggressors, I feel good. And if I can see evidence that I have contributed in any way to this growing understanding, I feel really good.

And you know, you can feel good too. You can help spread understanding, and you can see the results of your help. You don't have to spend thousands of dollars every month to have your own radio program in order to do this. You can help me do it. My organization, the National Alliance, has members all over the world who help support these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts and the Alliance's other outreach programs. I invite you to join us. You'll find information and an application form at our web site, If you don't have Internet access, just write to me and I'll mail you the application and information.

And if you'd like to help but just aren't a joiner -- or if you're just not ready to join yet -- you still can be a supporter. Just make a pledge to send me $10 each month. If you're worried about Janet Reno's secret police, you can send a postal money order, which is untraceable, or even cash. And of course, you can send more than $10 any time you want. But if you will pledge to send at least $10 each month to support what we're doing in the National Alliance, I'll send you our activities newsletter -- our monthly membership bulletin. That's exactly the same bulletin which is mailed out to all of our members around the world each month. I'll send it to you by first class mail every month. You won't be a member, you won't have a membership card or a membership record, but you'll receive the same bulletin that all of our members receive, and you'll be able to see the results of our activities: activities which you will be helping to support. And please be assured: I really do need your support.

One of the most interesting sections of our monthly bulletin is a sampling of both the positive and the negative responses we receive from the public as a result of our activities. In each bulletin I actually quote from a number of letters that I have received during the month, so that our members can see what the public is thinking. Even our hate mail is instructive, because it helps us to understand how the haters think -- if one can call it that. We can see very specifically just how the brainwashing of the media and the schools -- and in many cases the churches -- is reflected in the statements of those who have been brainwashed. We can see certain statements mindlessly parroted over and over in various hate letters, and we can draw some conclusions from this not only about the propaganda to which they have been subjected but also about how their minds work.

Anyway, what we're doing is interesting, and it's very important -- it's necessary -- and you can be a part of it. Just write me and let me know that you will be sending at least $10 each month, and I'll arrange for you to receive our membership bulletin by first class mail every month.

Speaking of my hate mail, I'm reminded of a subject I spoke about briefly with you a few weeks ago: a subject about which you'll certainly be hearing much more in the coming months; that's the subject of reparations to American Blacks for slavery. It's a subject which is beginning to pick up a bit of steam and will continue to do so. I recently read an essay by a Black woman who is concerned that as these reparations claims by Blacks become louder and more insistent, they

will enrage White nationalists. I don't know whom she had in mind when she referred to enraged White nationalists, but I'm a White nationalist, and I'm certainly not enraged. In fact, I'm quite pleased by the prospect of Black reparations claims: the louder and more insistent the better, the more money demanded the better.

At this time the reparations movement is being pushed mostly by Blacks, whose thinking seems to be that if the Jews could get away with it, so can they. I'm sure that it won't be long, however, before a gaggle of Jewish lawyers has shanghaied the Black reparations racket, and we'll see Black lawyers fighting with Jewish lawyers over who gets the biggest piece out of Whitey's hide.

So what does this have to do with my hate mail? Well, a fair amount of it comes from White wimps, from a whiney, feminized sort of White man who typically responds to my complaints about the out-of-control immigration situation by reminding me that the Indians were here first, that White people are immigrants, and that if anybody should be kicked out of the country it is Whites. "We stole the land from the Indians," these White wimps whine. "It doesn't really belong to us, so we have no right to keep anyone else out."

If I comment on the breakdown of law and order in Rhodesia and South Africa after those formerly civilized countries, built by White people, were turned over to Black rule, I hear a very similar sort of whining from the same White wimps. When I talk about the seizure of White farms in Rhodesia and the murder of White farmers and the rape of White women in South Africa, the wimps whine that turn about is fair play. Whites used to mistreat the Blacks in southern Africa, they say, and so now I have no right to complain that Blacks are mistreating Whites.

These are the wimps who cheered Bill Clinton when he boasted to college audiences during the past eight years that the White majority in America was on the way out: that within the next few decades the White majority would be shoved aside by people of color and by feminists and by homosexuals and by others who hadn't been given a chance to run things yet. And the wimps cheered: White wimps.

This sort of insanity didn't begin with the Clinton presidency. It was preached on college and university campuses all over America back in the 1960s. The message was that the rule of the world by heterosexual White males is not fair. White people, straight people, have had their turn. Now it's time for the non-Whites and the gays and lesbians and others to take their turn. And then really, things will be much better for everyone, even for the uptight, heterosexual White males, who had ruled the world brutally by force. The new way, it was asserted, would be women and Blacks and gays running things by committee. There would be no coercion. Everything would be worked out by talking. Everything would be shared. Everything would be fair.

You know, I'm not making this up. I was teaching on a university campus myself in the 1960s. The Jews were sowing their seeds, winning converts among the soft, feminized youth of the middle class even then. I've talked about this revolution in values and attitudes among young people during the 1960s in past broadcasts, and I'll undoubtedly talk about it again in future broadcasts, but for now I'll just recommend that if you're not old enough to remember the

revolution of the 1960s yourself, you can read a book about it that was written by one of the principal Jewish spokesmen for the revolution, Jerry Rubin. Rubin's book, *Do It*, was published in 1970 by the big New York Jewish publisher Simon & Schuster, and it's available in every major library in the country today.

Many other books also were written during the 1960s and 1970s promoting the same ideas and attitudes, but Jerry Rubin's *Do It* is the one I recommend, just because it's so accessible. It's written for young people, people with a short attention span. It's simple and straightforward and clear. There's no ambiguity about what this Jew is advocating. It may be embarrassing to some of Rubin's more sophisticated fellow travelers, who prefer sociological double-talk to Rubin's often obscene bluntness, but really, they're all promoting the same ideas, the same sort of world.

The young White people who absorbed Rubin's poisonous message in the 1960s are university administrators and high school principals and government bureaucrats and newspaper editors and Christian preachers today, using different words perhaps, but spreading the same poisonous doctrine to a new and larger generation of young White people: to the pre-teens in their baggy shorts and backward baseball caps; to the teenagers with the safety pins through their noses, listening to their CDs by Black rap stars; and to the wimpy, semi-literate, pseudo-sophisticated university students in their multi-culti dormitories who write their whining hate letters to me.

You know, I'm not enough of a psychologist to really understand this phenomenon, to understand why there are so many more whining White wimps who are susceptible to this Jewish poison than there used to be: why there are so many more pathetic, feminized young White men who believe that we ought to give America back to the Indians and let the Blacks do unto us as we are alleged to have done unto them than there were a century ago. I suspect that it has something to do with the way young people are socialized these days, spending their early years in the chaotic, democratic environment of daycare centers instead of at home. I wish I had a psychologist here on my staff to help me understand these things better.

But there are some things I do understand well enough. I understand that if White men 200 or 300 years ago had been like these feminized wimps who populate our college campuses today, we wouldn't have to debate about giving America back to the Indians,. The Indians would still have it. We never would have won the West. The Mexicans would still have it. In fact, we wouldn't be in North America at all -- or anywhere else for that matter. Kids who grew up in baggy shorts and backward baseball caps never would have stopped the Huns from taking over Europe in the fifth century, never would have been able to keep the Moors south of the Pyrenees in the eighth century. White men who believed that Huns and Moors and Turks and Mongols had as much right to Europe as Whites did and that we ought to be fair to these other races and share things with them simply wouldn't have survived. And they wouldn't have deserved to survive.

We are here today because our ancestors weren't feminized, Judaized wimps. And if our descendants are to rule this planet a century from now, a lot of people's ideas and attitudes need to be straightened out in a hurry. The feminized wimps need to be removed from our government, from our media, from our educational institutions and replaced by real White men.

That will be a tough job, because real White men are a lot scarcer than they used to be. But the job must be done; otherwise our race is finished -- forever. I don't really care how the job is done -- whether the wimps all get machine-gunned and bulldozed into giant lime pits or whether their thinking eventually is straightened out by a program of prolonged trauma and privation. But I think that a really good fight between Blacks and Whites over reparations for slavery can't hurt. I think that having Hillary in the U.S. Senate where the few decent White citizens left in New York can see and hear her every day and have their faces rubbed in her programs for the next six years can't hurt. I think that having a presidential election turn out in a way that leads half of the electorate to believe that the election was stolen from them can't hurt.

Well, I'll continue to talk with you about Black reparations and other things, and the National Alliance will continue to grow stronger, and its members will continue to do whatever is necessary to lay the groundwork for the survival of our people -- and you can support these efforts and stay in closer touch with what's happening if you'll write to me today and pledge your regular help.

Race Suicide

With the end of the year at hand this seems like a good time to sum things up. Before we sum up the past year, though, let's look at the past century. The salient feature of the 20th century was the collective suicide of the White race. In 1900 we ruled the world. We ruled politically, militarily, culturally, economically, scientifically, and in every other way. No other race even came close. We ruled India and Africa directly, and China was for all practical purposes an economic colony of Europe and America. The Chinese Emperor remained on his throne only so long as he let White men have their way in China. Japan was the only non-White nation of any significance that even had pretensions of autonomy.

We had superior weapons, superior armed forces, superior communications, superior transportation, superior agriculture and industry, superior standards of health, superior organization, superiority in every facet of science and technology. We had the best universities -- really, the only universities worthy of the name -- the best engineers. We built things that other races couldn't even imagine. We explored, we conquered, we ruled.

More important than anything else was our moral superiority -- and please don't misunderstand my use of that term. I don't mean that we were meek and inoffensive and turned the other cheek. I mean that we were proud and self-confident. We knew who we were, and we knew that we were far, far better than anyone else, and we weren't at all embarrassed by the fact that we were better. We recognized racial differences in the same way we recognized that the sun rises in the east, and we felt not the slightest need to apologize to anyone for that. Egalitarianism was a moral and mental disease that afflicted only a few of our people, despite the murderous outburst of egalitarian insanity that was the French Revolution a century earlier. Any sort of racial mixing was abhorrent to us. We looked on miscegenation with the same disgust and disapproval as on bestiality or necrophilia. We didn't tolerate it. And we didn't accept or trust Jews. That was our situation a century ago.

We did have some faults, however: some very serious faults. We were not vigilant. We were so confident in our superiority that we failed to heed the warnings of the few among us who ***were*** vigilant. We didn't pay attention when a few warned us, "Hey, we'd better do something about the race problem. We have nine million non-Whites in the United States, according to the 1900 census, and in the future they could become a real problem for us. Let's start getting rid of them now."

We thought, "Well, as long as they stay on their side of town and stay out of sight, how can they be a problem for us? Besides, they're useful for picking cotton and as cleaning women and cooks and gardeners."

And when a few warned us about the Jews we also didn't pay attention. A few warned us about the damage the Jews had done to us in the past, about their malevolence, about their growing wealth, but most of us didn't take the warnings seriously. We saw the Jews as obnoxious and unpleasant people, and we didn't let them into our private clubs and our better hotels, but we

didn't consider them really dangerous. We didn't even become alarmed when they began buying up our newspapers and elbowing their way into other propaganda media.

And lack of vigilance wasn't our only fault. We were too ready to quarrel with one another. No other race was seen as a threat to ours, so we felt no need to suppress our internal rivalries and jealousies and hatreds and form a solid front against the non-White world. We let fester old rivalries between the English and the Germans and between the Germans and the French and between the English and the Boers in South Africa and between those of us who spoke Germanic languages and those of us who spoke Slavic or Romance languages. We didn't notice our faults, our weaknesses -- but others did.

The latter half of the 19th century saw not only the beginning of the acquisition of our mass media by the Jews, but also the nearly simultaneous hatching of two long-term, murderous conspiracies designed to exploit our weaknesses and turn them against us. These two conspiracies were Zionism and Marxism. Some Jews went with one, some with the other, but both were deadly for us.

The Marxists issued their *Communist Manifesto* as far back as the middle of the 19th century, but it was another 50 years before they were able to have much of an impact on the Gentile world. As for the Zionists, they also began propagandizing and organizing about the middle of the 19th century and only became noticeable at the beginning of the 20th century, when they began having international Zionist congresses and more or less openly laying their plans to foment wars and revolutions, of which they could take advantage to promote Jewish interests.

For example, at the Zionist Congress in 1897, in Basel, Switzerland, the Zionist leader Theodor Herzl told his fellow Jews that they were having trouble persuading the Turks, who at that time controlled Palestine, to turn the country over to them, but that the Jewish leaders had plans for getting around the Turks. And I should mention that Herzl's address to the 1897 Zionist Congress has been published in a number of places, and any diligent researcher can dig up a copy. Herzl said:

"It may be that Turkey will refuse us or will be unable to understand us. This will not discourage us. We will seek other means to accomplish our end. The Orient question is now a question of the day. Sooner or later it will bring about a conflict among the nations. . . . The great European war must come. With my watch in hand do I await this terrible moment. After the great European war is ended the peace conference will assemble. We must be ready for that time."

Remember, Herzl was talking about the Jews' plans 17 years before the outbreak of the First World War. But the Jews were ready when the time came. In 1916, with the war more or less stalemated, they approached Britain's political leaders and made a deal to bring the United States into the war on the side of Britain in return for a British promise to take Palestine away from Turkey and turn it over to the Jews after the war. The British side of the deal was made public in the so-called Balfour Declaration. And the Zionists kept their end of the bargain by working through Jews close to the Democratic President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson had won the election to his second term in the White House in 1916 by promising America's voters that he would keep the United States out of the European war. But as soon as he took

office in 1917 he began scheming to get the country into the war on the side of Britain, which, of course, he did two months later. That cost a couple of million additional Gentile lives, but it got Palestine for the Jews -- and it also prolonged the war enough for the Jews in Russia to topple the czar and get their communist revolution off the ground.

When I said that some Jews took the Marxist route and some the Zionist route, I didn't mean that all Jews became active workers in one or the other of those movements. Most Jews remained full-time money-grubbers and provided propaganda and financial support for their conspiratorial brethren, continuing to buy up mass media and to dispense capital to the Zionists or the communists as needed. And they didn't wait for the First World War for that. The first big Gentile bloodletting of the last century in which they had a hand was the Boer War in South Africa, between the British and the Boers. This cruel and murderous war, in which Jewish capitalists were allied with British capitalists against South Africa's Dutch and German and French farmers -- the Boers -- laid the foundations for Jewish control of much of Africa's mineral wealth.

In 1904 the Jewish Wall Street speculator Jacob Schiff, planning ahead for a communist takeover of Russia, helped to finance the Japanese side in the Russian-Japanese war and used his influence to block loans to the Czar's government from America. This was the same Jacob Schiff who a little more than a decade later provided the Jewish-Bolshevik movement with an infusion of $25 million to finish the job in Russia: that's $25 million from capitalist Wall Street to finance the communist butchery of Gentile Russians. In 1917 $25 million was a lot of money; in any case it bought enough bombs and bullets and communist propaganda leaflets to get the job done.

Now, none of this Jewish activity was really secret. The lemmings didn't know about it, because it wasn't in the funny papers or the movies. But Jews weren't even trying to keep their sympathies or their activities secret, and observant Gentiles continued to issue warnings to anyone who would listen. But, as I said a moment ago, we weren't vigilant. White Americans didn't believe that they were in any danger. Things such as the deal to bring America into the First World War in return for the turning of Palestine over to the Jews were too subtle for the American mind.

After the war the mass murder of Ukrainians and Russians by Jewish-Bolshevik commissars might possibly have registered with White Americans, except that the average White American didn't think of Russians and Ukrainians as real people: they spoke a different language and dressed differently from us. And besides, by that time the Jews had gotten a pretty good grip on Hollywood and the broadcasting industry, and so the only side of the story that most Americans were allowed to see or hear was the Jewish side.

Europeans were more vigilant than Americans. For one thing Europeans had longer memories: they were more aware of the long history of Jewish scheming and predation than Americans were. For another thing, in Europe the danger was quite a bit closer. Communist parties in a number of European countries besides Russia had taken advantage of the chaos in the wake of the war to make grabs for power, and in a few countries -- Hungary, for example -- they succeeded temporarily. People noticed the ethnicity of the commissars and were horrified by their behavior toward the Gentile populations. Even in insular Britain no less a public figure than

Winston Churchill spoke out clearly about the danger of Jewish communism. In a full-page feature article in the February 8, 1920, issue of London's *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, Churchill wrote:

This movement among the Jews is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weisshaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky in Russia, Bela Kun in Hungary, Rosa Luxembourg in Germany, and Emma Goldman in the United States, this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality has been steadily growing. It played . . . a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.

There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus Tchitcherin, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate Litvinoff, and the influence of Russians like Bukharin or Lunacharski cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky or of Zinovieff . . . or of Krassin or Radek -- all Jews. In the Soviet institutions the predominance of Jews is even more astonishing. And the prominent, if not indeed the principal, part in the system of terrorism applied by the Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution [the Cheka] has been taken by Jews, and in some notable cases by Jewesses. The same evil prominence was obtained by Jews in the brief period of terror during which Bela Kun ruled in Hungary. The same phenomenon has been presented in Germany (especially in Bavaria), so far as this madness has been allowed to prey upon the temporary prostration of the German people. Although in all these countries there are many non-Jews every whit as bad as the worst of the Jewish revolutionaries, the part played by the latter in proportion to their numbers in the population is astonishing."

Actually, Churchill said quite a bit more in this article about the dangers of allowing Jewish communism to go unchecked, and if you really want to make a study of the background of our present mess you should read the entire article yourself. That's the February 8, 1920, issue of the *Illustrated Sunday Herald.* If you can't find it yourself in a large research library, the entire article is photographically reproduced in the book *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, which is available from National Vanguard Books, the sponsor of this program. And when you do find the article from which I just read -- a major article written by one of the most prominent personalities of the last century and published in a major British newspaper -- you might ask yourself why you had never heard of it before I called it to your attention.

As I said, we lacked vigilance. A few people paid attention -- America's pioneer automaker Henry Ford, for example -- but most White Americans were too busy with their ball games and funny papers. And we didn't really care about what the Jews were doing to White people overseas, since they weren't Americans. About the only people who really paid attention were

the Germans, who resolved not to let the Jews do to them what they had done to the Russians and had tried to do to the Hungarians. So they proceeded to get Rosa Luxembourg and her pals off their backs and out of Germany. And when the Germans did that, the Jews in America began screaming bloody murder and calling for another world war to save them from the Germans. And by this time the Jews had almost a monopoly on getting their side of the story to the American public.

Well, our people had one other fault in addition to an inadequate sense of racial solidarity with other Whites around the world and a lack of vigilance: we also lacked responsible leadership. We lacked even a system for giving us responsible leadership. What we had were politicians: skilled liars -- actors, lawyers -- who never asked themselves, "What policy is good for our people?" but only, "How can I get elected? What must I promise the people in order to get their votes? What policy will make me popular?" And as the grip of the Jews on the mass media, on Hollywood and Madison Avenue -- and therefore on the minds of the public -- became more and more nearly complete throughout the last century, the question the politicians asked themselves became, more and more: "What must I do to please the Jews and gain their support?"

And so in 1933, in the same year that a German government took office with a policy of freeing the German people from the grip of the Jews, in America a government took office with a policy of doing whatever the Jews wanted done. Franklin Roosevelt surrounded himself with more Jews than any previous American President. In this regard he was the Bill Clinton of his day.

Using Roosevelt as their willing tool, the Jews pulled the same sort of bait-and-switch trick on the American people to get us into the Second World War that they had pulled using Woodrow Wilson to get us into the First World War. Just as Wilson had done 24 years earlier, Roosevelt ran for re-election in 1940 on a campaign promise to keep the United States out of the war in Europe, and while he was making that promise to the American people he was actively scheming with his Jewish advisors and supporters to get the United States into the war as soon as he could, and meanwhile to keep the war in Europe going by making promises of support to those countries opposed to Germany.

It was fighting on the wrong side of that war, more than anything else, that laid us low. It also destroyed the British Empire and laid Britain low. Throughout the non-White world Whites began abdicating their rule, withdrawing, apologizing. The disease of egalitarianism spread like wildfire. There was a moral collapse throughout the White world. It wasn't just the German people who lost the Second World War; it was all Europeans, all White people, including European-Americans.

The Jews were the only real winners. The First World War resulted in opening up Palestine for their Zionist faction and delivering Russia to their communist faction. The Second World War not only saved them from getting booted out of Europe by Hitler, it delivered all of eastern and much of central Europe to their communist faction and finished delivering Palestine to their Zionist faction. The war cost them a million or so of the less-nimble Jews in Europe, but it gave them the basis for their enormously profitable "Holocaust" story, with which they have beaten the White world over the head ever since.

And so today we have George Bush trying to outdo Bill Clinton in multiculturalizing the government of the United States. Conservative Americans, patriotic Americans, put their hope in Bush to pull America back from the insanity of the Clinton era, and the first thing Bush does is try to ingratiate himself with the Clintonistas, with the Jews, by appointing non-Whites to the most important posts in his administration.

Read the man's lips. What he's saying is: "Hey, I'm really not such a bad guy. See, I'm appointing Blacks, I'm appointing Jews, I'm appointing Mexicans. And the Blacks and Mexicans I'm appointing are just as pro-Jewish as I am. My tough-talking Black secretary of state speaks Yiddish and will support Jewish interests around the world just as strongly as Bill Clinton's Jewish secretary of state has done. You can trust me. I'll do whatever you tell me. I'll support Israel. I'll support 'speech crime' laws. I'm your man." And he's not saying that, he's not making these appointments, because that's what Republicans want or even what Americans want. It's what the Jews want. George Bush is a hollow man, an empty man.

And George Bush is a splendid symbol of the state of our race today: a splendid symbol of our moral collapse during the past century. It is entirely fitting that such a man should be our figurehead leader as we continue on the course of racial suicide that we have been on for the past century. It is entirely appropriate that he became our figurehead leader through the comic-opera sort of process we have witnessed during the last two months of the first year of this century -- which certainly will be our last century if we do not make a radical change of course soon and begin regaining our lost moral strength.

What We Can Do

One of the more common responses I receive from listeners goes something like this: "OK, you've convinced us that we have some very serious problems, but you never tell us what we should do about these problems."

Two weeks ago I spoke in general terms about the sort of White world we want to have in the future, and again I received many letters along the line, "I agree with your vision of the future, but you didn't tell us how to get from here to there."

But, of course, I have often talked with you about what we must do. Sometimes, I should admit, what I tell you is very general. Two weeks ago, for example, I told you that the new, White world we want can only rise out of hard and bloody struggle. That's not very specific. But in other broadcasts I have been specific. I have talked specifically about some of the things we must do to get from here to there.

I think that the people who complain that I never give solutions to the problems I present are looking at the world a little differently than I am. When they say, "Tell us how to get from here to there," what they really want me to tell them is a safe, easy, and painless way to get from here to there: a quick and sure way. And, of course, I cannot tell them that, because there is no such way. We have gotten ourselves into a really bad mess, and it inevitably will cost us an enormous amount of blood and suffering to recover from it -- if we are able to recover at all. I don't talk much about the specifics of the blood and suffering because, for one thing, that will come a bit later, and we don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves.

For another thing, in these soft and comfortable times, most people just can't cope with really hard concepts. I had a letter a couple of days ago from a listener who said that he agreed with most of my broadcast, but that I was too "extreme" in talking about remedies. He thought that my suggestion that welfare mothers should be sterilized was horrible -- "over the top" was the expression he used -- and that it certainly would turn off people who otherwise would be receptive to my vision of the future.

Well, all I can say to that is that if he finds the thought of sterilizing welfare mothers to be "over the top," he'll have a hard time coping with the terrible reality which lies ahead of us. He's like one of those gentle and civilized folks who appreciates the bacon he eats with his breakfast but can't bear to think about the bloody details of how the bacon got from the pig happily rooting in the farmyard to his plate. Sterilizing welfare mothers will be one of the kinder and gentler things we will be obliged to do.

Anyway, there's not much point in debating such remedies now, because we're not yet in a position to implement them, and we don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves. We need merely to understand that our struggle will be long and difficult and will involve many things so far "over the top" that they would cause our more comfortable and civilized listeners to swoon if we got into the details now.

The specific remedies that we want to talk about in detail are the things that we actually can do -- or begin doing -- now. And the thing that I have spoken about over and over again is communication. Nothing else that we try to do has any chance of getting us from here to there unless we first have acquired the ability to communicate effectively with our people. He who controls the means of communication with the public controls the future.

And as I have said at least 50 times in these broadcasts, that is why the Jews, as soon as they began arriving in he United States in the 1890s, began establishing themselves in our mass media. They didn't buy up farmland. They didn't try to get a monopoly in the railroad or steamship business. They didn't try to build a strong position for themselves in the munitions industry or in kitchen appliances. Instead they began buying up our big-city newspapers. By the beginning of the last century they owned the *New York Times.* They acquired the *Washington Post* at a bankruptcy sale during the Great Depression. As soon as the motion picture business began showing its products in theatres, the Jews swarmed into Hollywood and elbowed out all of the Gentiles except Walt Disney; they had to wait until he died to take over the Walt Disney Company. In the 1920s they began taking over the radio broadcasting industry. When commercial television came on the scene at the end of the Second World War, they controlled it from the beginning.

None of this was an accident. From the beginning they knew what they were doing. They understood that in order to control and corrupt and exploit our society, they must first control the channels of communication. It was as instinctive as a tick finding its way from the tall grass onto a passing dog and burrowing in. It is why they are working so strenuously now to censor the Internet and to persuade the government to enact legislation against "speech crime." In America they still are playing a double game, with some Jews pretending to be supporters of the First Amendment while other Jews are busy persuading the lemmings that the First Amendment ought to be abolished, but in every country where "speech crime" legislation has been enacted since the Second World War, the Jews are solidly in favor of that legislation and are the most active agitators for the prosecution of "speech criminals," the suppression of banned books, the rigid censorship of the Internet, and every other means to keep dissidents from challenging the Jews' control of the flow of information to the public.

So again, our very specific plan for getting from here to the kind of White world we want is to break the grip of our people's enemies on the flow of information and ideas and to develop our own media for communicating with the people. That may sound prosaic. It may sound dull because it doesn't involve marching in the streets or shooting, but it is absolutely necessary. By itself, of course, it is not enough. But it is the first step. We must be able to inform our people, we must be able to motivate our people, we must be able eventually to move our people -- but first we must be able to communicate effectively with them. Without effective and continuing communication, nothing else is possible. And, difficult as it is to fight the lies of the Jews when they already have such a grip on the minds of the lemmings through their media control, it is possible for us also to communicate. By directing our efforts toward the two or three per cent of our people who still are able to think for themselves rather than toward the lemmings, we are beginning to make a small difference. Through these radio broadcasts and our books and the music we distribute to young people, we are informing people and influencing their thinking, and the Jews hate it.

Let me give you a very specific example of why it is so important to be able to communicate with the people. It's also an example of the enormous power of the communications media to influence the perceptions -- and therefore the attitudes and opinions and behavior -- of the public, for good or for evil. Just two weeks ago I heard a very brief snippet of news on the *CNN Headline News* program that I watch for at least ten minutes every day. The news announcer mentioned that the second quadruple murder in just eight days had taken place in Wichita, Kansas, and that the police had two suspects in custody. And that was it: no details and no pictures. I thought that certainly there would be details and pictures on later news reports. But in the following days there was no further mention of the quadruple murders in Wichita. And, as I said, I watch the *CNN Headline News* by satellite every day -- in fact, often twice a day: once in the morning and once in the evening.

Now, cynic that I am, that sort of behavior by the Jewish news media always makes me suspicious: especially the fact that there were no pictures, no faces of victims or murderers, on the most widely watched television news program in the country. Two quadruple murders in a week in a Midwestern town the size of Wichita, and CNN has nothing to say about it? That's equivalent to two massacres of 40 people each in Chicago in a week.

You know what I thought? I was immediately suspicious that there must be something Politically Incorrect about those murders, some racial angle, perhaps, that the Jewish media bosses had decided we didn't need to be told about. So I asked some of my people to see what they could find out from Wichita-area news sources. And within a couple of days I had a stack of news reports on my desk from the local newspaper, the *Wichita Eagle,* and I also had photographs of the victims and of the murderers. And then I understood why the Jewish media bosses in New York had decided to keep Americans outside the area right around Wichita from knowing about the murders, why they had decided to keep telling us, over and over and over again, about the latest dispute over dimpled ballots in Florida, rather than telling us about the terrible things that happened on a cold night in Wichita just a few days ago -- not just terrible, but also terribly important.

So I'll tell you what happened. On the evening of December 14 five young people -- three men and two women -- were together in a Wichita house. One of the young women, Suzanne Muller, was a Wichita State University student. Two of the people in the house were high school teachers; they were 26-year-old Jason Befort and his 25-year-old fiancée. The other two young men, Bradley Heyka and Aaron Sander, were friends of Befort and shared the house with him. Sander, 29 years old, was preparing to become a priest. He and Suzanne Muller were dating. All five of the young people in the house that evening were clean-cut, clean-living, all-American types.

At about 11:00 PM two Black males suddenly showed up at the door with a pistol and forced their way into the house. They led all five of the Whites out of the house and drove them away in two vehicles. One of the vehicles was Jason Befort's new pickup. The Blacks drove them around for several hours, stopping at several automatic teller machines, where they forced the Whites to withdraw money. At about 2:00 AM Friday the Blacks drove to a snow- covered soccer field outside Wichita. There the Blacks made the White women undress, and then both Blacks took

turns raping the two White women. When they had finished, they made all five Whites kneel in the snow in a line, then went down the line and shot each of them in the back of the head.

After that the two Blacks drove back to the house where Befort, Heyke, and Sander had lived and ransacked it, stealing television sets, a VCR, and other personal belongings of the victims. Before they left they killed Befort's pet dog.

One of their victims was not dead, however. Befort's 25-year-old fiancée regained consciousness shortly after the Blacks drove away from the soccer field. Despite having been shot in the back of the head, she ran naked through the snow in the sub- freezing night for a mile, until she found a house where a White couple lived who let her in when she pounded on the door and cried for help. She was able to describe the Black rapists and killers and their vehicle to the police, and both were arrested a few hours later. The two are brothers, and both have long criminal records. They are typical lowlife Blacks, one with dreadlocks and the other with his hair in corn rows. One was released from jail just a few days before the killings.

That's the story that the media bosses decided didn't merit national coverage. And it wasn't just CNN that killed the story. I spoke to several people who watch the news regularly on other networks, and no one had heard about the Wichita murders. I'm not surprised. That's just the way it is with Black-on-White crime, no matter how atrocious. The media bosses simply don't want any information going out to the White public that might cause any of us to question the wisdom or the rightness of the continued multiculturalizing of America, or that might cause any of us to realize that we're under attack and need to think about protecting ourselves.

Well, there's at least one other aspect of this tragedy in Wichita that deserves our attention. All of the victims were able-bodied White people, three young men and two young women. None was a cripple. One of the young men, Jason Befort, the high school teacher, also was a basketball coach. And yet none of them put up any resistance. They let two Blacks lead all five of them out of their house and drive away with them. The three White men stood and watched while the two Blacks took turns raping their women. They all knelt obediently in the snow and let themselves be shot in the back of the head, one at a time. Why?

It's true that they all were Christians. It's true that the priest who conducted the funeral Mass for Jason Befort made a point of telling everyone at the funeral that they should not seek vengeance but instead should forgive the killers. But, you know, Christians didn't used to be such pansies. And it is a shameful fact that many of our young men today who are not especially religious also are not very manly. It's not just the Christians who have let themselves be persuaded that not only is it wrong to defend yourself, but that it's especially wicked to defend yourself against a non- White. To refuse to give a Black anything he demands is tantamount to racism. Really, there's a substantial portion of the White population in America who really would have mixed feelings about defending themselves against a Black intruder in their homes. They would stand by and watch a Black rape a wife, a daughter, or a sister before they would shoot the Black.

That sort of moral depravity is not all the result of Christian preaching. Most of it comes from the Jewish media, from Hollywood films and television entertainment programs which condition susceptible elements of the public not to be hostile to Blacks, not to resist Blacks, not to defend

themselves against Blacks. In Wichita, where the media bosses couldn't conceal the rapes and murders which took place there two weeks ago, Whites flooded into Wichita gun stores to purchase firearms for home protection. The Jewish media bosses don't want White people in other parts of the country doing the same thing. They don't want Whites deciding to protect themselves. They don't want their media conditioning undone by reality. That's why they suppress news that doesn't serve their purpose.

And that's why it's essential for us to be able to stymie their efforts at suppression of the news. We can't do much for the lemmings at this time, of course. The only information they receive comes from network television. They never look for information elsewhere. They don't want to know anything else. But there are three or four or five million White people in America who still are able to think for themselves and who do want to understand what's happening. We're reaching a growing number of these perceptive people every week. After we have reached and informed and motivated enough of them, we'll be able to begin reaching the lemmings. But we must do things a step at a time. We must build our ability to communicate with our people.

I'll give you another example of the way we already are able to communicate effectively with those of our people able to think for themselves, in addition to exposing the suppression of news about Black-on-White crime. One of the Jews' most important and powerful assets is their "Holocaust" story. Not only do they use it to extort tens of billions of dollars in so-called "reparations" from the Gentile world for wrongs they claim were done to them sixty years ago, but they use it to shield themselves from criticism or scrutiny. If I criticize their control of our news and entertainment media, for example, then I am just like one of those awful Nazis who shoved six million innocent Jews into "gas ovens" during the Second World War. That's why most people are afraid of being accused of being anti-Jewish. They are afraid of the "Holocaust" story.

The Jews understand this, of course, and so they protect their "Holocaust" story jealously. That's why the "Holocaust" is not subject to examination. If, for example, some scholar, some historical researcher, comes along and says, "I wonder whether it was exactly six million Jews who were shoved into gas ovens. Perhaps it was only five million. Perhaps not every Jew who died perished in a gas oven. Perhaps some of them died in other ways. I think I'll investigate the matter and find out exactly what the details were." Anyone who says that is attacked as a "Holocaust denier." They never accuse him of being a "Holocaust examiner" or a "Holocaust scholar." They always call him a "Holocaust denier." They portray him as some sort of nut-case flat-earth theorist who believes that ***no*** Jews died during the war, that there were ***no*** concentration camps, that there was ***no*** persecution of Jews, that there was no "Holocaust." That's what's implied by the label "Holocaust denier." And it's a fraudulent label, a crooked label.

Virtually no one believes that no Jews were killed during the Second World War. But plenty of people who have looked into the matter understand that things didn't happen quite the way the Jews and their collaborators say they happened. But if such a knowledgeable person begins talking about what he knows, then he is discredited by all of the media under Jewish control as a "Holocaust denier." The lemmings believe the accusation without question. But perceptive people can see that it is a fraudulent accusation. They can see that there is a big difference

between questioning the details of the "Holocaust" and denying that any Jews at all were killed or persecuted.

And that's exactly why I talk so often about the "Holocaust" in my broadcasts. It's an easy and convincing illustration of the basic crookedness of the Jewish media bosses. Once a perceptive person sees the way in which the Jewish media fraudulently use the term "Holocaust denier," he is much better able to understand and believe my assertion that the suppression of the news about what happened in Wichita two weeks ago was no fluke. It was deliberate and malevolent. The news was suppressed because the Jews want to keep the White public morally disarmed so that they can more easily destroy us.

Five years ago I had a hard time getting people -- even intelligent and perceptive people -- to understand that. Today there are hundreds of thousands of people in America who understand that, and the number is growing every week, and an important reason why this understanding is growing is that my ability to communicate with the public has grown.

So if you ask me, "How do we get from here to there? Tell us what we can actually do about our problems," then my answer is, we can continue building our ability to communicate effectively with people of good will who are able to think for themselves. And then one day we will be able to communicate with the lemmings too. And when we are able to do that, we will be able to do everything else that must be done. That's what I'm doing. And as for what you can do: you can help me. I do need your support.

Draw Your Own Conclusions

Two weeks ago I told you about the atrocious murders of four young White men and women in Wichita, Kansas, last month by two Blacks. Two of my reasons for telling you about these murders were, first, the fact that the controlled news media in America had imposed a total blackout, outside the Wichita area, on the news of these atrocious crimes; and second, the fact that the Whites who were murdered didn't resist the Blacks who murdered them, and I wanted to draw a lesson from this failure to resist.

Well, another two weeks have passed, and the national Jewish news media have maintained their total blackout on the murders -- and during this time I have learned a few more details about the crimes which accentuate both points I made two weeks ago. What I told you in my earlier broadcast was that two Black brothers, 20-year-old Jonathan Carr and 23-year-old Reginald Carr, invaded a White home in Wichita on the evening of December 14, kidnapped the three White men and two White women in the home, all of them in their 20s, forced them to withdraw money from several ATM machines, then drove to a snow-covered soccer field on the outskirts of Wichita. There the Blacks raped the two White women, then told all five of the Whites to kneel in the snow and shot them in the back of the head, one at a time. After that the two Blacks returned to the Whites' home, burglarized it, and killed a pet dog they found there: a small, gray terrier.

One of the young White women they shot in the head didn't die however. She regained consciousness, ran naked and bleeding through the snow for a mile, and summoned police, who arrested the Blacks a few hours later. That's what the Jewish media bosses decided we didn't need to hear about, and they clamped a complete blackout on the story on December 15. In eager collaboration with the Jewish media, local authorities -- local politicians -- also imposed an embargo on all news about the affair. The local female district attorney, Nola Foulston, repeatedly asserted that race was not a factor, and that the rapes and murders would not be treated as "hate crimes."

What I have learned recently is that after the two Blacks drove the five Whites to the soccer field, they not only forced the White women to strip and then raped them, but they also forced all of the Whites to put on a sex show for the amusement of the Blacks. On that snowy soccer field they forced the White men to engage in homosexual acts; they forced the White women to have sex with each other; and they forced the White men to have sex with the White women before shooting all of them. After the Blacks forced the Whites to kneel naked in the snow and shot them in the back of the head, they deliberately ran over them with one of the vehicles they were driving. This additional information was leaked from the grand jury which heard the evidence in the case, despite the official news embargo.

Furthermore, three days earlier the same two Blacks murdered another White woman, Ann Walenta, a cellist in the Wichita Symphony Orchestra, while she was sitting in her car outside her home. And four days before that, on December 7, they kidnapped, robbed, and pistol-whipped a White man, 23-year-old Andrew Schreiber, the manager of a Wichita convenience store.

Nothing racial about any of that, right? And certainly nothing that the White public should be told about, right? I mean, it's certainly not as newsworthy as the dragging death of a Black ex-convict in Jasper, Texas, in 1998 by three White ex-convicts, is it? I mean, the Jasper killing was given top billing by all of the controlled news media in America -- and in Europe as well -- for two years, and the racial angle was emphasized over and over and over again: hardened White racists drag innocent Black man to death. So obviously the murders and rapes of five White people in Wichita by a couple of underprivileged and misguided Black youths doesn't need any news coverage. Enough news already about interracial crime, right? No need to exacerbate racial tensions, right?

Well, that's one of the points I wanted to accentuate. The other point is the total lack of resistance of the White victims. It now seems that the two Blacks were armed only with a .380 caliber semiautomatic pistol. All of the killings were done with that same gun, and the police are still looking for it. Now, you certainly can be killed with a .380, especially if you're shot in the back of the head at close range, but it's not much of a man-stopper. It's a pretty anemic caliber, and it's only used because it's small and can be carried concealed easily. It's a ladies' gun. And yet three able-bodied White men let two Blacks armed only with a .380 pistol force them to stand and watch their women being raped and degraded and even to participate in the degradation themselves. And then they knelt obediently in the snow and let themselves and their women be slaughtered, one at a time.

That's really embarrassing. One expects more of a White man. This sort of sheep-like behavior reminds me of a scene in one of my novels, *Hunter,* in which a group of White office workers kneel obediently on the floor and let a Black with a straight razor go down the line and slit their throats, one at a time. In my novel the Whites submit because they have been conditioned by the Jewish mass media not to resist Blacks. They have been conditioned to regard any resistance to Blacks as "racist." When I wrote *Hunter* 12 years ago, I was concerned that perhaps I was getting a bit ahead of myself, and that to portray Whites as so strongly conditioned by the Jewish media that they would meekly let themselves be butchered by Blacks would not be credible to my readers. I asked myself, will most Americans believe that Jewish media propaganda can have that strong an effect on people? Well, I worried about it at the time, but I left the scene in the book, and what happened in Wichita last month suggests that I really wasn't getting too far ahead of myself after all. That's a real shame.

Now let's talk about Jewish media propaganda for a while. Is it fair of me to describe it as deliberate, calculated psychological conditioning designed to demoralize White people -- and to emasculate White men in particular? Am I imagining things in believing that the mass media are slanted deliberately by the people who control them, with the aim of weakening White people and softening them up for the slaughter? Do I believe such things only because I don't like Jews and am therefore too ready to attribute bad motives to them?

Some listeners think that is the case. Some people suggest to me that the attitudes portrayed by the Jews in the entertainment they produce for White people simply reflects their prejudices, but that there's no purpose behind it to corrupt or weaken us. Nearly all Jews are liberals, they tell me, and so it is natural that they produce films and television shows that portray liberal attitudes. And I suppose, following that line of reasoning, that the way in which they cover the news for us

also is simply an unconscious reflection of Jewish likes and dislikes, with no ulterior motives behind it.

Other listeners suggest to me that I am putting the cart before the horse to blame Jewish media propaganda for changing public attitudes and opinions. What the Jews put into their Hollywood films and television programming is simply a reflection of life in America, they tell me. Americans have become more liberal, they tell me, and the Jews of Hollywood and Madison Avenue simply are following that trend, not leading it. After all, they say, the Jews are businessmen, and they're just giving the American people what they want. And the same thing applies to the news. If the American public really wanted to know what happened in Wichita last month, then the Jewish media bosses certainly would have told them. But Americans don't want to hear that kind of news, they tell me. That sort of news has a racist flavor to it, and it makes Americans uncomfortable. That's the only reason the Wichita story wasn't covered; Americans didn't want to hear about it. On the other hand, they were interested in the Jasper, Texas, dragging story. Americans felt that sort of story needed to be told in order to help fight racism. That's why the Jewish media told it . . . and told it . . . and told it.

Anyway, that's what some people tell me in order to explain why the Jewish media do what they do: why they suppress some news and exaggerate other news. Personally, I don't believe it. I believe that the Jewish media lead the trends instead of following them. I believe that the Jewish media bosses have a propaganda agenda. I believe that they use their control of the news and entertainment media in a calculated way to shape public attitudes and influence public behavior in America deliberately in order to achieve goals of their own. And I believe that those Jewish goals are inimical to our people.

But you know, you should decide that for yourself. You shouldn't just take my word for it. Yesterday a new Jewish film premiered. The name is *Save the Last Dance.* The film was made jointly by Paramount Pictures and MTV Films, both of which are subsidiaries of the Viacom Corporation. The Viacom Corporation is run by -- and largely owned by -- Jewish media boss Sumner Redstone, who was known to his parents as Murray Rothstein. And Redstone also acquired CBS recently, making him one of the top three media bosses in America -- all three of them Jews, of course. Redstone has staffed his media empire with Jews from top to bottom. He has put in a Jewess, Sherry Lansing, as president of Paramount Pictures, for example. And Viacom's MTV division, which specializes in interracial entertainment for trendy young White people, is well represented by the executive there who has handled the *Save the Last Dance* project, David Gale. Gale, a Jew, is senior vice-president of MTV Films.

Save the Last Dance is a film aimed at 13- to 17-year-old White girls. Its message to these teenaged White girls is that sex with Black boys is "cool." Very briefly, the story line is this: Sara is a White high school girl who lives in a very White small town in Illinois with her mother. Sara loves to dance, and her ambition is to become a ballet dancer. Then Sara's mother is killed in an accident, and Sara moves to Chicago to live with her father. In Chicago she attends a mostly Black high school, meets a Black boy who is into hip hop, and the two of them are drawn together by their shared interest in dancing -- although their dance styles are as different as . . . black and white. And so, of course, they end up in bed together, despite the objections of Sara's "racist" father.

I might not have mentioned this film to you if it were simply another piece of the race-mixing filth the Jews of Hollywood have been churning out during the last few years. All of this filth has the same aim, but with most of it the people who don't want to see the truth about what the Jews are up to could argue that it is simply typically low-grade Hollywood entertainment which uses interracial sex for spice, for titillation, but that there's no evil motive behind it, no intent to encourage interracial sex.

Well, they can't argue that about *Save the Last Dance.* This is a film which is aimed squarely at teenaged White girls, by far the most impressionable and susceptible segment of the White population, and its intent is to make them more receptive to the idea of interracial sex. All sorts of advertising promotions have been launched for this film, and they're all aimed at teenaged White girls. If you want to know what's on the minds of the people who made this film, go to their very own web site, savethelastdance.com, and read what they say. Clearly, encouraging interracial sex was the thing most on their minds. The film's Jewish producer, Robert Cort, discusses his motivation with his co-producer, David Madden. They say that they and others at Paramount wanted to produce a film about:

interracial romance and the social impact created by such a subject. We felt a movie could explore what those obstacles were for people involved in such relationships, particularly young people in high school.

So the Jews at Paramount Pictures turned to a Black director who has a fixation on interracial sex, Thomas Carter. According to the movie's official web site, savethelastdance.com, Carter:

had been looking for a story about interracial relationships that he could bring to the screen. Carter says the film positively reinforces the possibilities for people to love and understand each other, even when they are from different backgrounds and races.

Well, that's just a small sampling. Look at some of the film clips from *Save the Last Dance* that you can view free on the Internet. Look at some of the promotions that are so obviously intended to persuade teenaged White girls to see the film and to imitate Sara's behavior. The clear message of the film to these teenaged White viewers is, "Go thou now and do likewise."

The last thing I want to do is put more money into Sumner Redstone's pockets, but I recommend that you see the film for yourself, so that it will stick in your mind and you still will remember it when the time for the cleansing of America comes.

I don't want to give you the impression that there's something special about Redstone or the other Jews at Viacom. Some Jewish media push interracial sex more blatantly than others, but they're all behind it: all of the Jewish newspapers and magazines from the *New York Times* and *Newsweek* magazine on down, all of the Jewish film and television producers, all of the Jewish advertising agencies. It's not just a Redstone thing or a Viacom thing or a Paramount Pictures thing; it's a Jewish thing.

I'll give you another example. The Miramax division of Disney also has a new film promoting sex between teenaged White girls and Black boys. The name of the Disney film is *O.* Although it

hasn't been released yet, there's plenty of information available about it. It's been finished for more than a year, but the release has been postponed several times, reportedly because the Jewish bosses at Miramax, Bob and Harvey Weinstein, were nervous about some of the sex and violence in the film. There's a horrific scene in the film where the Black "hero" brutally rapes his pretty, blonde, teenaged girlfriend.

The Weinstein brothers are very close to both Al Gore and Hillary and Bill Clinton, and it has been rumored that they were concerned that controversy over the film might hurt Gore's chances in the recent presidential election. Perhaps Michael Eisner, the Jewish boss of Disney, Miramax's parent company, was worried too. And maybe the film's Jewish executive producer, Michael Levy, also expressed concern. Unless there's another postponement, however, *O* finally should be released sometime in the first half of this year. You should see that one too, in order to steel yourself for the hard and bloody things we will need to do in the future.

And really, that's what this is all about. As important as it is for White Americans to be informed about the criminality of Blacks and the hatred that Blacks have for us, as important as it is for us to be informed about atrocities such as those in Wichita last month, what is far more important is that we understand the systematic and deliberate distortion and suppression of the news by the Jewish bosses of the news media. The Wichita rapes and murders are more important as evidence of Jewish intent than of Black criminality.

And as important as it is for decent White Americans to be aware of the sort of destructive filth coming out of Hollywood which is targeting our children, what is far more important is for us to understand the systematic nature of this destructive filth, to understand that there is a purpose behind it, and to understand what that purpose is and whose purpose it is.

On these broadcasts I believe it's fair to say that I try harder than anything else to make myself clear. I try to state things as simply and unambiguously as I can. I try to find the most compelling evidence I can and to present it accurately and in a way that makes its meaning easy to grasp. Whenever I can, I use evidence that listeners can check for themselves if I tell them where to look. Certainly, that's true of the things of which I've spoken on this broadcast: both the Wichita rapes and murders and the Jewish films promoting miscegenation. And I try to draw my conclusions from the evidence in a way that makes those conclusions unavoidable for any reasonable listener. The principal conclusion I have drawn in this broadcast is that the Jews who dominate our news and entertainment media are not simply businessmen trying to maximize their profits, like any other businessmen. They are men who also have a political, social, cultural, and racial agenda. They report the news selectively in order to advance their agenda, and they produce entertainment for the public designed to advance their agenda. Among other things on their agenda are the moral disarmament of the White public, the destruction of any sense of White identity or White pride, the inculcation of a sense of White guilt, and the paralysis of our will to resist the total Jewish domination of our society, the paralysis of our will to survive.

Now, that's a strong conclusion to draw just from the evidence I've presented in this broadcast. But I've presented corroborating evidence in more than two hundred other broadcasts. The selective reporting of the news in a way designed to make Whites feel guilty and the production of Hollywood films that attempt to persuade teenaged White girls that they should look favorably

on sex with Blacks fit in perfectly with the Jews' support for open borders, the Jews' tireless work for "diversity" and multiculturalism, the Jews' advocacy of more and more "hate crime" legislation, the Jews' campaign against the Second Amendment, the Jews' efforts to censor the Internet and obtain legislation against "speech crime." Look at Jewish motives and activities in the light of history. Look at the way in which America has changed demographically, culturally, and morally during the past half-century under the impact of Jewish propaganda and Jewish policies. These changes did not come about by accident. They are the result of design.

The biggest and most important single factor in the Jewish campaign against White America is the Jewish control of the mass media of news and entertainment. Most Jews, of course, are not media bosses. Most Jews are not in a position to plan the selective reporting of the news or produce films designed to encourage interracial sex, the way Sumner Redstone and Michael Eisner and the Weinstein brothers are. But all of them -- or nearly all of them -- support the same things these Jewish leaders do. What is happening to America is not simply the consequence of having a small number of powerful and evil Jews in the media. It is happening as a consequence of having six million Jews in America. A small number of them control our mass media. The rest provide the Jewish tribal infrastructure which makes that control possible.

Again I say to you: don't just take my word for it. Think about it for yourself. Check the evidence for yourself. Draw your own conclusions. But don't just continue sitting on your hands and ignore what is being done to your country, to your civilization, and to your race.

MTV and Hate

Three weeks ago I began telling you about a horrible mass murder and rape of young White people in Wichita, Kansas, by a couple of Blacks. The main point I emphasized in talking about this awful crime against our people was that the Jewish news media and the White liberals who collaborate with them -- the Clintonista types -- were deliberately covering up the news about it. It wasn't that they didn't think it was important; they knew it was important, and that's why they were covering it up. The people who should have been reporting to you every detail of what happened in Wichita weren't saying a word about it. They were hoping you wouldn't learn about it. And so I told you about what happened in Wichita, and I explained to you why the Jewish media bosses didn't want you to know about it.

Of course, the massacre in Wichita wasn't the only newsworthy event being covered up by the Jewish media while I was talking to you about Wichita. I just decided to focus on Wichita, and I thought it likely that meanwhile news about some of the other crimes against our people would leak out through other media. Well, that didn't happen. The Jews successfully kept the lid on. And then last week one of the top Jewish media bosses, Sumner Redstone, owner of Viacom and MTV and Paramount and CBS, provoked me and made me decide that perhaps I really should talk more about the horrible things being done to our people by this multicultural society the Jews and their friends have forced on us.

First, the provocation. Actually MTV's regular programming is a nonstop provocation. Racial mixing is its persistent theme, the theme pushed day and night, week after week: all races and both sexes mixed together, gyrating and jerking and rapping to throbbing Negroid music. A few years ago I couldn't understand why any sane White parents would expose their kids to this filth. Now I have a better understanding of the lemming phenomenon. I understand that the majority of our people -- White people -- will do anything, no matter how disgusting or depraved or self-destructive, that they believe is fashionable. And I also have a better understanding of the way in which the Jews are able to use their control over the mass media of news and entertainment to create fashions and to corrupt our institutions, to corrupt our society, to corrupt a whole army of collaborators -- of businessmen, of actors and actresses, of spokesmen, of preachers and politicians and writers and teachers -- from our own people to help them with their filthy business. And let me tell you, when the day of reckoning comes, the punishment for all of these traitors, for all of those from among us who consciously and deliberately collaborated with the enemies of our people, for all of those White people who let their faces, their voices, their names be used to conceal the Jews who were paying them -- their punishment will be awful.

Well, let's not get ahead of ourselves. Last week MTV interrupted its regular fare of filth to present a special dose of brainwashing. The occasion was a big push for new "hate crime" and "speech crime" legislation. For two decades the Jews have been pushing harder and harder for more laws designed to control what we say and what we think. It was the largest of the Jewish pressure groups, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which invented the concept of "hate crime" and took the lead in promoting it among law-enforcement people, the government, and the general public. The politicians were willing to go along, of course, but the Jews were having a hard time persuading the White public that people ought to be punished for what they

said or for what they presumably were thinking when committing a crime instead of solely for what they did. This Jewish concept is contrary to our whole Western tradition of law, contrary to our whole sense of justice.

So the Jews decided to spend more time on propaganda, on brainwashing, to swing the public around. The first step, before continuing the push for more legislation to penalize speech and thought, was to get the public accustomed to the concept of "hate crime," to get them to accept this newly invented category of crime. And so they did two things. They began talking and writing about "hate crime" in all of their mass media. If you are able to search back issues of publications such as the *New York Times* or *Time* or *Newsweek* magazine, for the term "hate crime," you'll discover the term simply didn't exist before about 1985, and then suddenly it appeared in nearly every issue of these publications. The campaign to condition the public to think of "hate crime" and "speech crime" as recognized categories of crime was on -- and it was a planned, carefully designed campaign; it didn't just happen.

Then in April 1990 they pushed the Hate Crimes Statistics Act through the Congress, and President George Bush signed it into law. It merely required law enforcement agencies to keep track of crimes in which racial feelings or dislike of homosexuals might have been a factor. The aim really was not to gather statistics: it was to condition law enforcement people to accept the new categories of crime. And then actual legislation followed, mostly at the state level. What the Jews want now is greatly strengthened legislation, and they want it at the Federal level. That was the purpose of Sumner Redstone's special MTV programming last week. It consisted of hour after hour of recitations of supposed "hate crimes" -- assaults on Blacks, Asians, Jews, and homosexuals by heterosexual White males. The Jews who did the programming even threw in a few assaults on Whites by non-Whites, but the clear message of the programming was that "hate" is a White phenomenon and that most so-called "hate crimes" are committed by heterosexual White males.

The truth of the matter is that in the great majority of interracial assaults the victims are White, and the perpetrators are non-White. In virtually every interracial rape, for instance, the victim is White. And if you question whether or not hate is involved in these Black-on-White rapes, go to any library for a copy of Eldridge Cleaver's autobiographical book *Soul on Ice* and read what he has to say about it. Cleaver was a Black rapist who was a darling of the Jews and is described by them in obituaries as a "civil rights activist." Cleaver wrote:

I crossed the tracks and sought out White prey. I did this consciously, deliberately, willfully, methodically . . . . Rape was an insurrectionary act. It delighted me that I was defying and trampling upon the White man's law . . . and that I was defiling his women . . . .

The facts of interracial crime are easy enough to determine from the crime statistics that were collected by the FBI long before the ADL's Hate Crimes Statistics Act of 1990 and are still collected and compiled every year and are available to the public from the Department of Justice in Washington as the *Uniform Crime Reports.* But the truth was not a consideration in last week's "hate crime" programming. Promoting a feeling of White guilt, morally disarming White viewers, was one of Mr. Redstone's considerations, and working up a feeling that we really do

need new and stronger laws to keep those awful, hateful, heterosexual White males under control was another of his considerations.

So it was important to maintain the deception that in interracial crimes non-Whites and homosexuals are the victims and heterosexual White males are the perpetrators. That's why MTV told us once again about the dragging death of a Black convict in Jasper, Texas, and about the beating death of a homosexual in Laramie, Wyoming, but had not a word to say about the terrible interracial massacre in Wichita last month. And also not a word to say about many other recent and atrocious hate crimes, in which the victims were White.

For example, here's one I haven't told you about yet. Less than a month ago, on the evening of December 23, Vickie Lynn McGraw, left her Shreveport, Louisiana, home to visit friends. The 48-year-old White mother of two, former wife of a Shreveport police lieutenant, never made it to her friends' home. Two Blacks were loitering outside Mrs. McGraw's home, and as soon as she got into her car they rushed her, pointed guns at her, forced their way into her car, and drove off with her.

After that it was a familiar story. The Blacks drove her to an automatic teller machine and forced her to withdraw money. Then they beat, raped, and sodomized her. Finally, they threw her from her car, killed her by firing a bullet into the back of her head, and left her corpse in a roadside ditch, where a passerby found her on Christmas Eve morning. Meanwhile the two Blacks rounded up five more of our colored "equals," and they all went on a spending spree with Mrs. McGraw's credit cards.

It only took the Shreveport police and the local sheriff three days to round up the killers and their friends. And the local newspaper, the Shreveport *Times,* did report the matter diligently, with photographs of Vickie McGraw and of the sub-humans who raped and murdered her. The New Orleans newspaper, the *Times-Picayune* carried a very brief report of the murder, without photographs or any other clue as to the race of the victim or the murderers. And that's about it. Outside of Louisiana no one has heard about what happened to Vickie Lynn McGraw.

And she wasn't just some White welfare slut who hung around with Blacks, some piece of race-mixing White trash of the Nicole Brown Simpson category, of whom we could say that she got what she deserved. She was a decent, middle-class White woman, a wife and mother with whom literally millions of other White American women could identify and sympathize -- which is exactly why the Jewish media bosses blacked out the news about what happened to her. The last thing in the world they want is millions of decent White women sympathizing with Vickie McGraw, thinking about what happened to her, and then perhaps thinking about the whole business of multiculturalism and where it's taking us. If they think too much about Vickie McGraw, they may not take to heart the lesson of Sumner Redstone's special MTV programming on "hate crimes" last week.

I mean, really, if you are in the news business to make money, if you are simply a businessman, you grab a story like the Vickie McGraw story, and you make the most of it, because it is obvious that millions of Americans will be moved by it. But if your primary reason for being in the news business is to condition the public, to brainwash the public, then you have different

considerations, don't you? If you're not just a media businessman who incidentally happens to be Jewish, but instead are a coldly calculating predator, working in conspiratorial concert with other predators whose aim, like yours, is to deceive and demoralize the White public, then you impose a blackout on stories like the Vickie McGraw story and the Wichita massacre story and every other story that doesn't fit your destructive, genocidal purpose.

Let's change the subject from Black-on-White crime for a moment and look at another aspect of Sumner Redstone's effort to sensitize the White public on the matter of "hate crime" and "speech crime." Some of the "hate crime" victims he listed in his special programming last week were homosexuals, most notably Matthew Shepard, the young sodomite who made the fatal error of trying to find a date in the wrong bar in Laramie, Wyoming, a couple of years ago. And just as he lied about interracial crime, trying to persuade us that Whites are the principal perpetrators and non-Whites the principal victims, he also lied about crimes involving homosexuals and heterosexuals, trying to make us believe that in nearly all such crimes the homosexuals are the victims, and heterosexuals are the perpetrators.

Do you remember the name John Wayne Gacy? He was a homosexual serial killer, the most prolific serial killer in America's history. Gacy handcuffed, raped, sexually tortured, and murdered 33 young men between 1972 and 1978, burying most of his victims in the crawl space under his house in Chicago. How about Jeffrey Dahmer? Is that name familiar? Dahmer took up where Gacy left off. Between 1978 and 1991 he murdered 16 boys and young men after drugging them and having sex with them. He then ate parts of their corpses and kept their heads and genitalia in his refrigerator for months. Gacy and Dahmer both received quite a bit of media publicity when they were caught, because that was before the current drive to cast homosexuals in the role of "victim" had gained much speed.

But during the Clinton era -- the 1990s -- the drive picked up a great deal of speed indeed. If you've been listening to my broadcasts for much more than a year you'll remember the name Jesse Dirkhising. I talked about him a couple of times in October 1999. He was the 13-year-old boy in Rogers, Arkansas, who was kidnapped by two homosexuals, tied up, drugged, and raped to death, on September 26, 1999. This horrible homosexual murder was totally blacked out by the Jewish media bosses outside of Arkansas. The Mathew Shepard beating death, which had occurred the previous year, was still receiving worldwide publicity, and any publicity about the murder of Jesse Dirkhising would have taken the steam out of the media publicity campaign about Mathew Shepard. And so the media bosses said not a word about little Jesse.

Perhaps I've made my point. If you go by the body count, the homosexuals have the heterosexuals beat by a wide margin. So why did Mr. Redstone try so hard to convince us otherwise? Well, in the first place, the very loose coalition that has long existed among most of the enemies of traditional White society -- Jews, feminists, racial minorities, liberals, and homosexuals -- became much tighter and better organized during the two Clinton administrations. Homosexuals have moved up in this coalition and now have achieved full "victim" status, alongside Jews, Blacks and other non-Whites. And in the second place, it serves their purpose of proving to the lemmings that heterosexual White males are dangerous "haters" who need to be disarmed and constrained by new laws.

Well, actually, from Mr. Redstone's point of view, there's more to it. Building public sympathy for homosexuals and giving them a special, legally protected status, serves to undermine further the morale, and to morally soften up, the society Redstone and his fellow tribesmen are busy devouring. Their current "hate crime" and "speech crime" campaign is not just to keep homosexuals from getting beaten up when they solicit in the wrong bars or from having their feelings hurt when some insensitive heterosexual makes a crude joke about them. There's a whole syndrome of more-or-less related social changes being pushed along with the acceptance of homosexuality: pedophilia, for example, and child pornography, which is very largely homosexual in nature. In my view, none of these changes is healthy; none of them is good for us. They're good only for the people who want to weaken us and to destroy us.

Some of the listeners I receive letters from take issue with that. They don't want to believe that this media campaign is malicious. They prefer to believe that it is based only on the liberalism of media people, who naturally sympathize with the underdogs and the outcasts, with the meek and the weak and the alien and the morally crippled. That means we're supposed to believe that Sumner Redstone and all of his high-priced employees at MTV and CBS and Paramount have never heard of the Justice Department's *Uniform Crime Reports* or the Wichita or Shreveport murders or John Wayne Gacy or Jeffrey Dahmer or the Jesse Dirkhising murder. We're supposed to think that they actually believe that Whites are more often the perpetrators of interracial assaults, and that homosexuals are gentle, inoffensive people.

Well, I'm sure that they don't actually believe those things. I'm sure that they consciously and deliberately manipulate the news with malice aforethought. They deliberately make the news fit the false picture of life they portray with their entertainment media. And they do it maliciously; they do it because they want to weaken and destroy us.

Despite the listeners who don't want to accept that conclusion, I believe that most of you agree with me on that point: namely, that the media bosses do know exactly what they're doing, that they do distort the news deliberately and deliberately cover up the news they don't want us to know about. That's really the only conclusion that a reasonable observer can draw from the evidence.

Many more listeners balk at accepting another conclusion of mine, and that is that it's not just a few evil Jewish media bosses deliberately distorting our news and producing films designed to encourage miscegenation and to persuade us that homosexuality is normal, and a few Jewish pressure groups such as the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center pushing for "hate crime" and "speech crime" legislation, but that it is the Jews as a whole who are doing these things. The Jewish media bosses and the Jewish pressure groups are doing their malicious and destructive work as a part of and on behalf of the Jewish community as a whole. Many listeners still don't want to believe that because they still think in a sort of fuzzy, feminine, subjective way. They focus on the individual exceptions, on the Jews here and there who more or less behave themselves, and these individual exceptions keep them from seeing the big picture.

Let me try to bring the big picture into a little better focus for these folks. I'm sure you've all heard about the controversy in the media over the refusal of the Boy Scouts to permit homosexuals to be Scout leaders. The media have portrayed this ban on homosexual Scout

leaders as a case of intolerance, bigotry, hate, and so on. They have pooh-poohed the idea that homosexual Scout leaders might use their position to take advantage of the young boys in their care. Well, Boy Scout officials know better and have held to their refusal to let homosexuals be Scout leaders. So now the Clinton coalition types are increasing the pressure. I'll read you the beginning of a news report that was in the *New York Times* just ten days ago. The report, by Laurie Goodstein, is headed "Jewish Group Recommends Cutting Ties to Boy Scouts: A Protest Against the Ban on Gay Members."

I'm reading now from the January 10 issue of the *New York Times,* page A12:

Reform Jewish leaders are recommending that parents withdraw their children from membership in the Boy Scouts of America and that synagogues end their sponsorship of Scout troops, the strongest reaction yet by a religious group to the Supreme Court decision allowing the Boy Scouts to exclude gay members.

The report goes on to point out that Reform Judaism represents about 40 per cent of America's six million Jews. This declaration by the leaders of Reform Judaism is really just a media event, however, because practically no Jews are actually involved in the Boy Scouts, either as sponsors or as members. But it is a pretty good indicator that the Jewish community as a whole stands behind the Jewish media bosses, at least on this issue of trying to persuade us that homosexuals are "normal" and pose no danger to our society.

In future broadcasts we'll look at where the Jewish community as a whole stands on other policies promoted by the Jewish media bosses.

Racial Fitness and Survival

During the last sever our people, which have been covered up deliberately by the controlled news media so that the Jewish media bosses can more easily maintain their deception that so-called "hate crime" is primarily a matter of heterosexual White males preying on non-Whites, homosexuals, and members of other officially favored groups, and therefore we need to abolish the Bill of Rights so that everyone will be safe and comfortable. The crimes I have specifically called to your attention -- for example, the Wichita massacre and the abduction, rape, and murder of Vickie McGraw in Shreveport -- are crimes of such nature that by any objective standard they merit national news coverage, but instead of reporting these crimes, the media have covered them up, and from this fact I have drawn conclusions about the motivations of the media bosses.

Well, I could continue talking week after week about atrocious Black-on-White crimes covered up by the controlled media in order to strengthen my conclusion. Unfortunately, there's no shortage of such crimes to report. When I report these crimes against our people, or when I give examples of media cover-ups, I have a nagging concern that I will sound as if I'm whining. I complain about the things our enemies are doing to us, but I don't do anything except complain. Or at least, I know that that is the way some people look at it. In fact, some people take a very negative view of the whole situation. They look at what is being done to us; they look at our almost total lack of resistance; they look at the behavior of the lemmings who collaborate enthusiastically with those who are destroying our race and our civilization; and then these observers throw up their hands and say, "My god, as a race we don't deserve to survive!"

In fact I received a letter a few days ago from a listener who has a strongly Darwinian point of view. He's on our side, more or less, but he has quite a defeatist attitude. He wrote to me:

Isn't it true that if the European race weren't so inferior to the Jews, we wouldn't have ended up in this predicament in the first place? Hasn't our race proved over and over again that we belong at the bottom of the racial ladder, existing only to serve the Jews? Hasn't the White race proved over and over again that we deserve the genocide now being inflicted on us?

My correspondent goes on to provide evidence for his conclusion that our race has lost the struggle for survival and must, therefore, in the natural course of events, become extinct, like the saber-toothed tiger and the passenger pigeon before us. He points out that we no longer have a collective intelligence, a tribal feeling, or real leadership, and that without these essentials no race can survive. As things are going now, we can with reasonable certainty forecast a nightmare future: The Jewish propaganda coming from our television receivers will become more and more blatant, promoting multiculturalism, miscegenation, and White guilt and self-hatred ever more stridently. Our young women, in a mindless scramble to be fashionable and imitate what they see on their TV screens, will jerk, gyrate, and rap to an MTV beat with their Negro lovers. Our young men, increasingly soft and unmanly, will watch passively and largely without comprehension and then will turn back to their video games. The White working class and middle class will plunge even more deeply into credit-based consumerism and will hardly notice what the younger generation is doing, as long as the present economic prosperity, based on the technological innovations of fewer and fewer creative members of our race, holds out. The

politicians will enact legislation making it a penal offense to speak out against the process of decay or the people behind it.

More and more non-White immigrants will continue flooding into America and into Europe, and nothing will be done to halt the flow, whether the Republicans or the Democrats, the Conservatives or the Laborites, are in office. Republicans and Conservatives will continue talking about such things as "restoring national pride," "restoring excellence to education," "getting the government off the backs of productive citizens," and similar policies that appeal to the ever-hopeful and ever-credulous White citizens who have not yet joined the Clinton coalition or the Blair coalition, but in fact the government's actual policies will remain nearly the same, regardless of the party in office.

When the economy does take a major downturn, the half of the population that receives a monthly check of one sort or another from the government will be kept in line with promises of an enhanced dole, and the politicized police agencies, armed with new "speech crime" and "hate crime" laws, will be poised to pounce instantly on anyone else who tries to rock the boat.

The White birth rate will fall even further below the replacement level, while the number of mongrels of various shades born will continue rising. Finally, the hideously grinning Jew, who before remained behind the scenes rubbing his hands and gloating over his handiwork, will be able to step into the open and rule in his own name. Within a century our race will be gone, and, according to the fellow who wrote to me, there will be a natural justice in that outcome. In the long run, only the fit survive, and we have proved ourselves unfit.

I have heard similar arguments from other people. In some cases it is simply a cop-out, an excuse for giving up the struggle and doing nothing: "The war is already lost," these people say. "Why should I take a chance on losing my job by speaking out now, when there is no longer any hope of racial survival?" In other cases people who are not really cowards are so discouraged by what they see around them that it's difficult for them to put much energy or enthusiasm into a struggle they fear is hopeless. Perhaps for the sake of this latter group it is worth our time to look more closely at this matter of fitness and survival.

Fitness, of course, is not an absolute thing. It can be defined only in relation to a specific environment. An organism -- or a race -- that is superbly fit in one environment may be totally unfit in another. Furthermore, we must be careful in equating ability to survive with superiority. The passenger pigeon was surviving marvelously well in North America, it was flourishing in the environment here, until White men with firearms entered that environment and hunted the species to extinction. But many other species survived the intrusion of the White man into their environment: for example, the bacterium *Clostridium tetani,* the microorganism that causes tetanus. Is it correct, therefore, to say that *Clostridium tetani* is superior to the passenger pigeon? Perhaps, but only in a very limited sense: the former is still here, and the latter is extinct. And I have no doubt that if the White man put his mind to it, he could drive *Clostridium tetani* to extinction as he did with the virus that causes smallpox. In a broader sense, of course, it is meaningless to talk about such dissimilar organisms.

Similar considerations apply to questions about the relative fitness of our own race and the Jews. For a very long time the Jews have lived in a symbiotic relationship with non-Jews -- more than 3000 years, if one includes the relationship between the Jews and the ancient Egyptians. During most of the relationships between Jews and non-Jews, the Jews have lived as a marginalized minority, hated and mistrusted by the non-Jews but tolerated because of the Jews' commercial and financial usefulness.

Relationships of this sort were accompanied by a constant tension between the Jewish minority and the non-Jewish majority. A literary anecdote that illustrates well this tension is provided by the Russian author Nikolai Gogol in his Cossack story *Taras Bulba.* Every Cossack camp had a contingent of Jews, who were despised by the Cossacks but usually tolerated because the Jews always were ready to sell the Cossacks anything they might want, especially liquor. Selling liquor to the Cossacks was a hazardous occupation for the Jews, however, because every so often the Cossacks' dislike of the Jews would exceed the limits of their tolerance, and then a general de-Judaizing of the Cossack camp would ensue. In *Taras Bulba,* the Jewish camp-followers were all thrown into a nearby river and drowned, except for one who hid under a wagon.

And this amusing anecdote was mirrored on a larger scale in every European country throughout the Middle Ages. The Jews would gradually infiltrate a country and then in their inimitable way take over certain facets of the economy: the trade in alcoholic beverages, inn keeping, prostitution, and moneylending were the most common. When they were not prohibited by law from doing so, they monopolized the trade in White slaves. At the same time they were acquiring the wealth of the peasants and the craftsmen and the bourgeoisie in this way, they would buy protection from the aristocracy by financing wars, by serving as tax collectors, by giving financial advice, and so on. This *modus vivendi* often resulted in the Jews being wealthier, on the average, than the Gentiles among whom they lived, but their wealth never bought them acceptance or respectability. They always were despised social outcasts, so different from the host population that comparisons were meaningless, and in most countries, at least prior to the 19th century, they were not even citizens, because citizenship was based on blood, on tribal connections, on race.

Just as with the Cossacks, the citizenry eventually would become exasperated with the Jews and rise up against them. The king or duke or what have you would decide that he didn't need the services of his Jewish tax collectors enough to put up with rioting, and so in order to quell the public unrest and disorder he would undertake a general expulsion of all the Jews from his realm. This happened in every European country at least once, and in several of them it happened more than once, because a generation or so after being expelled the Jews would come sneaking back in again, and the process would repeat itself.

In any case, I don't think that it is correct to say that the Jews proved themselves more fit than we or superior to us in any general sense. In only one characteristic were the Jews superior: namely, in their amazing ability to acquire money. Otherwise, our race did an overall better job of surviving. We excelled in every other field of endeavor, in all the arts of war and peace: in literature, in engineering, in painting and sculpture and astronomy, in building cities and roads and exploring new lands. To say that the Jew was superior because he was richer is like saying

that the tick on the dog's back is superior to the dog because the tick is fatter. The dog does many things well; the tick only sucks blood.

Well, I have been talking about the state of affairs prior to the 19th century. This is the 21st century. We are rapidly being driven into extinction while the Jew oversees the process and becomes fatter than ever. What happened to change our fitness relative to that of the Jew? How did our society change from one with a proud and masterful spirit, a masculine spirit, to one with a feminine, submissive spirit? How did we lose our aristocratic pride in being independent and self-sufficient and learn instead the servile ways of the democrat, looking to the government to protect us and provide for us in return for our taxes and our votes? What happened to our tribal consciousness, to our pride of race? Why do so many of us feel that we should apologize for being White? How did we lose control of our women? A century ago we would not have considered for a second permitting our women to consort with Negroes, even if they had had the inclination to do so. What took away our self-confidence and put us on the defensive?

People change over the course of generations. Races change as breeding patterns change, and certainly the welfare state and racial mixing have caused a certain decline in racial quality, but this biological change has been relatively small, and it's not the principal reason for our present jeopardy. We are essentially the same race we were a century ago, biologically speaking. So how did we lose our pride and our uprightness and become such a disgusting mob of egalitarians, oblivious of the future and willing to tolerate everything?

The basic answer is that the great mass of our people are neither good nor evil, neither great-spirited nor petty, neither heroic nor cowardly and self-indulgent, neither loyal nor disloyal, neither upright nor tolerant of depravity and crookedness; they are neutral. Every quality in them is only latent, waiting to be evoked and made manifest by an external force. Everything is a question of leadership, of guidance, of the example that is set for them. With good leaders, with wise and strong leadership, with honest and racially conscious leadership, the best qualities latent in a people, in a nation, in a race are evoked and made manifest. With heroic leadership, with great leadership, a whole people -- lemmings and all -- can be called to greatness and heroism, if those qualities are latent in them -- and those qualities are still latent in our people, despite present appearances.

We have had a catastrophic failure of leadership. Why? Well, for one thing, democracy is not conducive to great leadership, even under the best of circumstances. A more relevant answer is that democracy in the age of television, with the television under the control of our hereditary enemies, is an unmitigated disaster. I'm using the term "television" to stand for all of the controlled mass media, of course. We are headed for extinction now, not because we have been conquered by a non-White army in the way that some of the White peoples of central and eastern Europe were conquered by Huns and Mongols and Turks during the Middle Ages, before other White peoples brought the conquerors to a halt and then rolled them back. The Black assaults on our people, the invasion by Mexicans and Asians, are not threatening our survival because these non-Whites are superior to us in any sense of the word. These non-Whites are threatening our survival only because we have lost our will to resist, only because we have been morally crippled, only because we have lost our pride and our self-confidence and our tribal

consciousness, and ultimately it is television in the hands of the Jews that has morally crippled us.

I suppose that's a bit of an oversimplification. The public schools and the universities also condition our people morally for extinction, and so do the Christian churches. But ultimately it is the Jewish control of the mass media that has poisoned these institutions and changed the way in which they condition our people. After all, most educators -- which is to say, most teachers and most school administrators -- are as much lemmings as the rest of the population, as much susceptible to what comes from their television screens as are those Americans who are not educators. And so are the Christian preachers and priests and church administrators; Christian doctrine has proved to be amazingly flexible in adapting itself to changing political fashions.

So at this time we are heading toward extinction because we lack leadership, and the Jews are taking advantage of this lack of leadership to pump us full of spiritual poison through their control of the mass media, essentially paralyzing our will to resist their takeover of our society. What does this say about our fitness? Many people believe -- and I have said this myself -- that White people are especially susceptible to the Jewish spiritual poison. Can Blacks and mestizos and Asians be made to feel racial guilt and self-hatred the way Whites can? Well, probably not in exactly the same way, but I would be surprised if they turned out not to be susceptible to psychological manipulation at all. Every race must have a lemming majority in order to be stable and survive. I suspect that if the people who control the mass media put their minds to it they could condition Blacks or Vietnamese to hate themselves and engage in self-destructive behavior too, just as they have conditioned us, although probably the details of the conditioning would be different.

We were fit three thousand years ago when we lived in an environment that did not include Jews. Even in Europe when Jews were present we eventually developed antibodies against them that allowed us to survive. We forced them to live more like inactive spores than like active pathogens. Unfortunately, the early settlers of North America did not bring enough of those antibodies with them. When the spores began to break open in Europe during the 19th century -- and even earlier in England -- we were less able to resist the Jews than we were during the Middle Ages. When we had built a new and increasingly prosperous civilization in North America and the Jews began coming in during the last part of the 19th century we had almost no resistance to the infection. Letting Jews into the United States was like giving smallpox-infected blankets to the Indians. They used us to break down the Old Order in Europe with two ruinous, fratricidal world wars. Then the advent of television at the end of the Second World War gave them the genocidal weapon they needed to finish us off.

We are fit when we live in an environment without Jews. We can whip every other race with both hands tied behind our backs. With Jews we are like a dog infested with disease-carrying ticks. If the dog can get rid of the ticks soon enough he will survive. If he doesn't get rid of the ticks they eventually will cause him to die. Does this mean that the ticks are more fit and more deserving of survival than the dog? I wouldn't say so, but clearly the dog must do something about the ticks -- soon. And we must do something about the Jews -- soon. And clearly the key to getting the Jews off our backs is to regain control of our mass media.

Well, we really haven't decided anything new today. Nevertheless, I think it's helpful to understand the dynamics of the process that is carrying us to our extinction. It's helpful to understand that the fact that mestizos are pouring across our southern border without opposition says nothing about our fitness relative to that of mestizos. The fact that Blacks are taking over our cities, terrorizing our schools, and running off with our women says nothing about our fitness relative to that of Blacks. The whole war for survival is between us and the Jews. Once we've taken their control of television away from the Jews, we've won the war. We'll sweep the Blacks and the mestizos and the mongrels away in a matter of days. It will be messy, but there's no doubt as to who will win.

Child Porn, Ecstasy, and Pardons

Today we'll take a look at what Bill Clinton did with his last few hours in the White House, but first I'd let to give you an update on some things we talked about in earlier broadcasts. In my broadcast of October 7, 2000, I told you about a child-pornography ring that kidnapped Russian children and then made videos of them being raped, sexually tortured, and killed. Wealthy perverts in the West buy these videos, paying as much as $20,000 for the videos in which a child actually is killed.

The pornographers had a temporary setback in October last year when Italian police raided the homes of some 600 Italian perverts who had been buying these videos. Nine of the importers and distributors of the child pornography in Italy were arrested, and two men in Russia involved in making the videos also were arrested. But there was no news coverage of the arrests, and none of the big shots in the Russian child-porn business were arrested: just two thugs actually involved in kidnapping, raping, and killing the children.

Then a couple of Italian television news reporters working for Italy's largest TV network who had seen some of the videos seized by the Italian police were so outraged by what they saw that they broke the news blackout by broadcasting scenes from some of the videos on a prime-time television news program viewed by 11 million Italians. The Jewish boss of the news department of the government-owned television network, Gad Lerner, immediately fired the reporters who had violated the blackout. And there was absolutely no news at all about these events in the United States, even though many of the customers of this child-porn ring live in the United States.

It was the blackout of the news in America of the arrests in Italy that aroused my interest in this matter. Can you imagine anything more horrible than kidnapping White children, then raping, sexually torturing, and murdering them for the gratification of wealthy perverts who like to watch that sort of thing? Such activity can flourish only in the dark. If you drag it into the open the perverts will run for cover, like cockroaches in a dirty kitchen when the light is turned on suddenly during the night. And without the perverts buying the child-porn videos, there will be no child-porn business. If the perverts are afraid to buy child-porn videos, if they are afraid of being exposed, then Russian children will not be kidnapped, raped, tortured, and killed in front of video cameras, because there will no market for this filth, no money to be had for the Jews who run the business.

I'll go over that again: It's not just that the customers, the perverts who buy the child-porn videos, are as guilty as the pornographers who make the videos -- it's not just that the customers are paying for little White children to be kidnapped, raped, tortured, and murdered and therefore deserve to be punished at least as much as the people they pay to commit these crimes -- it is also that if one drives away the customers, then one shuts down the business and saves the lives of White children. And the way to drive away the customers is exposure. Therefore, hardly anything more cries out for news coverage than the child-pornography business. And yet when this became especially relevant news because of the raids and arrests in Italy last October, there wasn't a peep about it from the controlled news media in America.

That was no oversight. That was no accident on the part of the media bosses. There are more perverts in the United States buying child pornography than there are in Italy. Why protect them? Ordering, buying, receiving child pornography is not only a horrible and racially destructive thing, it also is illegal. Why don't the controlled news media in America expose this business, expose the people involved, when something happens to make it even more immediately newsworthy?

Well, I answered that question for you in my October 7 broadcast, and I also answered it in later broadcasts. Part of the reason is that most of the people who buy this filth are homosexuals. Most of the Russian children who are raped and tortured for their gratification are little boys -- although some little Russian girls also are victims, because there also are heterosexual pedophiles who buy child pornography. But homosexuals make up the majority of the paying customers, and the rule among the Jewish media bosses is that homosexuals are to be portrayed favorably whenever possible. If they can't be portrayed favorably, then don't portray them at all; kill the news.

A more important reason for keeping quiet about child pornography is that the people at the top of the business -- not the ones who kidnap the children from public parks in Moscow and then rape them in front of the cameras, but the ones who organize the business and collect the profits -- are Jews, and the Jewish media bosses in America know that. That's why people like CBS boss Sumner Redstone and ABC boss Michael Eisner and CNN boss Gerald Levin protect the child pornography business by not exposing it, no matter how newsworthy it is.

I've told you that before, but something happened earlier this year that corroborates what I told you. A man described by Federal authorities as the U.S. West Coast distributor for a child-pornography ring operating in Moscow was arrested at his home in Walnut Creek, California, on January 4. His name is Seth Bekenstein. His brother, Joshua Bekenstein, immediately flew in from the East Coast and posted a $500,000 bond to get his brother out of jail. My guess is that the government will get to keep that bond, because when his trial date comes up Seth will be safely relocated in Israel.

The child-pornography ring in Moscow for which Seth Bekenstein works is the same child-pornography ring whose Italian distributors were arrested last October. It's still in business today because the Jewish media bosses -- Sumner Redstone, Michael Eisner, Gerald Levin, and the rest -- refused to expose it in October. And they're continuing to protect it today. You would think that the arrest of one of the major distributors of child pornography in the United States would merit a little news coverage, wouldn't you? And yet there was almost a total blackout on the news of Seth Bekenstein's arrest on January 4, of his bond hearing on January 12, and of his release from jail. You certainly heard nothing about it before I told you about it a minute ago, unless you live in the Walnut Creek, California, area where Bekenstein was arrested. The reason I know about it is that a listener who lives five miles from Walnut Creek, in Danville, California, sent me a copy of the January 13 issue of his local newspaper, the *San Ramon Valley Times,* which reported on the arrest and the bond hearing. As far as I am aware, the news appeared nowhere else. It didn't appear in the largest newspaper in that area, the *San Francisco Chronicle,* for example. For more details you can contact the *San Ramon Valley Times* reporter who wrote the story. He is Brian Anderson, and his e-mail address is banderson2@cctimes.com.

Listen, I don't like to repeat myself, but child pornography is not just a matter of naughty pictures of naked children. It's not illegal just because some sexually uptight Christians who are horrified by the thought of nudity pressured the Congress to pass a law against distributing or purchasing the stuff in the United States. The perverts who buy child pornography are the most depraved degenerates you can imagine in your worst nightmare. They get their sexual satisfaction from seeing little children raped and sexually tortured. Some of them are willing to pay $20,000 to see a small White boy raped to death by adult homosexuals. They finance this sort of activity with their purchases. That's why child pornography is illegal in the United States. It involves paying other people to commit kidnapping, rape, and murder.

The people who buy child pornography need to be exposed. They need to be made to fear for their miserable lives. If I had my way they would all be rounded up and killed. It would make the world a cleaner, healthier place. I also believe that the people who distribute this filth ought to be killed as soon as they are caught, not turned loose so that they can flee to Israel. And I also believe that the media bosses who protect this filthy business by keeping it covered up deserve to be hunted down and killed too. They are all in this together: the perverts, the producers and distributors, and the media Jews who protect them.

There is a pattern in this child-pornography business that we can observe in many other activities. The consumers -- the sick people who buy child pornography -- are presumably mostly Gentiles. The people who procure and distribute the stuff are Jews, as are the people in the media who protect the whole business with their silence.--Consider the distribution of illegal drugs in the United States, for example. The most popular drug fad at the moment among White yuppies is a drug known as "Ecstasy," which is a potent member of the amphetamine family: methylenedioxymethamphetamine, or MDMA for short. Other drugs, such as heroin and crack cocaine, are used mostly by non-Whites and by lowlife Whites who socialize with Blacks and other non-Whites. Many Jews are involved in the distribution of heroin and cocaine, but so are other ethnic groups, and the non-Jews outnumber the Jews. The "Ecstasy" trade, however, is totally dominated by Jews.

You wouldn't know this just by watching television news programs or reading the mainstream news periodicals aimed primarily at Gentiles. Among themselves, however, the Jews talk more freely about such things than they do to us. The *Forward*, formerly the *Daily Forward* and formerly published in Yiddish as a Jewish-Communist newspaper, is one of the most informative of the specifically Jewish newspapers published in New York. The January 19 issue of the *Forward* carried a long report on the "Ecstasy" trade by their correspondent Benny Avni. He reports:

". . . Israeli criminals have cornered the market on the drug ecstasy, controlling by some accounts as much as 75 per cent of the American market.

Avni then cites a statement by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration:

In recent years Israeli organized-crime syndicates, some composed of Russian émigrés associated with Russian organized crime syndicates, have forged relationships with Western

European traffickers and gained control over a significant share of the European market. The Israeli syndicates are currently the primary source to U.S. distribution groups.

Well, I hardly need to tell you that these so-called "Russian" émigré groups in Israel have no real Russians in them at all. They are all Jews who merely lived in Russia before going to Israel.

The special appeal of "Ecstasy" for Jews is the enormous amount of money to be made from the drug. "Ecstasy" pills are manufactured in Amsterdam and Antwerp in laboratories owned by Jews for as little as fifty cents per pill. In New York and Miami and San Francisco the pills are sold to White yuppies in discos and night clubs for as much as $40 each. And the pills are very small. Using briefcases and suitcases with false bottoms, Jewish couriers smuggle as many as 50,000 pills at a time into the United States. That's a retail value of as much as $2 million for an investment of only $25,000. One Israeli, Sean Erez, who recently was extradited from the Netherlands to the United States on drug smuggling charges, is said by the Drug Enforcement Administration to have smuggled a million "Ecstasy" pills into the United States during a period of a few weeks last year, using Hasidic Jews as his couriers. Hasidic Jews are Jews with beards and sidelocks who wear long black coats and black hats and live mostly in or around New York City. His operation came unraveled when seven of his Hasids were arrested. Unfortunately, there are plenty of other Israelis to take the place of Erez.

In addition to the huge profits, perhaps the Jews who run the "Ecstasy" trade are attracted by the fact that the consumers of their drug are nearly all affluent young Whites, and that prolonged use of the drug causes permanent brain damage. Certainly, the Jews have a predilection for making their money in those economic activities most harmful to us. With a sure instinct they seek out the weaknesses in our society and the sickest individuals in our society, and they do everything they can not only to exploit those weaknesses for their profit but also to exacerbate them. Vice and corruption are what they are most at home with. Thus they have dominated child pornography, the White slave trade, large parts of the trade in illegal drugs, the liquor business, and so on.

Well, I'm not the only one who has been thinking about Jewish criminals recently. That's what Mr. Clinton was doing during his last hours in the White House, as he put together his lists of criminals to receive presidential pardons or have their sentences commuted. Now, Jews comprise approximately 2.5 per cent of the U.S. population. They make up about half of one per cent of the U.S. prison population. That percentage is small not because the Jews don't often break the law, but because they're harder to catch, harder to convict, and harder to send to prison when they are convicted. They tend to avoid street crime and concentrate on so-called "white-collar crime," which is much more difficult to prosecute.

Insurance fraud is one of their specialties: so much so that during the early part of the last century whenever an insured building in New York caught fire, the police investigators always suspected what they called "Jewish lightning." But it wasn't the Jewish owner of the building who poured the gasoline and tossed the match. Some Black who was paid $100 for the arson would actually light the fire, while the Jew was 150 miles away at some resort hotel in the Catskills, surrounded by alibi witnesses. Today fraud of one sort or another is still one of their biggest sources of income, and it has become much more profitable to defraud the government

than it used to be to defraud private insurance companies. Generally they are able to afford good lawyers who more often than not will enable them to wriggle out of a tight spot with a favorable plea bargain when they do get caught.

Anyway, the figure I want you to remember for a moment is 0.5 per cent. That is the percentage of the U.S. prison population that is Jewish. The percentage of convicted felons who are Jews is higher -- around one per cent -- because Jews are less often imprisoned even when they are convicted. Well, on the morning of January 20, just a couple of hours before leaving office, Mr. Clinton's list of criminals whose sentences he had commuted or to whom he had given presidential pardons was released. He pardoned 140 people and commuted the sentences of 36.

Now, simply the fact that he waited until the last moment to reveal his list of pardons and commutations ought to raise the suspicion of any perceptive person. Clearly he waited until he was ready to walk out the door because he knew that there would be questions about his choices, and he didn't want to have to answer those questions. By the time the reporters had received his list and studied it, he no longer was President. What he had done could not be undone. It was one last swindling of the American people. Of the 140 felons receiving presidential pardons 17 are Jews. That's 12 per cent: approximately 12 times the percentage of convicted felons who are Jews. Interesting, isn't it?

Even more interesting is the fact that of the 36 persons whose sentences were commuted -- convicted felons who were in prison serving their sentences on January 20 -- nine are Jews. That's 25 per cent of the total. That's 50 times the percentage of Jews currently in prison. That's more than interesting, isn't it? Do you think that was just a fluke? I don't.

Four of these nine Jews -- Benjamin Berger, Jacob Elbaum, David Goldstein, and Kalmen Stern -- are Hasidic Jews who together swindled the government out of tens of millions of dollars with various fraudulent schemes. They are prominent members of the New York Hasidic community of New Square. They set up a fictitious Jewish school, a *yeshiva,* and then collected tens of millions of dollars from various Federal programs to support the nonexistent school and its imaginary students. That's tens of millions of dollars of our tax money.

Rumor has it that the Jews of New Square made a deal with Hillary Clinton before last November's elections. They would vote for her in her New York Senate race if she would persuade her husband to get their four members out of prison. And that's what happened. The vote in New Square in November was 99.3 per cent for Hillary -- that's 1,359 votes for her against 10 votes for her Republican opponent, Rick Lazio -- and less than three months later all four New Square Jews had their sentences commuted. Amazing coincidence, isn't it? And remember, these Jews were the ultra-Orthodox variety, who more often than not vote Republican. Neighboring Hasidic communities voted overwhelmingly for Lazio, while New Square gave nearly every vote to Hillary. They must have known something we can only suspect.

The most interesting name on Clinton's pardon list was that of convicted securities swindler, Jewish billionaire Marc Rich. Rich and his fellow Jewish securities swindler, Pincus Green, swindled the American public out of hundreds of millions of dollars back in the 1980s. Both

were pardoned last month by Clinton. Actually, Rich was involved in much more criminal activity than securities fraud. He is one of those super-rich international Jewish wheeler-dealers, in the Boris Berezovsky-Vladimir Gusinsky category.

As soon as they realized they were about to be arrested, Green and Rich both fled the country. They were convicted in absentia, but they've never served a day in prison for their crimes. That's really a first for Clinton: giving a pardon to someone who is still a fugitive, someone who is still defying the law. Well, there's more to the story. Rich's former wife was dispatched as his ambassador to the Clinton government. She has given more than a million dollars to the Clintons and the Democratic Party.

What all of this looks like to me is that Mr. Clinton stuck it to the American people one more time before leaving office by selling pardons and commutations to the highest bidders. That's certainly what happened in the cases of Rich, Green, Berger, Elbaum, Goldstein, and Stern. But you know, there are some rich Colombian drug lords in prison who didn't receive pardons, and there are some Jews who did receive pardons or commutations who couldn't have paid much for them: Susan Rosenberg, for example, who was a member of a radical communist group that murdered two policemen and a guard in a bungled armored car robbery. She was sentenced to 58 years in prison for that, but now Big-Hearted Bill has turned her loose.

Many people besides me are very suspicious about Mr. Clinton's pardons and commutations, and there has been talk of investigations. Because of the Jewish angle here, however, I won't advise you to hold your breath while waiting for results from these investigations. There's more than just bribery involved here, and it's the sort of thing the media bosses would just as soon you not hear about.

The "Peace Process"

For several weeks prior to the election of a new prime minister in Israel, the Israeli election campaign was a major story in all of the news media in the United States. Who will it be: Ariel Sharon, the Butcher of Beirut, who as Israel's defense minister arranged and facilitated the murder of several thousand Palestinian women and children in refugee camps in Lebanon in September 1982? Or will it be Ehud Barak, who gave up a career as an international terrorist to go into politics?

The media over here played the story as one of hawks versus doves. Sharon, the leader of the hawk faction, deliberately provoked the fighting of recent months between Jews and Palestinians with his visit to the Temple Mount last fall. The reason for that was to motivate his hawk constituency and provide a new power base for himself prior to the election. His plan seems to have been quite successful. Of course, what's been going on between the Jews and the Palestinians since Sharon's provocation last year isn't fighting in the usual sense of the word: it's Palestinian children throwing stones at heavily armed Jewish soldiers, who in turn have had snipers sitting behind barricades with rifles and telescopic sights and picking off the more active young Palestinians. At the same time the Jewish government has been sending out murder squads in civilian disguise to assassinate leaders of the Palestinian community in their homes. That's why nearly all of those killed have been Palestinians.

Assassination used to be what Barak did for a living before he went into politics. He used to sneak into Lebanon under the cover of darkness to murder Palestinian writers, poets, and anyone else who might provide motivation and cohesion for the Palestinian resistance. In the recent election campaign he was portrayed as the dove, the would-be peacemaker. Some dove! To maintain the illusion his supporters were shown on American television marching in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem with signs calling for peace. Many of the signs were in English, however, a pretty good clue that they really were aimed at American TV viewers rather than at Israeli voters.

Americans are perennial suckers when the call goes out to support the so-called "peace process" with another few billion dollars from the U.S. Treasury. The "peace process" has become almost as big a swindle as the "Holocaust." Undoubtedly, the Jews would like for the Palestinian children to stop throwing stones at them. They want the Palestinians to go back to carrying the water and hewing the wood for the Jews, like good Gentiles, and to give up their silly effort to get back their land. After all, the Jews' tribal god Yahweh promised the Jews that they could steal that land, and that's what they did, and now they have no intention of giving it back. That line goes over pretty well with the nutcase fundamentalist Christians in the United States, who were rooting for Sharon in the recent election. And the nutcase liberals in the United States, who really and truly believe that it is possible for the Palestinians and the Jews to coexist peacefully on Palestinian land, rooted for Barak.

The main thing for the Jews is to keep the laughable charade known as the "peace process" limping along without actually doing anything except demanding more money from American taxpayers and at the same time continuing to bleed the Palestinians by selectively killing off their

leaders until they no longer have the will to resist Jewish domination. It worked for the Jews in Ukraine and Russia, in the Baltic states and in Poland, so why not in Palestine too?

The American liberals who have a hard time believing that the Jews are anything but the gentle, inoffensive, peace-loving, humanitarian, violin-playing egalitarians that they pretend to be on their controlled television undoubtedly missed a news item from Israel last month. This is a report from Associated Press International, datelined Jerusalem, January 21. The report begins:

An Israeli court on Sunday sentenced a Jewish settler to community service and a fine for the beating and kicking death of an 11-year-old Palestinian boy. The boy's father expressed outrage and accused the court of issuing a "license to kill."

The report goes on to say that the Jew, 36-year-old Nahum Korman, was a security guard at a Jewish settlement near Bethlehem. He drove into a nearby Palestinian village looking for Palestinian children who had been reported throwing stones at passing Israeli cars. He found 11-year-old Hilmi Shusha and decided to make an example of the boy. The Associated Press report continues:

The prosecution contended that Korman beat and kicked the child, knocked him down, put his foot on the boy's head, and struck him with a pistol. The boy suffered a head injury and a fractured spinal cord and died the next day in a hospital

The Jewish judge ordered Korman to perform community service and to pay a fine for killing the child.

Now, I'll bet you didn't read that report in the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post.* Both of those newspapers subscribe to the Associated Press wire. But this particular report was one that the Jewish bosses at those newspapers decided you didn't need to see. It might have confused you. It doesn't fit the picture of Jewish behavior or Jewish values they believe you should have. But it **does** fit the ages-old Jewish pattern. The key here is that the murderer was a Jew, and the victim was not. The Jewish religion permits Jews to murder Gentiles without penalty unless the murder might be discovered by other Gentiles and result in harm to the Jews. And that's why Nahum Korman was fined and ordered to do community service: the Palestinians kicked up a fuss abut the murder, and it got picked up by foreign reporters.

If any lemmings are listening, they will not believe a word of that, of course. They know that Judaism is pretty much like Christianity. Haven't you heard of "Judeo-Christianity," the "Judeo-Christian tradition," and so on? All of the politicians and the Christian preachers and the media people use those terms all the time. And we all know that the Christians and the Jews have the same Ten Commandments, don't we? Actually, the Jews and the Christians are related to one another in a very fundamental way: the relation is that of deceivers and deceived, of wolves and sheep. What would they do without each other?

Lest I seem like a hypocrite, I should tell you that I am not denigrating the Jews because they value their own lives quite differently from the lives of non-Jews. I am not denigrating the Jews for not being the egalitarians they pretend to be. I **am** denigrating them for pretending to be what

they are not. No one in his right mind is an egalitarian. The members of every tribe that will survive very long on this planet value the lives of their fellow tribesmen above the lives of those who are not members of the tribe. Judaism is a survival-oriented religion. Christianity is not.

Perhaps a more meaningful and relevant difference between the two religions is that Judaism is a religion for survival in a multicultural society. It is a religion for governing the behavior of a Jewish minority in the presence of a non-Jewish majority. Christianity, on the other hand, is a religion for governing the behavior of Christians in a homogeneous Christian society. In a multicultural society it becomes suicidal. Judaism makes very clear distinctions between Jews and non-Jews, and the rules are different for the way a Jew should behave toward his fellow Jews and the way he should behave toward non-Jews: quite different. In Christianity the rules are the same for everybody. That's an important distinction, and it's important for us to understand it. It's important for the minority of Christians who aren't lemmings to understand it too.

So again, I don't denigrate Jews because they don't believe in treating everyone the same. They want to survive, and there's nothing wrong with wanting to survive. What's pathological about the Jews is that they are constituted for existing as a predatory minority in a non-Jewish society. Judaism is a religion for predators. Christianity is a religion for pacifists. Judaism encourages deception. Christianity insists on truthfulness. Each is suited to a specific sort of environment.

The Jews, through their control of the mass media of news and entertainment, have deliberately changed the environment in America to suit themselves, to enhance their own survivability at the expense of the non-Jewish majority. That's what they always do everywhere that they are allowed to get away with it. That is their nature. That is why they often are successful, and it also is the reason why they are so hated and always have been. It is for good reason that we have the very well known and often used terms "anti-Semite" and "anti-Semitic," but don't have equivalent terms for other ethnic groups. "Anti-Semite," of course is a bit of a misnomer. It doesn't mean a person who doesn't like Arabs or other Semites; it means only a person who doesn't like Jews. There is no term "anti-Buddhist" or "anti-Hindu," even though there are far more Buddhists and Hindus in the world than Jews. Believe me, the Jews are special. They are unique.

We may have conflicts with other groups -- we may be threatened by other groups -- but no other group has ever threatened our existence in the way we are threatened by the Jews.

Being predatory by nature may give the Jews certain survival advantages, just as it tends to get them into trouble a lot more often than is the case for most other groups. It also makes it very difficult for them to have a "normal" mode of existence: that is, to live only among themselves, instead of as a minority among non-Jews. In Israel, for example, aside from the Palestinians, and aside from the White women they import as sex slaves from eastern Europe, they have no one to prey on but themselves. Convincing their fellow Israelis to invest in fraudulent stock schemes is not as easy as selling the Brooklyn Bridge to naïve Gentiles in America, so their predatory instincts tend to come to the fore in other ways: in the way they treat their own women, for example.

In this regard recent revelations about the sexual behavior of male Jews on Israeli *kibbutzim* are especially relevant. The *kibbutz,* or Jewish communal village, is an Israeli institution dating from the time before the Second World War when the Jews were bent on proving to the world the virtues of communism. Everything in the communes is community property, including the children and the women. Children are taken from their parents shortly after being weaned and thereafter live in dormitories, where an extraordinarily large number of them are sexually abused. This sexual abuse of children became entrenched in many *kibbutzim* because of taboos against seeking assistance from police or other authorities outside the *kibbutz.* The abusers were protected by a code of silence.

The code of silence was broken recently when a former *kibbutz* member, Nahshon Golatz, filed a lawsuit against the *kibbutz* movement and the government of Israel seeking compensation for the abuse to which he had been subjected as a child. His lawsuit has opened a floodgate, and hundreds of other former *kibbutz* members have come forward with their own horror stories: stories that most Jews would prefer to keep quiet. Several newspapers in Britain, including the *Times* and the *Independent,* reported some of the details last month, and this in turn has encouraged other *kibbutz* victims to speak out.

Especially interesting is the picture that has emerged of the treatment of women and girls in the *kibbutzim.* Rape is a common feature of *kibbutz* life. Women, teen-aged girls, even children as young as three years old are regularly raped, unless they have a male protector who is strong enough to fight off the gangs of rapists who prey on them. Gang rape of unprotected women is an especially popular sport among male *kibbutzniks.*

I'll read you a few lines from a report that appeared in the British newspaper the *Independent* on January 20. The report quotes an Israeli woman, herself a former *kibbutznik,* who heads a rape-crisis center in Israel:

"There were girls who were fair game, whom it was permitted to victimize," she said. "A stranger won't understand, but on the *kibbutz,* sick as it may sound, the girls who were hurt were always from weak families."

She compared the predatory *kibbutz* male to "the tiger in the wild that marks out the wounded, limping ewe for himself and hurls himself on her -- that was exactly how the attacking males, adolescents and adults, in the *kibbutz* identified the victims."

I am reminded of the horrible stories from the 1950s of what happened to German girls on Israeli *kibbutzim.* Ever since the Second World War, of course, the Germans have been exposed to nonstop Jewish propaganda about what terrible people they are for having been so nasty to those wonderful, innocent, gifted, blameless, sensitive, violin-playing Jews who lived in Germany before Hitler came along and got rid of all of them for no good reason. As usual, the young women were most affected by this guilt-propaganda, and after the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948, many guilt-stricken young German women went off to Israel to do penance by serving as volunteer workers on *kibbutzim.* Well, you can imagine what happened to those poor girls. Many of them simply disappeared. But they kept coming and kept disappearing because the

German news media dared not report anything unfavorable about the Jews, and so it took a while for the news of what was happening to get out.

Anyway, we have a new prime minister in Israel now. I don't know that he's any more of a Jew than Ehud Barak was -- a Jewish assassin has been replaced by a Jewish mass murderer -- but I do suspect that the United States is more likely now to get pulled into yet another war in the Middle East to advance Jewish interests there.

George Bush is busy winning points with American conservatives by pushing for a big tax cut. He's fighting the Democrats who want to use the money for more government-managed welfare programs of one sort or another in order to win points with their own constituency. This fight against the Democrats is making Bush a hero to conservatives, but I do not see Mr. Bush as a hero of any sort. In particular I do not believe he will stand up to Israel. I do not believe that he will resist the new demands that will be made on the United States by the Sharon government.

I do not know exactly what is being planned in Israel now. I do not know what the Israelis will use as a pretext for war. Perhaps it will be the claim that Saddam Hussein has developed new weapons of mass destruction and needs to be put down. Perhaps it will be Syrian troop movements. Perhaps it will be increased militance among the Palestinians. I do not know what it will be, but I see a war coming just as surely as I saw a war coming when Bill Clinton appointed an all-Jewish foreign-policy and national-security staff after his reelection in 1996. In early 1997 I predicted that Madeleine Albright and the rest of Bill Clinton's all-Jewish crew would deliberately get us involved in another war, and two years later we were bombing Belgrade in preparation for turning the Serbs of Serbia's Kosovo province over to the tender mercies of the KLA's cutthroats.

Mr. Bush has all non-Jews out front now in the most visible positions on his foreign-policy and national-defense team. Cynic that I am, the reason that I see behind this is that when the war comes the public will not see any visible Jews out front leading the charge and so will not be inclined to say that the Jews dragged us into another war for Israel. And I believe that the war will come -- in less than two years this time. And it certainly will be a war for Jewish interests, not our interests.

There cannot be peace in the Middle East as long as the Jews are determined to dominate the region. And the Jews, being what they are, will have it no other way. That's why I call the so-called "peace process" in the Middle East a laughable charade, a deliberate fraud on the American people designed to keep them sending money and military equipment to the Jews. I am afraid, however, that this time it will be American blood as well that the Jews will expect us to supply in order to ensure their victory in their next war against their neighbors.

And you know, it's more than our money and our blood. Think what it means for America publicly to support a country led by a creature such as Ariel Sharon. Most Americans and most Europeans and other people around the world weren't aware that Ehud Barak worked as an international terrorist for the government of Israel in the past. But everyone knows what Ariel Sharon did in Lebanon. Everyone knows that he is a bloodthirsty mass murderer of women and children. And America will be supporting him. Mr. Bush will hug him when he comes to visit

the White House. The other politicians in Washington will be falling all over themselves to shake his hand and have their pictures taken with him. A disgusting prospect.

You know, if Ariel Sharon showed up at the White House with Nahum Korman, the Jewish settler who was fined for kicking and stomping an 11-year-old Palestinian child to death, I have no doubt that Mr. Bush would give Mr. Korman a big hug too. George Bush and Bill Clinton may have different policies on taxes, but when it comes to taking orders from their Jewish handlers, there is no difference at all between the two politicians.

And here we are sending U.S. military units, our soldiers, to Israel now, this week, where the chances are excellent for them to become involved in hostile action -- perhaps something else along the lines of the bombing of the USS Cole -- giving Mr. Bush an excuse to get us even further entangled in Israel's dirty affairs and ultimately in another war. I cannot help but think that that is exactly what someone had in mind when the decision was made to deploy American soldiers from their base in Germany to Israel this week.

Sharon, Rape, and the Wizard of Oz

There are so many things worthy of comment today that it's difficult to make a choice.

Certainly, one of the more significant things is the world's reaction -- or lack of reaction -- to the election of Ariel Sharon to be Israel's prime minister, as soon as he can put together a government. Do you remember the reaction of the mass media, the politicians, the leaders of the Christian churches, and all the rest of the big shots when Jörg Haider's Freedom Party won enough parliamentary seats in the Austrian elections a little over a year ago to have a role in the Austrian government? Some countries recalled their ambassadors. Politicians around the world were shaking their fingers at Austria and announcing that they would not tolerate Haider's participation in the Austrian government. Trade embargoes against Austria were threatened. And the reason? Haider had broken some taboos by making statements the Jews didn't like. He had said that there had been many decent people fighting on the German side during the Second World War, including people in the SS. He had said that some of Hitler's economic policies in the 1930s had made good sense. And he had called for a cutoff of immigration into Austria.

Now, Haider is not made of very stern stuff, and when he was criticized for his statements, he apologized and back-pedaled. But his apologies had not been enough, and the electoral success of his party resulted in a continuous barrage of sensationalistic media attacks against him and the ostracism of Austria by everyone who stepped to the music of a Jewish drummer.

So now Ariel Sharon is set to become the prime minister of Israel. Sharon is the man who, as Israel's minister of defense in September 1982, during Israel's invasion of Lebanon, made the arrangements for the slaughter of more than 3,000 Palestinian women and children in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps just outside Beirut. The Palestinian fighters had evacuated the camps, leaving their women and children behind, after being assured by the U.S. government of Ronald Reagan that their families would be safe. As the Jews moved in, radio communications among Israeli military commanders were monitored in which they talked about carrying out "purging operations" in the refugee camps. Then the Jews surrounded the camps with their tanks so no one could escape and sent in the butchers. For two days they kept the camps sealed while the slaughter went on. They kept the camps illuminated with flares at night to assist the murder squads. That was Ariel Sharon's work: more than 3,000 murdered women and children, murdered in a characteristically Jewish way after tricking the men into leaving their families unarmed and defenseless.

But the massacre of refugees in Sabra and Shatila that gave Sharon the nickname "Butcher of Beirut" wasn't his only work. Long before 1982, when Sharon was an Israeli army general, he was notorious for the atrocities he and his troops committed. He liked nothing better than to sneak into an undefended Jordanian village at night with his soldiers and go on a throat-cutting rampage. After the reaction to his butchery in Sabra and Shatila in 1982, Sharon was obliged to resign as defense minister and leave politics for a while. But when he decided to run for prime minister last year, he prepared the way by deliberately provoking the violence and killing that have been so much in the news in recent months. At a moment when things were already extremely tense, he marched up to Jerusalem's Temple Mount with a large contingent of armed

bodyguards who chased away Moslem worshippers and caused outrage among Palestinians. This outrage predictably erupted into stone throwing by Palestinian children and the shooting of Palestinian civilians by Jewish soldiers. Barak couldn't restore order, and so Sharon beat him in last week's election and won the chance to become prime minister in his place.

And where is the outrage among the politicians who were wagging their fingers at Jörg Haider a little over a year ago? Where are the sensational media stories about Sharon's criminal history? Why are the church leaders who condemned Haider's "immoral" statements now silent? Who is threatening to recall an ambassador from Israel or to cut off trade with Israel?

This is a lesson for those with eyes to see. It is a lesson not so much about Israel's atrocious behavior but about the hypocrisy and utter dishonesty that characterize virtually all of those outside Israel who occupy positions of power and influence. And it also is a lesson about the nature of our mass media, a lesson about the motivations of the men who control the media. The conventional wisdom is that the media are liberal, that the men who determine their policies are liberals, leftists. But that isn't so. The truth of the matter is that the media are not liberal: they are Jewish. The men who control them are not liberals: they are Jews. And that is why the media reacted the way they did to Haider's electoral success in Austria and to Sharon's success in Israel. Understand? If you believe that you have any other explanation for their behavior, tell me about it.

Well, I could talk all day about this subject -- about the absolutely fundamental problem for the whole world that this Jewish control of the media is -- but let's talk about some other things today. There have been lots of new Black-on-White crimes that the media bosses have decided that you don't need to hear about. An unfortunately high percentage of these crimes have been against young White women. In Little Rock, Arkansas, for example, a serial rapist has raped at least eight White women at gunpoint during the past five weeks. I say "at least eight" because eight victims so far have come forward and given matching descriptions of the Black rapist to police. I have no idea how many other women have been too afraid or too embarrassed to go to the police or simply are unable to give an adequate description. Anyway, we have a Black rapist on the loose in Little Rock who has brutally raped at gunpoint at least eight White women in the last five weeks, and it's not news outside of Little Rock.

Three months ago, back in November of last year, I told you about the disappearance of Lucie Blackman in Tokyo. Lucie was an exceptionally attractive 21-year-old English girl -- a tall, slender, blue-eyed blonde -- who went to Japan as a tourist and ended up working as a "hostess" in an exclusive Japanese businessmen's club. And then she disappeared. In November I told you that although no trace of her had yet been found, Lucie almost certainly had been drugged, raped, and murdered by a Japanese real estate tycoon, Joji Obara, with whom she had been seen leaving the club. Obara liked tall, blonde girls and already had raped a number of them and gotten away with it. Well, now Lucie has been found. That is, her head, her torso, and her hands have been found embedded in a concrete block a little over 200 yards from Obara's waterfront luxury apartment. It's big news in Japan, but I'll bet you hadn't heard about it. I mean, what a story! Tall, beautiful English girl, wealthy father, predatory Japanese rapist who is a business tycoon, girl's dismembered body discovered in concrete block near tycoon's apartment, and it isn't news in America!

Listen, this is another subject I could spend all day talking about. I have detailed reports on my desk right now of half a dozen other cases of White women raped or murdered or both by Blacks here in the United States in the past few weeks, and the news has been covered up except in the immediate areas where the crimes took place. I believe that it's worthwhile continuing to talk about these crimes even after I've made my point because there always are new listeners who need to be convinced.

After I reported on the mass rape and murder of Whites in Wichita, Kansas, by two Blacks a few weeks ago, I had a number of new listeners write to tell me that they hadn't believed me when they heard my broadcast, so they had checked it out themselves and were astounded to find out that it was true. They hadn't thought it possible that anything so horrendous could be or would be covered up. They hadn't believed that any responsible person -- the news director for any national news medium, for example -- would want to cover up such a thing. I believe that every time I talk about something like the Wichita massacre I help a few more people discover just how serious a problem we're facing.

And certainly it's a serious problem when the people who control the national media deliberately distort the news, suppressing some news and exaggerating other news, in order to mislead public opinion. That is a serious problem. But I'm afraid that often I am guilty of not probing the nature of the problem deeply enough. I'll give you an example. Members of my organization, the National Alliance, have been distributing some of our publications in Little Rock recently, calling attention to the rising incidence of Black crime against White people. This is a bit of a sensitive issue in Little Rock at the moment because of the series of Black-on-White rapes there I mentioned a minute ago, and while the consciousness of the White citizens of Little Rock is up a bit, we are seizing the opportunity to provide some information to them to which they otherwise might not be as receptive.

Well, the unfortunate fact of the matter is that a majority of the White citizens of Little Rock -- and every other city in the United States -- are not receptive to any information or idea that is Politically Incorrect, no matter how atrocious the situation. They will cling to Political Correctness like a drowning man clings to a life preserver. They will think what they are told to think and say what they are told to say by Authority. They are lemmings.

After one of our distributions in Little Rock a couple of days ago I received a letter from a lemming there. He began his letter:

Get out of Little Rock! The last thing this city needs is a bunch of ignorant, shortsighted, ill-bred bigots tainting the rest of us with hate. I was disgusted when I saw hundreds of your organization's pamphlets littering the driveways of normal, decent people here. *Et cetera.*

He went on to tell me in a prissy, self-righteous way that he is a White conservative who always votes Republican. He also said, however:

Give up your dream of a White nation. It is not going to happen, and it shouldn't. The world is a diverse place, and it is the better for it.

That, of course, is the party line of both the Democrats and the Republicans, with perhaps a barely detectable difference in emphasis. "Diversity is good. More diversity is better" is the Politically Correct party line. The lemmings believe it because they have heard it directly from their TV. Their favorite sports stars and Hollywood celebrities say the same thing. Al Gore and George Bush say that they believe it, and, by golly, so does every lemming. And the lemmings never heard either Al Gore or George Bush say a bad word about Black rapists who prey on White women. Their TV never has told them anything about Black rapists.

Undoubtedly they are against rape -- at least, the respectable, Republican lemmings are. Presumably, the lemmings who have voted for Bill Clinton in the past can't be very much against rape. But even the Republican lemmings will suddenly have very mixed feelings when the racial aspect of rape is raised. They know that it's okay for them to be against rape. But it's not okay to talk about or even think about Blacks raping White women. That hints of not being sufficiently enthusiastic about the wonderful diversity that has been growing like a rapidly metastasizing cancer in our society for the past 40 years or so. The Correct party line is that diversity is all good; there must be no reservations about that: nothing that questions the goodness of diversity.

I mean, just imagine where talking or even thinking about Blacks raping White women might lead. One might think back to a time where Blacks raping White women was virtually unheard of, because, for one thing, Blacks weren't permitted to hang around White neighborhoods, and for another thing, for a Black to lay a hand on a White woman meant certain death. One might then begin thinking about how and why such a big change has come about over the past 40 years. One might begin thinking about the relationship between the increase in diversity and the increase in the incidence of Blacks raping White women. Oooh! Very Incorrect thinking!

It's easy to see why the Republican lemming who wrote to me from Little Rock is upset. He is afraid that if I and other National Alliance members talk about the racial aspects of rape in Little Rock it will, to use his words, "taint the rest of us with hate." Which is to say, that if National Alliance members in Little Rock make a big enough fuss about Blacks raping White women there, and people in Little Rock start thinking about it and talking about it, people in other parts of the country may suspect that the folks in Little Rock are "tainted with hate." They will suspect that the Republican lemmings of Little Rock aren't sufficiently enthusiastic about increasing diversity there. I believe that, unfortunately, the Republican lemming who wrote to me is more concerned about that than he is about stopping the rape of White women by Blacks.

Ten years ago I used to think that the way to straighten out the thinking of Republican lemmings was to hit them up alongside the head with a piece of two-by-four or with a sturdy, oak table leg. Then as I learned more about lemmings I realized that wasn't really necessary. Trauma and privation certainly aren't bad things when people need to be reoriented, but what is far more effective is simply to change their authority figures. Lemmings don't need to have their thinking straightened out with a piece of two-by-four, because in a very important sense of the word they don't think.

The Republican lemming who wrote to me didn't look at the evidence, think about it, and then come to the conclusion all by himself that more diversity is better. That's what his TV told him, and he's just parroting it back. Lemmings no more think about what they're saying than talking

parrots do. That doesn't necessarily mean that they're stupid. This Little Rock Republican may be able to program his own VCR and figure out his income taxes all by himself, but when it comes to the question of Political Correctness, he does not think. It's a conditioned reflex.

I've talked with you before about this lemming phenomenon, but it's an extremely important idea, and it leads to some very important practical conclusions, so I want now to run quickly through the idea once again. First, in the struggle for racial survival in which we are now engaged perception is extremely important. It is essential for people to believe that our struggle can be won. Many people who should be working with me or actively supporting me look at all of the people parroting back what they hear on TV, and they compare that 96 or 97 or 98 per cent of the White population with the very small number of people who are willing to speak out against Sumner Redstone's plan for a more diverse America, and they are discouraged. They conclude that it's hopeless, that the odds against us are too great, that the forces of lemminghood are too strong. And so they give up. They won't fight back.

But you know, that's the wrong way to look at the struggle. It's not us versus the lemmings. It's us versus the people who tell the lemmings what to think. And that's a very important distinction. I'm reminded of something I saw as a small boy. It's the scene in *The Wizard of Oz* when Dorothy and her friends discover that the seemingly all-powerful wizard is not so powerful after all without his illusions and special effects. The Jews are primarily illusionists. They work behind their television screen to create the illusion that everyone agrees with their poisonous ideas and is happy with the way Jews are pushing things: the illusion, for example, that every "normal, decent" person is happy with the trend toward more and more "diversity." But pull the plug on their television, so that the illusions no longer appear on their screen, and one finds them not so formidable a force after all. And the lemmings, without being told what to think, can only mill around in confusion.

Which is not to say that the lemmings in their mindless millions are not dangerous and can be ignored. The point is that we don't have to convert the lemmings. We don't have to persuade them. We just need to whip the illusion-masters. Then the lemmings can be turned 180 degrees in a matter of weeks. The same lemmings who now call for more diversity -- and really believe what they are saying -- will be calling for racial cleansing and a homogeneous White America -- and really will believe what they will say, when the mass media have been taken away from the Jews and returned to the control of our own people.

And that is why I emphasize over and over on these broadcasts the importance of being able to communicate with our people, the importance of breaking the Jewish monopoly control on the dissemination of information and ideas and images and illusions. The key to the survival of our people -- the key to returning our people to moral and spiritual and racial health, the key to salvaging what is left of our civilization and our culture and restoring them to health and progress -- is, first, to be able to compete effectively with the Jews in communicating with the non-lemming two or three or four per cent of the population able to think for themselves; and then to smash the Jews' grip on the media with which they control the thinking of the lemmings.

That certainly is not an easy task -- but it's a much more feasible task than trying to make the lemmings think for themselves, and it is more feasible than trying to convert the lemmings while

the Jews are still in control of their machinery of illusion. So what we do now is continue to build our own media -- continue to gain more listeners every week to these broadcasts; continue to build our ability to disseminate leaflets wherever they may reach anyone with an open mind; continue to make books and other printed material and audio material and video material available to people seeking the truth -- and to do this faster than the Jews can move forward with their efforts to ban the First and Second Amendments, thereby outlawing their competition and assuring the perpetuation of their monopoly control of the minds of the lemmings.

We'll talk more about this in later broadcasts, because it is by far the most important task for the survival of our people. But there are other things to talk about as well. I have been accumulating some interesting information on Mr. Clinton's pardon of the fugitive Jewish billionaire criminal Marc Rich, and I'd like to share that information with you next week.

Marc Rich and the Rule of Law

When I predicted in my broadcast two weeks ago that George Bush soon would drag the United States into another war at the behest of the Jews, I really didn't expect him to move so quickly. Of course, it's still pretty much a one-sided war: we drop bombs on the Iraqis and maintain a blockade of Iraq, and they don't strike back at us. But, hey, keep up this kind of one-sided war long enough, and it will become two-sided. Did you hear George Bush and his head mulatto explain that the bombing of Iraq was purely "defensive"? Iraqi air-defense radar was becoming too "offensive" and needed to be slapped down. We bombed the Iraqis in order to "protect our pilots," who are in the habit of flying provocatively over Iraq every day to show the Iraqis who's boss. I love these *Alice in Wonderland* statements by politicians and bureaucrats. They talk about how they abhor aggression and respect the rights of small nations, and then when the Jews snap their fingers, they send in the bombers to blast Serbia or Iraq for behaving as sovereign nations are entitled to behave in conducting their own internal affairs.

I also told you two weeks ago that although the Democrats and the Republicans might have slightly different taxing policies, when it comes to taking orders from the Jews there is no difference between them. George Bush is just as ready to bomb Baghdad and kill Iraqis as Bill Clinton was ready to bomb Belgrade and kill Serbs. And neither of these countries was our enemy. Neither had taken any hostile action against us or threatened our national interests. This latest attack on Iraq is solely to protect the interests of the Jews in Israel, so that they can continue butchering Palestinians without threat of opposition.

Bush and his mulatto in the State Department talk about the need to keep Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction. What liars and hypocrites! If Mr. Bush were concerned about preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, he should be giving his stern warnings to Ariel Sharon, not to Saddam Hussein. The UN weapons inspection teams should be probing the biological warfare laboratories in Israel instead of worrying about Iraq.

Liars and hypocrites: those are terms that apply pretty well to every politician in the Western world these days, and the Republicans are no better than the Democrats. Watch George Bush's face carefully when he's making a public statement. You'll see that secret little liar's smirk that he hasn't quite learned yet to suppress, like the really skilled liars have.

I've said this before, but the problem we're dealing with here is not just a few crooks who have sneaked into our political system; we're dealing with a whole system of government that is terminally corrupt, a system that has no room in it for anyone who isn't a crook.

In this connection, let's look in detail at a prime example currently in the news of just how rotten the system has become. The example to which I refer is the batch of pardons and commutations of the sentences of criminals that Bill Clinton dispensed last month just minutes before the end of his term in office. All the attention is being focused on just one of these criminals, Marc Rich, because he happens to be the biggest and most successful of them, but to understand the real significance of the Marc Rich pardon we need to look at it in the context of all of the pardons and commutations Mr. Clinton issued on January 20.

When one examines the whole list of criminals who found favor with Mr. Clinton, the most striking feature about the list is its Jewishness. It's not just that Jews are somewhat over represented on the list; they are vastly over represented. Jews constitute just one-half of one per cent of the U.S. prison population, yet fully one quarter -- 25 per cent -- of the convicted criminals whose sentences were commuted are Jews. That's fifty times the rate we would expect. And the Jews who received a full pardon, including Marc Rich and his criminal colleague Pincus Green, were over represented on the pardon list by a factor of 12, compared to their percentage of the convict population in the United States. I'll bet you that none of the mainstream media comment on this enormously disproportionate Jewishness of those receiving presidential clemency. The Congressional and other investigators probing the Marc Rich pardon certainly will tiptoe around this glaringly evident fact.

What does it mean? We know that some of the Jewish criminals whose prison terms were commuted received Mr. Clinton's clemency because they live in the state of New York, where Hillary recently was campaigning for a Senate seat and needed Jewish support. Four of these criminals -- Benjamin Berger, Jacob Elbaum, David Goldstein, and Kalmen Stern -- were prominent leaders in one ultra-Orthodox Jewish community, the village of New Square, which delivered virtually every vote to Hillary on election day, while other ultra-Orthodox communities nearby voted overwhelmingly against Hillary. That in itself is as glaringly suggestive of corruption as the overwhelming Jewishness of the clemency lists. Both Clintons, of course, are extraordinarily brazen and pushy political climbers, but this willingness to trade pardons for votes in such an open way sets a new record for brazenness. The Clintons were really thumbing their noses at the American people -- and also at the political system of which they are parts. This was not so much recklessness on their part as it was recognition of the fact that the system has become so corrupt that almost no one really cares any longer, and so the Clintons could get away with almost anything.

Nearly everything else the Clintons have done, however, including Bill's unzipping for Monica in the Oval Office and Hillary's running off with the White House silverware and furniture, pales in comparison with the pardon of Marc Rich. Like so many of the other Jewish criminals pardoned by Bill Clinton last month, Rich didn't steal his money with a ski mask and a sawed-off shotgun; he did it with a telephone, a glib tongue, and a knack for shuffling papers and sleight of hand. Rich, an international commodities trader, built his business through tapping into a worldwide network of Jewish middlemen and by knowing whom to bribe and how much. He saw a lucrative opportunity for himself in 1979 when Iranian militants seized the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took 62 Americans there hostage. The United States retaliated by imposing an embargo on Iranian oil, and it thenceforth became illegal for any U.S. citizen to buy or sell Iranian oil. That didn't bother the typically rootless and cosmopolitan Rich in the least, even though he held U.S. citizenship at the time. He saw an opportunity to enrich himself and to benefit his fellow Jews in Israel at the same time. What happened to the American hostages was not his concern. He arranged for the smuggling of six million barrels of oil from Iran to Israel, and he took a hefty commission for himself. He also made money on arms deals he arranged between Iran and North Korea. Of course, he couldn't very well declare all of this illicit income, and so he neglected to pay some $48 million in taxes on it.

Nevertheless, he and his business partner, Pincus Green, were caught and indicted on 65 counts of trading with the enemy, tax evasion, wire fraud, racketeering, and other felonies. Rich could have gotten 300 years in prison, but instead he fled the country in 1983 and has been a fugitive from justice ever since. This is the fellow of whom Bill Clinton has said that he never should have been indicted on criminal charges, that his offenses were only of a civil nature. Really! That's one of Mr. Clinton's principal excuses for pardoning Marc Rich: the man isn't really a criminal. He may have broken a few minor rules and perhaps civil penalties were appropriate, but certainly not criminal charges.

Being on Interpol's Ten Most Wanted list didn't keep Marc Rich from continuing to enrich himself, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars a year. He has given an estimated $200 million to Israel during the time he has been on the run and recently he gave more than a million dollars to the Clintons and their Democratic Party associates, the latter through his ex-wife Denise, a hard-faced, sleazily over-decorated, bleached Jewess: just the sort to fit right in with the Clintons' social circle. She is said to have received nearly a billion dollars from Rich in a divorce settlement, and she still works for him, out of her 25,000 square-foot, three-floor apartment on New York's Fifth Avenue. When the House Government Reform Committee tried to question her about that a few days ago, she pled her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination.

Marc Rich is guilty of far more than the felonies for which he was indicted in 1983. If I had the power to bring Marc Rich to justice, the charge I would bring against him, the crime for which I would condemn him to be suspended in an iron cage above the White House gate until his flesh had rotted from his bones, is genocide. I'll get into the details of that in a moment, but first I want to make it quite clear that Marc Rich is by no means the only dangerous Jewish felon Mr. Clinton pardoned last month. The impression one gets from reading news reports about the people pardoned is that they are just fast-buck artists -- lawyer types -- who perhaps are a little tricky and don't follow all of the rules, but aren't really bad or dangerous people: for example, those four nice ultra-Orthodox Jewish boys from New Square, New York, who were clever enough to trick the government into giving them more than 40 million dollars by filing all sorts of applications for financial aid for a *yeshiva* -- a school -- that didn't exist, and who had their sentences commuted by Mr. Clinton in return for all the other ultra-Orthodox Jews in New Square voting for Hillary when she ran for the Senate last year.

Well, listen! One of the other felons whose sentence was commuted by Mr. Clinton last month was New York Jewish lawyer Harvey Weinig. When he was practicing law in New York Mr. Weinig's most important clients were the Colombian bosses of the Cali cocaine cartel. In 1995, as part of a plea bargain, he admitted laundering $19 million in drug money for the cartel, and for that he was sentenced to 11 years in prison. Last month Mr. Clinton turned him loose. But actually, Weinig was involved in much more than laundering drug money. His clients customarily play rough; they don't just smuggle drugs; they kidnap people, they torture people, and they murder people. Weinig was involved in a kidnapping. The ransom money actually was delivered to his New York law office. The prosecutors actually had wire-tap recordings of Weinig discussing the kidnapping with some of his associates, and they were prepared to prosecute him for kidnapping and extortion and a number of other very serious felonies, which he wiggled out of with a plea bargain. And now Mr. Clinton has turned him loose. What was the

quid pro quo there? I don't know -- perhaps a lifetime supply of cocaine, Bill Clinton's drug of choice.

And I won't even get into the details of his release from prison of the Jewess Susan Rosenberg, who as a member of a violent communist gang was involved in an armored car robbery and the murder of two policemen and a guard. She was serving 58 years for that until big-hearted Bill let her go last month. Perhaps there's a Monica Lewinsky-type relationship there, although I don't really know.

The point I wanted to make is that the common element in the Clinton pardons and commutations is not that the crimes were all white-collar offenses that didn't really hurt anyone. The common element seems simply to be Jewishness. Well, there's more to it than that. The Jews he pardoned were not convicted of crimes of passion. They all are cold-blooded predators, who were involved in sucking the life out of the Gentile society in which they live, some by violent means, most non-violently, but the non-violent ones, the ones who only stole by trickery and deception, are no less destructive than the violent ones.

Marc Rich is the best example of that. His most serious and harmful crime is one for which he has not yet been indicted. That is the plundering of the Russian nation, the Russian people. A little over a decade ago, as the Soviet Union entered the final phase of its self-destruction, Marc Rich saw a splendid opportunity for himself. Corrupt bureaucrats in the Soviet government -- and nearly all of them were corrupt -- had seen the end coming and had begun a massive process of looting, grabbing everything of value for themselves before the ship went down. They did this through a racket known as "privatization."

Here's the way it worked: the bureaucrats in charge of various sectors of the Soviet economic infrastructure -- factories, mines, timberlands, and so on -- auctioned off these assets to private entrepreneurs, who in theory would operate them much more efficiently as purely capitalist enterprises. The government would benefit by converting inefficient, corrupt, money-losing properties into ready cash, and the whole economy would benefit from more efficient operation and foreign investment.

That was the theory. In practice, the corrupt bureaucrats inside the Soviet government made "sweetheart" deals with corrupt entrepreneurs outside the government. Russia's assets were sold, not to the highest bidder or to the person best able to manage them, but to crooks who had made secret arrangements with the bureaucrats, and they were sold for a tiny fraction of their actual worth. Kickbacks went from the entrepreneurs to the bureaucrats, and the entrepreneurs in many cases quickly re-sold the assets to third parties for enormous profits. Thus, the "privatization" of the Soviet economy. Thus the birth of a new class of billionaires, the so-called "oligarchs," who often had connections with organized crime. In a greatly disproportionate number of cases the crooked bureaucrats and the crooked entrepreneurs were Jews, and nearly all of the "oligarchs" who finally ended up with the wealth of Russia in their hands are Jews.

The crooks, both inside and outside the government, who plundered Russia were eager to squirrel away their ill-gotten hundreds of billions of dollars outside Russia, so that a future Russian government would not be able to take their loot away from them. But all of these Jews

grew up in the very restrictive, very parochial Soviet system. They had no experience at international wheeling and dealing, at money laundering, at hiding assets offshore in a way that they could not be traced. And that's where Marc Rich came in. He helped his fellow Jewish crooks in Russia with their looting in return for a percentage of what they stole, and he also did his own looting. From about 1990 to 1993 he was the biggest single trader in Russian aluminum and Russian oil, and he had his hands into many other Russian commodities as well, including gold, grain, nickel, and tin. Some of this is detailed in a book published last year that is available from National Vanguard Books, the sponsor of this broadcast. The book is *Godfather of the Kremlin: Boris Berezovsky and the Looting of Russia,* by Dr. Paul Klebnikov, a Russian scholar and a senior editor at *Forbes* magazine.

Marc Rich played a larger role than any other single person in getting the stolen wealth of Russia out of the country. More than any other single person he is responsible for making a once rich White country into the economic basket case that it is today. More than any other single person Marc Rich is responsible for the fact that millions of Russians are freezing and starving this winter, for the fact that the suicide rate and the alcoholism rate in Russia are at all-time highs, and for the fact that young Russian women, facing a future of bleak poverty at home, are letting themselves be lured into White slavery by Jewish slave dealers promising them jobs as secretaries or receptionists or housekeepers in Israel. This is the crime -- the genocidal crime -- for which Marc Rich should have his arms and legs broken and then be suspended in an iron cage over the White House gate. And Bill Clinton gave him a pardon!

Government investigators are looking into Rich's pardon, primarily in an attempt to discover any payoff from Rich to Clinton. The primary reason they're looking is because the affair stinks so much that the politicians among the investigators are hoping to earn a little political capital by publicly demonstrating their disapproval of Mr. Clinton's actions. They may find something and they may not, but I'm quite sure that they won't get to the real heart of the scandal, because that inevitably will take them into its Jewish aspects, and the very thought of that frightens them badly.

I should mention that some Jewish spokesmen are much more open in dealing with the Jewish aspects of the scandal than the Gentile politicians are. Some of the more far-sighted Jews are quite unhappy about the very heavy involvement of prominent Jewish leaders in the lobbying effort that secured Rich's pardon. Among the 100 Jewish big shots in the United States and Israel who wrote letters to Clinton urging the pardon was Abe Foxman, head of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the most powerful Jewish pressure group in the United States. All of these letters have been made public as the investigation in the Congress proceeds, and some Jews are expressing fears now that the public perception may be that there was an international Jewish conspiracy afoot to secure a pardon for Rich. That's exactly the fear expressed by Jewish writer Zev Chafetz in a February 15 column in the New York *Daily News.* Well, don't count on the lemmings to have such acute powers of perception. What the lemmings will perceive, however, is that something is really rotten in Washington.

Why did Bill and Hillary take such chances? Surely they could predict that they would be criticized for what they did, whether it was buying the votes of ultra-Orthodox Jews in New York, running off with the White House silverware, or pardoning such a notorious monster of

iniquity as Marc Rich. It is clear that they did what they did because they figured they could get away with it, that they could weather any bad publicity, just as Bill did during the Monica Lewinsky scandal. As I said before, they were thumbing their noses at the system. Even the lemmings can see that. What they did will not only serve further to undermine public respect for and confidence in the government and in our system of laws, but it also serves as an indicator of just how dangerously far respect and confidence already have been eroded inside the system itself. When the highest government officials, including the President himself, publicly display such contempt for the system, contempt is certain to increase greatly among the public.

You know, I don't think much of the system. I really do think it needs to be replaced, and the sooner the better. But the rule of law, which the Clintons have done so much to undermine, is what stands between any civilized society and the jungle. When there is no more rule of law, life becomes unbelievably brutal. America's feminized liberals, who believe that we can all live happily together without laws, like the members of some 1960s-style dope-smoking commune, are in for a really unpleasant surprise.

Law and Shamrocks

I am pleased to see that the public reaction to Bill Clinton's last-minute pardons of so many Jewish criminals is continuing to snowball. How can even the dullest lemmings fail to notice that the two cases making the most headlines are, first, the case of Marc Rich and his partner Pincus Green and, second, the case of the New Square four -- Benjamin Berger, Jacob Elbaum, David Goldstein, and Kalmen Stern from the ultra-Orthodox town of New Square, New York -- and that everyone involved in these cases, except Bill and Hillary themselves, is a Jew? I think that's wonderful, but I hold out no hope that any mainstream commentator on these cases will draw the correct conclusions from them. Let us just be grateful that a perceptive few will be led to understanding, and the lemmings will be left with something to scratch their heads about.

I mentioned in my broadcast last week that the reason the Clintons did what they did is that they thought they could get away with it. They figured that respect for the law already has declined to the point that no one would care enough to call them to account. And for the most part they are correct. Unfortunately for them, however, they made a few political miscalculations. They failed to foresee just how juicy a political scandal would erupt. They would have gotten away with everything except that some politicians simply couldn't resist using the scandal for their own benefit, and some Jews, seeing the potential for damage to Jews generally, began publicly distancing themselves from what the Clintons had done. And then, as I said, things began to snowball. The results of an opinion poll, in which 102,746 Internet users participated -- that's a substantial poll -- the results were posted last week by Netscape. More than three-quarters of those voting -- that's 78,466 votes against 24,279 votes -- more than three-quarters believe that a corrupt deal was made between the Clintons and the Jews of New Square, New York: votes for Hillary in her New York Senate race in return for pardons for the four convicted New Square Jews who had stolen more than $40 million from American taxpayers. If a similar public opinion poll were taken now for the Marc Rich case, I am sure that an even higher percentage of the public would express their belief that the pardon was corrupt: that it involved a payoff for Clinton. The one true statement Bill Clinton has made in connection with all of this is that he didn't expect such a strong reaction, or in his own words: "I was blindsided!"

As I just said, he made a political miscalculation, but his judgment that the system has become so corrupt that he should have been able to get away with what he did was more or less on target. Let me give you a few more examples to illustrate just how dangerously corrupted the system has become.

Last month 21-year-old Matthew Marshall was sentenced in a Houston, Texas, courtroom to spend the next ten years of his life in prison. He had been convicted, along with four other young White men, of violating the civil rights of a Black family in the Houston suburb of Katy. The five young men had burned a cross in front of a house occupied by the Blacks. They didn't assault the Blacks. They didn't threaten the Blacks. They didn't steal anything from the Blacks. They didn't even wake the Blacks up. But when the Blacks woke up of their own accord the next morning they found the charred remains of a six-foot cross in their front yard. The Blacks called the police, and shortly thereafter the five young White men were arrested, because, as in most such cases of foolish, alcohol-fueled vandalism, the young men didn't have enough sense or self-

discipline to keep their mouths shut about their prank. So now as punishment for that foolish prank Matthew Marshall must spend the next ten years in some hell-hole of a Texas prison, where the majority of the inmates will be Blacks and *mestizos.*

The judge, David Hittner, justified the severity of his sentence with the comment that in a pre-trial hearing he had heard young Marshall's father use a "racial slur." The judge smugly told a group of approving reporters: "It appears that the seeds of his racism were sown at home." If you're interested you can find the story for yourself in a February 5 Associated Press report from Houston. Ten years of living hell for a stupid, drunken prank and a "racial slur" -- by his father. Compare that with the punishment of the four New Square Jews who stole more than $40 million from the American people and whose religion is a continuing slur on all the rest of us. They received sentences ranging from two years to seven years -- and then Bill Clinton turned them all loose.

Marc Rich stole billions and never served a day in prison. And now Bill Clinton has given him a lifetime "get out of jail free" pass to ensure that he never will be punished for his massive crimes. The average prison sentence in the United States for a felon convicted of armed robbery is just under eight years, according to U.S. Department of Justice statistics. The average sentence for sexual assault is six years. If a Black accosts you on the street, puts a gun to your head, and takes your wallet, your wristwatch, and your cell phone, he'll get eight years, on the average. If he sexually assaults your wife, he'll get six years. Blacks don't ordinarily burn crosses, but we can imagine an equivalent prank: leaving a sign in a White family's yard that says, "Black power!" or, "Go back to Europe, you honkies."

Now, if the police even bothered to arrest the Blacks who did that, what do you imagine their punishment would be? A $50 fine for littering, perhaps? If a judge sentenced one of them to ten years for violating the rights of the White family, Jesse Jackson would have his traveling riot in action in Houston the next day. There would be outraged editorials about "Jim Crow law" in newspapers all across the country.

Well, of course, judges understand that sort of thing. A judge, after all, is just a lawyer with political ambitions: a cross between a lawyer and a politician, and that's a bad combination. He has several things on his mind when he judges or when he passes sentence. First, he thinks about his fellow lawyers. He considers the wealth and status, the prestige and importance, of the defense attorneys. If you walk into a courtroom with a $600-an-hour lawyer who has political connections, and he brings four of his legal assistants with him, at $100 an hour each, you will have a lot of sympathetic consideration from the judge. If you ever make the mistake of going into court without a lawyer, thinking that because you're familiar with the law, and justice is on your side, you can handle the matter yourself and save having to pay a lawyer, you're a goner. The judge will have made up his mind before the first witness is heard to punish you for trying to beat one of his fellow lawyers out of a fee.

The judge also will consider how the judges -- which is to say, his fellow lawyers -- on the appeals court will view the matter. Judges don't like to have their decisions overturned.

Most of all, however, the judge will consider how his decision will be treated by the media, especially if it's a case with any political aspect. Judges always want to give Politically Correct decisions: decisions that will not be looked on unfavorably by the media.

What about justice, you ask. Are you serious? Well, of course, I'm being too cynical. Justice is available in American courts, and you can get just as much as you can afford to pay for -- unless, of course, the media really have it in for you.

None of this, unfortunately, is fundamentally new -- except for the influence of the media. Jonathan Swift was making similar complaints about the courts in England 275 years ago. Nevertheless, there is a trend, and the trend is quite definitely downhill. And it's not just that there have been a few noteworthy flukes recently. It's true that Bill and Hillary have done more to undermine respect for the law than anyone since when O.J. Simpson was able to get clean away with slitting the throats of two people by the simple expedient of spending $10 million on lawyers and thereby earning a remarkable degree of indulgence from the judge.

I want to emphasize again that the Clintons are crooked but not stupid. In fact, Bill has been remarkably astute throughout his career at calculating what he could get away with, what the system would tolerate. He just failed to foresee the amount of public attention that would be focused on his pardon of Marc Rich. And once the public attention was there, there were plenty of Republican lawyers ready to go into a feeding frenzy, hoping to use the Clinton scandal to augment their own careers. The feeding frenzy in turn brought all sorts of other Clinton misdeeds to light that otherwise would have escaped public notice. So far Hillary has been the one most hurt by that. She had to give back the White House silverware, and her brother Hugh, also a lawyer, had to promise that he would give back the $400,000 fee he had accepted from a couple of convicted sleaze balls to use his influence as Bill's brother-in-law to secure pardons for them. That must really have hurt!

The Clintons have damaged the rule of law in America, not just in their latest scandal, but throughout the whole eight years of the Clinton era. But they are more significant as highly visible symptoms of decay than as agents of decay. The decay was well under way long before the Clintons came to Washington. A political system that was not already in near-terminal condition would never have admitted the Clintons as members.

Today we want to stay focused on just the judicial and law-enforcement part of the system, rather than on the system as a whole. We are concerned about the increasing corruption of the courts and of the legal establishment, the increasing politicization of law enforcement agencies, the increasingly bizarre rulings coming from the courts, the more and more reckless and unprincipled acts of legislatures. A visitor from another century would be alarmed. We should be alarmed too, except that we've become a bit numbed from being exposed to gradually increasing corruption for such a long time -- and the controlled media keep telling us that things are getting better and better, with more and more Black judges being appointed to the courts by the politicians, more and more female judges, more and more Politically Correct decisions from the courts, more and more Black police officials in our big cities, more mandatory "sensitivity" conditioning for cops, and so on.

As I said a moment ago, I'm not basing my dim view of the state of our legal system on just a few flukes. There definitely is a trend. The case of the 21-year-old White man in Houston who was sentenced to ten years in prison last month for a Politically Incorrect prank is not unique. Last year an 18-year-old White boy in Maryland was sentenced to ten years for a similar prank involving a cross and a Black family. Last month a 21-year-old White man, Kenny Vierra, was sentenced to six years in prison because he punched a Mexican in the nose in a parking-lot altercation in Sun City, Florida. Six years for one punch in the nose because Vierra referred to the Mexican as a "wetback" before he punched him and because Vierra had a swastika tattoo on his chest. That was enough for a politically ambitious judge to decide that a "hate crime" had been committed.

Another young White man, Jack Houston, who had been in the car with Vierra but who did not get out of the car during Vierra's altercation with the Mexican also was sentenced to six years in prison. A White girl who also was in the car with Houston, 23-year-old Staci Ann Schillace, was sentenced to seven months in jail. The two who stayed in the car were punished for having encouraged Kenny Vierra. The judge who handed down those sentences must be pretty proud.

In San Diego, California, a 25-year-old White man, Alex Curtis, has been held without bond since last November while the government prepares to try him on charges of having violated the civil rights of San Diego-area Jews. He could receive ten years in a Federal prison if convicted. Curtis used to publish what the government describes as a "neo-Nazi" newsletter. He is accused of inspiring a couple of friends to harass local Jewish big shots. The friends are alleged to have put a snakeskin through the mail slot of the local office of Jewish Democratic Congressman Robert Filner and to have left anti-Jewish literature outside the office and also outside the home of Morris Casuto, regional director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Curtis himself is alleged to have written an unkind remark about Morris Casuto on a wall outside a synagogue near Casuto's house. For these pranks Curtis is being held without bond, like some dangerous Colombian drug lord or Mafia chief, and is facing ten years in prison. If you want to read the details about his case, go to the Web site for the San Diego Union-*Tribune.*

Morris Casuto's boss, by the way, is Abe Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Foxman is one of the Jewish officials who helped secure a pardon for Marc Rich from Bill Clinton. Ten years for Matthew Marshall, six years for Kenny Vierra, six years for Jack Houston, ten years for Alex Curtis -- and a pardon for Marc Rich.

Yes, there is a trend in our judicial system, and it is toward Political Correctness. Judges -- and lawyers generally -- who in a sane and healthy White society should be the foremost guardians of our civil liberties, have instead become the greatest enemies of those liberties. There are, to be sure, other factors in addition to the corruption of lawyers. Letting Blacks sit on juries has led to a real *Alice in Wonderland* situation. They acquit high-profile Black criminals, such as O.J. Simpson, who are guilty beyond any shadow of a doubt, but woe unto any Politically Incorrect White man whose fate they are asked to decide. They have turned civil suits where they constitute a majority on the juries into games of Russian roulette. They think nothing of awarding astronomical sums for the most trivial injuries, even for hurt feelings.

And of course, there are the Jewish media relentlessly pushing the notion that the most fundamental civil liberty, the one civil liberty that really needs to be protected, is freedom from being offended or made to feel insecure, and the way to protect that most fundamental civil liberty is to enact more "hate crime" and "speech crime" laws and have them rigorously enforced by the legal and judicial establishment. And for the most part the lawyers -- including the judges -- are going along enthusiastically with that notion. Which is why young White men accused of "hate crimes" are being treated so savagely by the courts today. A White man who punches a non-White in the nose or slips a snakeskin through a Jew's mail slot is dealt with more severely than a Black who commits armed robbery or sexual assault on a White woman.

As I indicated earlier, part of the reason for this is that many judges are politically ambitious, and they want to be on the right side of the Jewish media. Another part of the reason is that judges, along with the rest of the lawyer class, are riding pretty high on the hog. As this society goes down the drain they are keeping their feet dry, and they want it to stay that way. Black rapists and armed robbers are not a threat to their comfort and security. White "hate criminals" are a threat, because they challenge the system that has rewarded the judges so generously. That's a very shortsighted, irresponsible, and immoral way for them to look at the world and their place in it, but that's the way it is these days. Things can only get crazier and crazier, more and more repressive and unjust, as Political Correctness fastens an ever-tighter grip on the legal and judicial establishment.

I'll give you an example of just how crazy things already are. Boston used to be a substantially Irish city, and even the city's subsidized housing projects were largely Irish. Even as the Black minority grew to a majority in the public housing, the poor and elderly Irish occupants had their areas, and the Blacks had theirs. Mixing, however, has been inevitable, and with mixing has come friction -- especially since Blacks have been taught by the media to walk with chips on their shoulders. They've learned that Whitey nearly always will back down.

It wasn't always that way. When the courts forced racial integration on the Irish of South Boston in the 1970s, the Irish fought back. They didn't fight back hard enough, though, and the judicial establishment eventually beat the Irish -- that is, the Whites -- into submission. These days the Blacks not only walk with chips on their shoulders, they look for any excuse at all to take offense at something Whitey says or does. They know the courts will back them up.

An instance of this is reported in the *Irish Echo,* the largest-circulation Irish-American newspaper. As more and more Blacks in Boston's public housing moved into areas where Irish already were living, the Blacks noticed the prevalence of shamrocks being displayed by Irish residents on their doors, in their windows, on playground equipment, and so on. The shamrock is the most common symbol of Irish ethnicity, of Irish pride. Well, the Blacks don't like it, and they have complained about it to the Boston Housing Authority, the BHA. I'll read you the first three paragraphs of a story in the February 14 issue of the *Irish Echo:*

In a controversial measure designed to placate offended minority residents, officials of the Boston Housing Authority are asking residents to remove shamrock displays from doors and windows in housing developments across the city, the *Irish Echo* has learned.

Confirming rumors that have been circulating around South Boston in recent weeks, Lydia Agro, BHA's communications director, told the *Echo* that housing managers are advising residents that shamrocks and other 'bias indicators" are offensive to some minority residents and should not be publicly displayed.

"There are a number of symbols that have been identified by some of our residents as making them uncomfortable and unwelcome," Agro said. 'In response to those concerns, we're including shamrocks along with swastikas, Confederate flags, and other symbols which give offense.

Now, I'll bet you wouldn't have believed that if I hadn't just read it to you from a newspaper. How long do think it'll be before some ambitious, Politically Correct judge sentences some elderly Irish widow to ten years in the slammer for displaying a "bias indicator" in her window? Does that sound ridiculous? If I had told you ten years ago that in the year 2000 an 18-year-old Maryland boy would be sentenced to 10 years in prison for burning a small cross in someone's yard, you would have thought that ridiculous too.

Times are changing, but they're not getting better -- and they won't get better until they've gotten bad enough to make White Americans rebel and take the administration of law away from those now misusing it in such a destructive way.

Seattle's Fat Tuesday Riot

As we all know, there was an earthquake in Seattle on Wednesday morning last week. The news media have covered all the aspects of that earthquake pretty thoroughly. Some of us undoubtedly also are aware that there was a riot in downtown Seattle just a few hours before the earthquake. I watch the CNN news every morning and usually every evening too. When I watched the news last Wednesday morning, the earthquake hadn't occurred yet, and so there was brief coverage of the riot that had occurred Tuesday night and into the wee hours of Wednesday morning. On my television screen I saw a crowd of disorderly young White people, most of them in their teens and 20s, engaging in some pretty serious vandalism. I saw one young White man jump up on the hood of a car and begin kicking in the windshield. Others smashed store windows. Pretty disgusting behavior generally, but not really unexpected in this age of self-indulgence, permissiveness, irresponsibility, and alienation.

The occasion for the riot was the end of Mardi Gras, so-called Fat Tuesday, the last day before Lent. Lent is traditionally a period of abstinence and fasting for Christians, and so Mardi Gras is typically a period of feasting and partying. There had been some rowdiness, hooliganism, and vandalism in Seattle during the previous two or three nights of Mardi Gras celebrations, but nothing like the riot on Fat Tuesday. Police officials estimated the total number of people milling around late Tuesday night at 9,000, and there were 350 policemen waiting on the edge of the crowd to keep things from getting out of hand.

Young women were baring their breasts, there was a great deal of drinking, and there was an occasional fight. The police watched but for the most part didn't interfere. In the television coverage I saw, there were few if any Blacks in the crowd. The CNN reporter said that about 70 people had been hospitalized, that the police had arrested 20 or so people, and that was about it. That, at least, was my impression of the Fat Tuesday riot in Seattle, and I suspect it also was the impression of most other Americans who were not actually present during the riot. Then came the earthquake Wednesday morning, and after that there was nothing else said about the riot; it was all earthquake news.

Except that I kept hearing rumors. People wrote to me and said that the Fat Tuesday riot really had been a race riot, with gangs of Blacks attacking, beating, and robbing White people. Well, that wasn't what I had seen on my TV screen, and so I discounted all of these rumors. I figured that there may have been a few Blacks involved in the riot, and that some observers had focused on just what the Blacks were doing, but what I had seen on CNN had convinced me that Whites were misbehaving pretty badly, and so whatever had happened in Seattle couldn't have been purely Black on White attacks, as some people were telling me. But I was curious enough to check out the Seattle news sources, just to be sure that there was nothing racial about the violence. I checked the two major newspapers, The *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* and the *Seattle Times*, and also the Web site of the main TV-news station there. What I learned from these news sources agreed with my initial impression from the CNN news report I had seen Wednesday morning, just before the earthquake.

There was some additional information. One young man who had been injured in the Tuesday riot had died the next day in a hospital. That was 20-year-old Kris Kime, a good-looking young White man: a healthy, clean-cut, all-American kid, judging from the news photos of him. But there was not a word about race or about Blacks attacking Whites. I'll read you a few sentences from the main article about the riot in the Wednesday edition of the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer:*

Tuesday's Fat Tuesday celebration disintegrated into ugly brawls early this morning as groups of toughs roamed Pioneer Square smashing bottles, setting off fireworks, and attacking anyone in their path. Police said 72 people were treated at area hospitals, including two with life-threatening injuries, and 21 people were arrested. . . .

Up to 3,000 revelers had been expected, but police this morning put the total in the Pioneer Square area at 4,000 and said another 5,000 were in the surrounding area. The crowd centered at First Avenue and Yesler Way for much of the night. Partyers were rowdy but generally calm before midnight -- drinking, dancing, and showering beads on women who bared their breasts. But in the early morning hours the mood changed drastically. Many fights broke out, shattered glass littered the area, and the crackle of fireworks filled the night. At least two cars were overturned. One young woman was beaten to the pavement by several women and men, and later another woman was slammed against a wall and struck several times on live television. . . .

Ugly street brawls sporadically erupted as the crowds dissipated toward the international district. A series of fights broke out at Second Avenue and South Washington Street, leaving one man lying unconscious in a pool of blood. Bands of hooligans cruised up Washington Street on foot, and by 2:15 AM two more men were left bloodied and senseless near Fourth Avenue. One man lay curled in a fetal position -- his body half on the sidewalk, half in the street. Blood spread from an open gash above his mouth. 'He just got jumped,' said Erik Osborn, 20, of Seattle, a friend who witnessed the pummeling. 'About 10 guys, some of them with mini-bats, just grabbed him and beat the hell out of him.' Moments later five men beat and kicked another man until his body fell limp into an intersection. They flipped over his limp body, pulled his wallet from his back pocket, then left him lying in the street.

Well, there's quite a bit more in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* story about the riot -- but not one word about race, not one word about what caused the mood of the celebration to change drastically. The words Black and White are not used once in the story. And there wasn't any discrepancy between the story and what I had seen on the CNN television news broadcast. Then on Thursday I received an e-mail letter from an observer in Seattle that went into much more detail than the rumors that had reached me earlier. I'll read the whole letter to you:

Dear Dr. Pierce, we want to share with you the real story in Seattle this week. On Tuesday night, during the Mardi Gras-Fat Tuesday celebrations in downtown Seattle, 350 riot-geared police stood idle while several hundred young people began to mingle peacefully outside the bars and clubs, which were closing early. Suddenly and without warning a group of 12 to 15 Black males with an equal accompaniment of Black females began to pick out at random, drag away, and beat to a bloody pulp any young, defenseless White person they could find. The victims were between 19 and 32 years of age. All were White, usually blond. Many were young ladies who were hunted and chased, their long hair pulled violently from behind. They were punched severely

with roundhouse attacks and finally, after being thrown to the ground, were kicked mercilessly until bloody, broken, and unconscious.

It was then that the Black girls finished the job by literally ripping anything of value from the usually unconscious young victim. This scene was repeated for approximately three hours by several different groups of incredibly violent, animalistic Blacks and ended only when our police chief, Gil Kerlikowske, was allowed to send in the riot police with armored cars, tear gas, horses, and ambulances. The race riot then ended within 15 minutes as the Black gangs vanished with the first signs of tactical response.

With more than 60 young people in local hospitals and one young, blond man beaten to death by these animals, we thought this might at least have made local nightly news. But due to the earthquake and the powers that be, not even my neighbors are aware of these disgusting events only minutes from our homes.

The big story you and the rest of the country will be hearing about, of course, is our 6.8-magnitude earthquake of 10:55 Wednesday morning. The real story, which will not be shown by any of the media, is the three-hour series of Black-on-White "hate crimes" that took place within eyesight of our esteemed police force and our terrified police chief.

We are angry, frustrated, and disgusted, and we can only hope that you will pass this terrible news on to the rest of our nation. We thank you, and we support you

Well, that letter inspired me to dig further. I asked two other people who had written to me to help me gather more information about what had happened in Seattle. Finally, in the Friday edition of the *Seattle Times*, in a story about the murder of Kris Kime, the truth began to come out. The story begins:

Kristopher Kime never knew what hit him. Jostling with close friends in the increasingly violent crowd at Mardi Gras in Pioneer Square on Tuesday night, he saw a young woman knocked to the pavement by a group of violent attackers. He bent over to help her to her feet, fearing she would be trampled. That's when someone from behind smashed a bottle into the back of Kime's head. He crumpled to the pavement, unconscious. Several attackers set upon him wildly, kicking him in the head before moving on.

Here's another paragraph from the same story, a description of events by one of Kime's friends who was with him that night:

We were in our own little group, and fighting was breaking out everywhere," Mattson said. "I saw a girl being pulled around by her hair until she was knocked down, and somebody was kicking her. It was disgusting, a whole group of people beating up one person.

So far, that sounds like all of the other news coverage of the riot I'd already read. But then, near the end of the *Seattle Times* story, was the following paragraph:

Witnesses said the man who hit Kime from behind was black, that he may have been part of a roving group of young black men and women who police say attacked many white party-goers in the crowd. But police spokesman Benton yesterday cautioned against concluding that the attackers were motivated by race.

Well, that's it: the first real news about the racial nature of the riot. Everything prior to that had been just what people on radio talk shows claimed they had seen or had heard from their neighbors. And I was getting that secondhand, since I'm 3,000 miles away and can't tune in to Seattle-area talk shows. I never depend on rumors for the things I report to you in my broadcasts. But the story that I just quoted from Friday's *Seattle Times* was enough for me to ask one of my people to locate and obtain some of the video footage of the riot that had been taken by cameramen at the riot but wasn't used on national television news programs, such as the CNN news program I had seen. When that video footage arrived, it clinched the story. It clearly shows gangs of Blacks attacking one White person after another, viciously and murderously, White women as well as White men, knocking them down, repeatedly kicking them in the head and stomping on them, while other Whites -- including the police -- just stand and watch.

And about the time I was first seeing those images, the dam broke back in Seattle. The story that the media bosses and the politicians had tried so hard to suppress burst into the open. An Associated Press report from Seattle released last Saturday is headlined: "Seattle Black leaders concerned Blacks blamed for Mardi Gras violence." The report begins:

The city's Black leaders worry that young Blacks are being singled out for blame in the Fat Tuesday riots that left one man dead, another hospitalized, and at least 70 people injured. The issue was not race, but crime, they stressed in meetings Friday with Mayor Paul Schell and Police Chief Gil Kerlikowske.

The Black president of the local chapter of the Urban League was quoted in the report:

We are concerned by how the violence is being portrayed. Our fear now is that it's become a race issue.

Well, it certainly wasn't and isn't being portrayed as a race issue by the local politicians, including the police chief. They were falling all over themselves trying to convince everyone that it wasn't a race issue. Clem Benton, a spokesman for the chief of police, told the Associated Press reporter, "We're investigating these crimes as crimes. This is all about criminal activity. It's not about race." And Dick Lilly, a spokesman for the mayor, piously told the reporter: "Clearly hatred has no place in our community." The implication is clear: if you even think that there was a racial basis for what happened in the Fat Tuesday riot, you're a "hater."

Well, thank God there are some White Seattle citizens who aren't afraid of being considered "haters." These are the citizens who saw with their own eyes what happened and then refused to keep quiet about it. They talked about what they saw on Seattle's radio talk shows -- and they kept talking about it until the politicians and the major media had to give up the pretense that race wasn't an issue. If it hadn't been for the radio talk shows the people who don't want the

world to know what really happened in Seattle on Fat Tuesday probably would have been able to keep the news suppressed.

Last Saturday's Associated Press report quoted one radio talk-show host:

"The people who very clearly were creating the mayhem, as plain to me as to anyone else, were African Americans," said Brian Suits, host of a call-in radio show. . . "The most crystallized opinion I heard was from a guy who perceived Seattle police were specifically staying away from looking racist," Suits said. "They're gun-shy about the perception of coming down hard on one single group."

So now you know what happened in Seattle on Fat Tuesday, and a substantial portion of the citizens of Seattle know too. But most Americans still don't know, for the usual reason: the big media, the national media, which are controlled almost completely by Jews, don't want you to know.

There are several interesting aspects to the Seattle story, in addition to the fact that a series of violent, murderous, Black-on-White race attacks took place there last week and the media and the politicians tried to hush it up. Blacks were just behaving the way Blacks naturally behave when the constraints are removed. And the Jewish media bosses and the politicians who dance to their tune were just doing what we've seen them do over and over again in other places and at other times -- in dealing with the Wichita massacre of December 14, for example, which I've detailed for you in several recent broadcasts.

The difference between Seattle and Wichita is interesting. In both cases the big media, the Jewish media, killed the news at the national level and kept most Americans in the dark. But in Wichita the local media dealt with the rapes and murders of the young Whites by two Blacks in a fairly forthright way. So far as I could tell, there was no attempt to keep the people of Wichita in the dark. In Seattle, on the other hand, the major media tried hard to keep even the local citizens from knowing what had happened. Why the difference between the two cities?

I don't really know, but I'm inclined to believe that it's primarily due to the difference in the White populations of those two cities. Washington is one of the Whiter states in the country. Only a little over three percent of the population is Black. Seattle is a much more fashionable place to live than Wichita. There's a much higher percentage of yuppies and soccer moms in Seattle than in Wichita. Seattle is a trendier city than Wichita: it's more liberal, more feminized. The people in Seattle have given indications on more than one occasion that they feel guilty about the Whiteness of their area. Church groups in Seattle have sponsored the immigration of Hmong tribesmen from Southeast Asia and are into all sorts of other programs intended to increase the "diversity" of the area, so that the White yuppies and soccer moms can feel better about themselves. Political Correctness is bigger in Seattle than in Wichita. Washingtonians are quite proud of themselves for having elected a half-Chinese mongrel for governor of their mostly White state. That sort of thing would be much less likely in Kansas.

The Seattle police were terrified that they would arrest more Blacks than Whites in a mostly White crowd and then would be charged with "racial profiling," the current liberal bugaboo, and

so they stood by and watched the Blacks go on their murderous rampage without interfering. I'm pleased that at least some of the White folks in Seattle noticed that and weren't afraid to comment publicly on it. Mandatory "sensitivity" conditioning for cops is just the sort of trendy thing that Seattle's yuppies and soccer moms would be in favor of. I'm sure that what happened on Fat Tuesday hasn't changed any of their minds, but it may have caused a few of the more perceptive and open-minded residents to begin thinking about the dangerous consequences of psychologically castrating the police with "sensitivity" training.

A disturbing similarity between Seattle and Wichita is the failure of the Whites to defend themselves or their kind. In Wichita three able-bodied young White men stood and watched helplessly while two Blacks raped their women, and then all of the Whites knelt obediently in the snow and let the Blacks shoot them in the back of the head, one at a time. In Seattle thousands of young White men stood with their mouths open in surprise and watched Blacks chase young White women through the crowd, knock them to the ground, and kick them. The only exception of which I am aware is young Kris Kime. If the Blacks hadn't killed him when he tried to help a White girl they were attacking, perhaps he would have been charged with a "hate crime" for interfering with the Blacks' rampage. The sort of spineless passivity displayed by most of the young White men in Seattle in the face of Black violence against their women is far more disturbing than the drunken vandalism I saw some Whites engaged in.

I am sure that some of this passivity is the consequence of the general feminization of our young men. I also am sure that part of the reason the young White men in the crowd failed to organize, arm themselves with baseball bats or whatever other weapons they could find, and put a quick end to the Black violence against other Whites is the media conditioning they have been receiving all their lives. They were afraid that to have opposed the Blacks would be "racist."

It is hard for me to feel sorry for Whites who are victimized by Blacks in the way the Whites of Wichita and Seattle were. White people who will not fight don't deserve to live. White people who are not mentally and morally prepared to fight don't deserve to live. And White people who are surprised that Blacks behaved the way they did in the Fat Tuesday riot clearly aren't prepared to fight.

Poisonous Doctrines

Today let's begin by talking about individualism and individualists. I'm using those words in a special sense. In this broadcast, when I say "individualist" I mean a person who habitually fails to consider or to give proper weight to the group context in which he belongs when viewing the world, formulating ideas, and reaching decisions; and who in evaluating other people fails to put them into the group context to which they belong, instead focusing narrowly only on the individual at hand.

I also will use the word "individualist" to designate a person who makes an ideology out of his individualism. In this sense an individualist is a person who believes that it is good, moral, admirable, proper, and so on, to disregard group contexts; and immoral, unpatriotic, reprehensible, and wicked not to disregard them. Actually it's impossible to avoid group contexts, and the ideological individualist himself divides people into two groups: namely, individualists, who, like himself, are good people; and "collectivists," who, like me, are bad people, akin to communists.

I've spoken with you in earlier broadcasts about the ideology of individualism, and today I want to focus more on some of the practical implications of the attitude. I'll tell you first what prompted my choice of this subject today: Two weeks ago I said some unkind things about lawyers, judges, and our judicial system, and in response to that broadcast I received a couple of indignant letters from lawyers who told me that I was both unfair and inaccurate in my negative characterization of lawyers. Not all lawyers are soulless, money-grubbing crooks, they told me. Some lawyers are decent, honest, patriotic people, they told me. Some lawyers agree with me about most things, and it is foolish to alienate them by calling all lawyers crooks. I need their support, and I will lose it if I continue to insult them.

Well, I can't really disagree with that. I personally know a few lawyers who aren't crooks, and I certainly do want to retain their support. Looking at my broadcast of two weeks ago from an individualist viewpoint, it was both unfair and inaccurate. The individualist would say that I paint things with too broad a brush. I should say that some lawyers are crooks, and then the individualist will agree with me. Of course, the essence of my message two weeks ago was not that some lawyers are crooks; it was that the judicial system is corrupt. The system designed by lawyers and staffed by lawyers for the purpose of making and interpreting the laws is corrupt. The fact that every lawyer is in some sense a part of that system does not mean that every lawyer is corrupt. A few lawyers who are in the system are fighting against the system. I didn't say that two weeks ago, because I wanted to keep my message simple and direct. I didn't want to distract my listeners from the main thrust of the message with qualifications and quibbles. It's an important message, and I wanted it to make the strongest possible impression on my listeners. I deliberately paint with a broad stroke.

Here's another example of the way in which people looking at things from an individualist viewpoint misunderstand my message. I am often critical of the Christian churches, of their subservient collaboration with the Jews, of their encouragement of miscegenation and their other racially destructive policies. And some Christians who agree with my positions on the Jews and

on race take offense at my comments regarding the overall role of Christianity in our society today, and they tell me, "Hey! I'm offended. All Christians aren't race-mixers and collaborators with the Jews." And of course, I understand that. I understand that there are many individual Christians who are good people, Christians who don't run with the Jews, but what I was talking about was the overall role of Christianity and the Christian churches in our society, and that role today is destructive.

Another example: I often talk about the feminization of our society and the feminization of our young men, and I make it quite clear that I don't approve of these things. This offends some women, who take what I say personally. An expression I used in one broadcast that offended several of my women listeners enough for them to send me indignant letters of protest was the phrase "college girls of both sexes." The implication was that college girls are not to be taken more seriously than feminized college boys. At another time I stated that permitting women to vote was a terrible mistake, and again I received letters from women who indignantly told me that they vote more responsibly than many men they know. Well, I'm sure they do, but I was talking about the overall effect of women's votes, and that has been very damaging to our society.

Of course, women as a rule take everything personally, and so I explain individually to those who protest that I do take women seriously, that I value and respect them, and that I love them -- but that I also understand that despite all of the fascinating individual differences among them, all of them are profoundly different from men.

When I receive protests from lawyers and from male Christians, however, I see the individualist fallacy at work. Men should not look at the world as individualists. They should understand that it is not only natural and proper but necessary to judge other men according to the group of which they are a part. Just as people have individual characteristics, they also have collective characteristics, and to ignore the latter from fear of being considered a racist or a sexist or an anti-Semite or a homophobe is the worst sort of folly. When one is in a war one doesn't judge the soldiers on the other side as individuals. One doesn't hold one's fire because the fellow in the enemy's uniform who is charging with a rifle in his hands may really have wanted to be a conscientious objector instead of a combat infantryman. If he's in the enemy's uniform, one shoots at him.

We understand, of course, that not all Blacks are muggers or gang-bangers or armed robbers or HIV-infected rapists, just as we understand that not every Jew is a predator who is actively scheming to destroy our people after he has sucked us dry. When I look at a Black I may see a criminal or a welfare bum, or I may see an honest, hard-working person, but in either case I see a Black, and I understand what his race is doing to my race collectively. Even if an individual Black with whom I am dealing is friendly, intelligent, and moral, I would be a fool to expect him to join me in a campaign to put an end to what his race is doing to my race and my civilization collectively.

I sometimes am obliged to deal with Jews: much more often than with Blacks, in fact, because Jews collectively have arrogated to themselves so many positions of control and influence in our society. And I am able to distinguish among individual Jews. I see that many Jews with whom I

deal are tricky and deceitful, but there are some who are straightforward and sincere, I believe. Many are really hateful, but occasionally I meet one who is almost likable. Yet I never forget what Jews collectively, as a whole, are doing and have done to my people collectively.

We must understand that we are in a planet-wide race-war, and the survival of our race depends on our winning this war. We won't win by wasting our time trying to figure out who the friendly Blacks are and who the hostile ones are. We won't win by refusing to talk about what the Jewish media bosses and the powerful Jewish organizations are doing to our people from fear that we may be unjustly casting suspicion on Jews who are simply minding their own business. We must deal with them collectively, and when the crunch comes that's certainly the way they will deal with us.

In fact, that's pretty much the way they already deal with us. When those gangs of Blacks were running wild through the Mardi Gras crowd in Seattle a couple of weeks ago, savagely attacking White people, they didn't try to figure out which Whites were racists and which ones were diversity-loving, race-mixing liberals. Their cry was, "Let's get a Whitey! We gonna kick some White ass tonight," and they attacked any White target of opportunity they encountered.

The national media have successfully kept most of the country from hearing about the Fat Tuesday race riot in Seattle, and on that subject I have a few more thoughts to share with you. For one thing, I've been able to gather a little more information about what happened that night. Not only was there a series of vicious beatings and robberies of White men and women by gangs of rampaging Blacks, there also was a series of sexual assaults. The controlled media were even more eager to keep these covered up than the beatings and robberies, but the news is leaking out -- in Seattle, at least.

It was very similar to what happened in New York's Central Park last year, when a gang of Blacks and Puerto Ricans grabbed White women who were walking in the park, ripped their clothes off, squeezed their breasts, pushed fingers into their vaginas, and otherwise abused and humiliated them. Just as in New York, in Seattle it was very definitely racial, often with both Black males and Black females collaborating in the sexual abuse of White women, and it was very definitely hostile: the same Black gangs who were sexually abusing White women were viciously beating White women and White men. When it happened in Central Park the news got out; primarily, I think, because a couple of very loud Jewish feminists were among those abused. In Seattle it's been covered up. But now it is coming out, after a fashion. I'll read just one line from a March 12 article in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* about just one woman who was being held down and abused on Fat Tuesday while a news reporter filmed the scene: "At one point there are 19 hands -- black, Asian, Hispanic -- on her body."

Now I want to talk with you more about something I touched on at the beginning of last week's broadcast, and that's the behavior of the White people in Seattle's Mardi Gras crowd both before and during the riot. I should begin by saying that it wasn't the way the local media and the Seattle police claimed it was, with hooligans of both races fighting it out. Whites did not attack Blacks. It was entirely Blacks attacking Whites. I have had a chance now to study videotape footage of the riot, and the one-sided nature of the racial attacks is quite clear.

What also is quite clear, however, is that many Whites in the crowd were acting like Blacks, and virtually all of the Whites were acting like lemmings. First, the Whites acting like Blacks: "wiggers" they are generally called, for an obvious reason. There were many young White men in the crowd wearing the backward baseball caps and baggy shorts that are the trademark uniform of the wigger. Pathetic souls that they are, they have been robbed of any natural sense of racial identity and racial community by this utterly sick and depraved society in which we live. And I mean deliberately robbed, with malice aforethought.

The Jewish media -- and the public schools -- have played especially reprehensible roles in this destructive, genocidal work. Everything that in healthier times helped give our young people a sense of collective racial identity and racial pride has been repudiated in the schools. The teaching of history and literature has become a joke. The Jews and the feminists and the egalitarians have ripped the guts out of everything in the schools that used to have White racial content. The multiculturalist ideologues think this is wonderful because it prepares our children to be world citizens in the New World Order of multiculturalism and diversity. For the multiculturalists it's a religion. But the conservative Republicans who have made an ideology out of individualism think it's fine too: at least, it's not collectivism; it's not racism.

But having a sense of collective identity, a sense of who we are and what group we belong to is what's natural. We evolved with a need for this sense of collective identity. That's the way we survived in the past. And so when the schools and the media rob the more lemming-like kids of their sense of identity, they look for a replacement. And the schools -- and especially the Jewish media -- have a ready-made replacement for them. They find it on Sumner Redstone's MTV. They find it in Black History Month, where they are told that everyone of worth, from the ancient Egyptian pharaohs to the inventors of the helicopter and television, were Blacks. They find it in the glorification by the media of Black basketball players and other Black sports figures. They find it in the almost inescapable presence of Black music promoted by the media. And they are made to understand that if they wear a Confederate flag patch on their shirts they'll be expelled from school. But it's OK to wear a Malcolm X T-shirt to commemorate a Black hero who wrote about how much he wanted to kill Whites. And so we have wiggers imitating Blacks in clothing styles, in speech patterns, in musical taste, and in behavior. That's why when we look at the video footage of Seattle's Fat Tuesday riot we can see young White men acting like Blacks, smashing windows, vandalizing cars, sometimes fighting with normal Whites, pawing girls, and behaving in a generally animalistic way.

Then there are the rest of the Whites, the approximately normal Whites. Two things are notable about them. First, they weren't expecting the Blacks to misbehave; they were completely surprised when the Blacks began attacking them. And second, they didn't fight back. With the notable exception of 20-year-old Kris Kime, who was murdered by the Blacks for behaving the way a White man should behave, they didn't even try to protect their own women. They just stood around and gaped at what was happening. To me these two things are far more disturbing than what the Blacks did.

So why were the more-or-less normal Whites surprised when the Blacks began behaving like Blacks? Why weren't they expecting that? Haven't we had enough experience with Black behavior in America yet?

And, of course, the answer to that is that the normal Whites are just as much lemmings as the wiggers. The wiggers just show it in a more degenerate fashion. The wiggers are usually the lower-IQ lemmings -- the lower-class, more impressionable lemmings. But the normal lemmings, most of them less than 30 years old, have been conditioned all their lives, just like the wiggers, by the Jewish media, by the schools, by the government, and by the Christian churches to believe that Blacks are the same as Whites, except a little darker. Really, most young Americans believe that, and they're surprised every time reality conflicts with their belief. Every day I receive letters from distressed young lemmings who have heard one of my broadcasts or visited my Web site. They whine at me, "Why can't you see that we're all the same? Don't you understand that the only difference between us and Blacks is skin color? Don't you know that the only race is the human race? The scientists have proved it!"

And really, they all sound pretty much alike. They have had these lies drilled into their heads, and they parrot them back at me. And some of these lemmings are reasonably bright, educated people. They really believe that scientists have proved that there is no difference between Blacks and Whites. And, I am sorry to say, some scientists have contributed to this false belief, either because they are lemmings themselves and want to show that they are Politically Correct, or because they hope to improve their chances of getting another government research grant. Some of the scientists associated with the human genome project, for example, have been quoted by the media as saying that the mapping of the human genome supports the notion that racial differences are insignificant. There is only a fraction of a percent difference between the genomes for Whites and for Blacks they say. The genomes for the various races are far more similar than they are different.

What they don't say, of course, is that there is only a fraction of a per cent difference between the genome for White people and that for chimpanzees. In fact, there is only a very small percentage difference among the genomes for all the species of mammals. Most of the mammalian genome, whether it is for a White person or a rat or a Negro or a dog, contains instructions for how to synthesize hair and skin and nails and bone and milk and teeth and nerve tissue and so on. Nearly all of the mammalian genome is taken up with these instructions that are pretty much the same for all mammals. Only a tiny fraction of the mammalian genome is different for each species. But that tiny fraction of the mammalian genome that specifies whether the hair and skin and bone and other tissues will become a White person or a rat or a Negro or a dog is important. The differences, small though they may seem compared to the similarities, are significant. Except to lemmings, of course, who really don't get it.

White women baring their breasts in the presence of Black males is an indication of just how lemming- like the normal Whites are. Even back in Christian times, when the Mardi Gras festival was a much more significant thing than it is today, there was a sexual flavor to much of the revelry. But if a woman bared her breasts in a village Mardi Gras festival in those times, 200 or 300 years ago, say, there were only Whites present, only members of her own tribe, her own racial family, and she could reasonably expect that she would not be sexually assaulted. There's an enormous difference between that and exposing herself to non-Whites. But lemmings have been conditioned not to understand that. And so they really were surprised when the Blacks in the crowd began behaving like Blacks.

It is not only the lie that we are all the same, that there are no significant differences between us and Blacks, that made the Whites in Seattle such easy victims for the Blacks. It also is the abominable doctrine of the ideological individualists that it is immoral to judge people collectively, the racially destructive doctrine that it is immoral to deal with rioting Blacks collectively. The individualists have preached that we should look only at individuals committing crimes against other individuals, and we should shut our eyes to the fact of Blacks committing crimes collectively against Whites. The individualists have preached that for Whites even to notice what Blacks collectively are doing to Whites collectively, whether in a Mardi Gras festival or in our public schools or anywhere else is wicked; it is racist. It is wicked to notice what the collective Black presence in our society is doing to our society, to our civilization. We must judge each Black individually; we must not organize a White posse and begin cracking Black skulls when we see Backs collectively rampaging against our fellow Whites, the way they did in Seattle.

These liberal doctrines are poisonous, racially destructive doctrines, both the doctrine of equality and the doctrine of individualism. Of course, there's more to it: there is the general softness, the generally feminized condition, of young White males these days. And there was the presence of the wiggers in the crowd, blurring the distinction between Whites and Blacks. Altogether, as a race we are in pretty sorry shape. It's really dangerous, and we need to do something about it. Get in touch with me, and I'll tell you what you and I together can do.

Countering the Poison

Today let's talk more about a very disturbing phenomenon that we've discussed several times in the past few weeks, namely a conditioned inability of White people -- or at least, a substantial percentage of White people -- to defend themselves against non-Whites. When I first told you about the rapes and murders of those Whites in Wichita, Kansas, by two Blacks -- rapes and murders the news of which was blacked out almost completely by the media outside of Wichita -- I commented that the most shocking thing about this atrocity was the total lack of resistance by the White victims, their complete failure even to attempt to defend themselves against two Blacks armed only with one relatively anemic pistol. The White men just stood and watched the Blacks rape and abuse their women, and then they all knelt obediently in the snow when the Blacks told them to and let themselves be shot in the back of the head, one at a time.

For the past two weeks we've been talking about the Mardi Gras race riot in Seattle, where small groups of Blacks viciously attacked individual White men and women in an overwhelmingly White crowd. While the Blacks punched young White women to the ground and then kicked them senseless, and while they ripped the clothes off other White women and pawed and probed them, nearby White men just stared without attempting to intervene.

Now I want to read to you a letter that I received this week from a listener of my American Dissident Voices broadcast. He relates an experience that he had in New Jersey:

A Black mugger, in broad daylight, attempted to rob a young, White businessman at knife point as the latter was making a withdrawal from an automatic teller machine. Rather than submit quietly, as so many of our young, European males do these days, the strapping young White man, a six-foot, five-inch giant named Paul, unleashed a devastating knockout punch to the mugger's face. The Black mugger, a muscular six feet, three inches or so himself, fell to the pavement like a ton of bricks.

The White hero, however, received a nasty knife gash in his forearm as he was throwing his punch. He was bleeding profusely all over his white shirt and his suit. Nevertheless, Paul calmly took out his cell phone and called 911 to report the attempted robbery and his own wound.

As Paul was waiting for help to arrive, the Black thug began to regain consciousness and slowly raised his head off the sidewalk. Big Paul then stomped on the mugger's head to make sure he stayed down and out. Upon seeing this, a White female, one of the group of eight to ten witnesses who had gathered, shrieked in horror and scolded our White hero for stomping on the Black criminal's head! A wimpish White male yuppie then leaned anxiously over the downed Black to see whether or not he was still breathing!

I was utterly dumbfounded. Here was a White victim-turned-hero, covered in blood, and yet some of the Whites who witnessed this event were more concerned about whether or not the poor, knife-wielding Black animal had suffered a serious concussion. I and some others attended to the bleeding Paul, but it was a bizarre scene. Paul's cut was nasty but not life-threatening. I

assume that the knife-wielding Black got off with a slap on the wrist in court that was far less painful than Paul's gash.

The inexplicable behavior of some of the White witnesses left a lasting impression on me. It wasn't until I read some of your material that I fully understood the true source of the disgustingly wimpish behavior I witnessed that day. If more White Americans were made of the same stuff as Paul, Western civilization would be back on the right track in 30 days, don't you think?"

Well, yes, if more White Americans reacted to non-White aggression the way Paul did, we would be in much better shape. And you know, White Americans, even those who weren't six feet, five inches tall, used to behave the way Paul did. A century ago almost any able-bodied White male would have behaved the way Paul did. And it would have been inconceivable that two White witnesses would have behaved the way the White female and the White male yuppie did in the incident described in the letter I just read to you. Really inconceivable!

So what has happened to us? Have we been softened up by too much Christianity, too much turn-the-other-cheek preaching? Well, I don't think so. At least, I don't think that is the primary cause of our present malady. Certainly Christians are in the forefront of the wimp brigades these days, but the country as a whole is less Christian now than it was a century ago. A higher percentage of our ancestors were convinced Christians than in the general White population today, but not even the worst of the Bible-thumpers among the pioneers who settled this country had let themselves be emasculated by their religion. Though they may have carried a Bible in one hand as they headed west and claimed the land for themselves and their posterity, they carried a rifle in the other hand. They were self-respecting Christians.

Has it been too much easy living, too much luxury and comfort, that has made cowards of most of us and has turned some of us into partisans of our enemies? Well, I think that's a part of the answer, but certainly not the whole answer. More than once, when speaking with people who already agree -- in theory -- with me on the racial issue and on the Jewish issue I have had the experience of seeing them recoil in horror when I talk about what ultimately needs to be done to clean up our society. When I talk about cleaning out the stables -- when I talk about an inevitable civil war -- they are horrified. I realize, of course, that we are in no position at this time to punish traitors and clean up our government. But even to contemplate a final solution for getting rid of the filth in the government and in the media horrifies my listeners. They will only consider solutions that don't involve violence or bloodshed: only nice, peaceful, non-violent solutions that don't hurt anyone's feelings. When I talk about the eventual need for ethnic cleansing on a massive scale to undo the damage done by non-White immigration and miscegenation during the past century, again they are horrified. "Oh, we can't do that," they say: "That's genocide!"

And I do think that this excessive squeamishness, which comes from living a soft and sheltered life, is to some degree responsible for paralyzing the will of our people. Maybe there's some Christianity mixed in there too, which makes so many of our people unwilling to do what must be done to protect our race, our society, our civilization. But whether it's Christianity or softness, the unwillingness to take effective action when needed is very real. In the Seattle Mardi Gras riot, for example, the Whites in the crowd certainly weren't going to stop the Blacks from

rampaging by appealing to the Blacks' commitment to a multicultural society. They weren't going to stop them by laying a hand gently on their shoulders and saying to them, "No, brother, no. You mustn't abuse people this way."

The only way to stop those Blacks would have been for a group of White men -- and it would have needed only four or five sturdy White men -- to arm themselves with baseball bats, fence posts, tire irons, pocket knives, or whatever other emergency weapons were at hand, and then to attack one gang of rampaging Blacks at a time and take them out -- disable them -- not by reasoning with them or by threatening them but by the decisive use of violence. That, of course, would have meant cracking Black skulls and drawing blood -- and risking injury to themselves. And most White men aren't up to that these days. They really haven't been raised right.

It is the sheerest foolishness to imagine that America is a powerful nation because a 100-pound girl in a U.S. Army uniform can push a button in some command center and launch a missile that will destroy a city somewhere on the other side of the world. Americans have lost their manhood -- or they are well on the way to losing it -- and that is why we will not be able to defend ourselves from our internal enemies, who are the real threat to our existence.

It is essential, of course, for us to have missiles capable of taking out Peking or Tel Aviv. It is essential for us to have a high-tech military capability so that we can kill thousands or even millions of enemies for each one of our own casualties. That's necessary because we foolishly have helped the non-White races of the planet reduce their death rates, industrialize themselves, and multiply until they greatly outnumber us, and we have helped the Jews develop Israel into a deadly arsenal of nuclear, chemical, and biological terror weapons. We need a high-tech military force to deal with this external threat. But what will destroy America is the enemy within, and against that enemy nuclear-tipped missiles and our other long-range weapons are useless. The enemy that will destroy us consists of the growing hordes of non-Whites already inside our borders and the White traitors in Washington and in every statehouse and every city hall and every newspaper office and every courthouse in the country who invited those hordes in and who now pamper and indulge them. That is the enemy that will destroy us, and to fight that enemy manhood is necessary.

Well, there's one more reason why White Americans stand around with their hands in their pockets, gaping helplessly while gangs of Blacks attack other White men and sexually abuse White women. It's the reason, I am sure, why that White woman in New Jersey was much more concerned about the welfare of the Black robber on the pavement than the welfare of the White man he had attacked with a knife. And, although I can't be sure, I strongly suspect it's also the most important reason why those White men in Wichita allowed the two Blacks to rape and abuse their women and then let themselves be killed without putting up a fight.

This most important reason for our inability or unwillingness to defend ourselves, our women, our nation, our civilization from the enemy within is that we have been psychologically conditioned all our lives -- deliberately conditioned -- not to defend ourselves against this enemy in our midst. What is the worst thing you can call a lemming, the thing that will make the average lemming turn pale with fright as he vehemently denies your charge? What label is

guaranteed to make any politician or bureaucrat or Army officer or chief of police grovel and apologize and run for cover? That is the label of "racist," of course.

It's a label that was virtually never used 50 years ago, in the days when American society was supposedly racist through and through. Even 30 years ago White Americans could talk about race in an open and honest way, without fear. Even university professors, who these days are not noted for either courage or intellectual honesty, could talk about racial matters 30 years ago. I was a university professor, and I discussed with my colleagues the inevitable decline in academic standards which would accompany the government's efforts to force universities to accept unqualified Black students and unqualified Black faculty members. In those days, even though some professors were flaming liberals, we could at least discuss racial matters. But within the past 30 years the iron curtain of Political Correctness has descended, not just on our university campuses, but on our whole society.

How did it happen? It happened because we were deliberately brainwashed, deliberately conditioned psychologically by clever propagandists. Television was the principal propaganda medium -- and still is. The most popular television shows, which nearly every American viewed -- shows such as *All in the Family* and *M*A*S*H* -- were clever propaganda, designed deliberately to make "racism" a feared label and to put a whole range of other ideas and attitudes beyond the pale of acceptability, while at the same time making acceptable certain types of behavior which previously were abhorrent to most Americans.

All in the Family's Archie Bunker was used to make White Americans with traditional ideas about race and sexuality seem ridiculous, to seem ignorant and small-minded. *M*A*S*H*, starring the leftist actor Alan Alda, was used to make Whites with traditional attitudes seem like vicious bigots, despised by all decent people. Tens of millions of White Americans watched these programs on black-and-white television screens week after week. I was one of those White Americans. The programs were genuinely funny, genuinely entertaining. And they were genuinely poisonous to the easily manipulated lemmings who made up the vast majority of the viewers.

And I hardly need to tell you that this brainwashing effort aimed against the White American majority was designed and implemented almost entirely by the tiny Jewish minority in our midst, who by the 1960s had gained virtually total control of the mass media of news and entertainment. They staffed the media at every level and pumped their poison into virtually every living room in America. *All in the Family* was the creation of Norman Lear. *M*A*S*H* was the creation first, as a Hollywood film, of Robert Altman and later, as a TV series, of Larry Gelbart. Lear, Altman, and Gelbart were all Jews, and so was virtually every other propagandist working behind the scenes of the media. Behind every media campaign of lies and deceit, behind every piece of poisonous propaganda, behind every piece of subversive filth being poured into American living rooms and American schoolrooms was a gaggle of scheming, hate-filled Jews bent on destroying our civilization and our race.

Well, *All in the Family* and *M*A*S*H* were just two examples of the media brainwashing blitz that shifted into high gear in the 1960s and is still accelerating. There were dozens of other TV series, some subtle and some not so subtle; there was the slanted network television news; there

were Hollywood films and radio programs and popular magazines. And there were other propaganda themes besides racial equality and the promotion of homosexuality. There was the "Holocaust," all about how the poor, persecuted Jews had suffered so terribly at the hands of the Germans -- through no fault of their own, of course -- and were deserving of all sorts of compensation and special consideration and exemption from blame.

There was the drive to "equalize" men and women in military service, in the workplace, and in every other way. This drive to equalize the sexes was not carried on just through political lobbying and demonstrations. Television entertainment played a major role by masculinizing the portrayal of women and feminizing the portrayal of men and by portraying as a bigot and a hater, as an object of contempt and ridicule, anyone who didn't want to go along.

There was the drive for so-called "children's rights," the drive for unlimited permissiveness and against parental "repression" of children -- and in fact, against any form of discipline or restraint. This drive was perhaps most visible in the efforts of radical youth-movement Jews such as Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin with their "kill your parents" slogan in the 1960s and 1970s, but it was Jewish television that promoted more subtly and also more effectively the attitudes that parental authority was old-fashioned and out of style and that self-discipline, responsibility, and good work habits were only for dull, narrow-minded people, that the modern attitude was, "if it feels good, do it."

This Jewish propaganda blitz, this brainwashing campaign aimed at demoralizing White America, has been and still is a multi-front campaign. Its most important front may have been the racial front, and its next most important front may have been the sexual front, but every aspect of our society -- every institution -- that may have provided us with a sense of pride or solidarity has been and still is under attack. The aim has been not just to make Blacks equal to or a little better than Whites, to make women equal to or a little more powerful than men, to give children as much authority as parents; the aim has been to equalize, to democratize, to homogenize everything. Anything from the old order -- anything from the White, patriarchal, hierarchical order -- that stands out is to be attacked and pulled down: equalized, democratized, homogenized.

An interesting example of this is the recent drive to undermine the prestige and blur the identity of the Army's elite Rangers, with their distinctive black berets and their extraordinarily martial and masculine esprit de corps. Anything that is elite is hated and disparaged by the partisans of the new world order -- and especially something like the Rangers, long a hotbed of masculine, patriarchal, inegalitarian attitudes. Rather than making a direct, frontal attack on the Rangers, the Army's politicians and bureaucrats decided as a first step to take away the Rangers' distinctive appearance. They decreed that henceforth every member of the Army, including every Black female clerk and every mestizo cook, would wear a black beret, just like those worn by the Rangers. It would be a unifying move, the Army bureaucracy smirked.

The next step undoubtedly would be to require the Rangers to lower their standards and to have a quota for Black females and mestizos. The Rangers have been sharply criticized, along with the Army's Special Forces and the Navy's Seals, for being too White and too male. It's past time for all of these elite groups to be equalized and feminized.

The Rangers, I am pleased to note, did not cave in quietly to the attempt to equalize them with the rest of the Army. They raised hell about it and won a good bit of support from many other people, including some influential people. The Army politicians refused to back down on their decision to give black berets to everybody, but under pressure they grudgingly gave permission, just a few days ago, for the Rangers to switch to tan berets, thus maintaining -- for a while -- their distinctiveness.

Aside from the Rangers, unfortunately, there aren't many segments of our society who have had the pride and self-respect to stand up to the equalizers. Most have gone along quietly. Many have gone along enthusiastically, hoping to curry favor with the equalizers.

So what do we do? How do we go about restoring our manhood? Unfortunately, for America as a whole it's not as simple as it would have been for the Whites in that Mardi Gras crowd in Seattle. It's not just a matter of a few of us grabbing fence posts and splitting Black skulls. The first thing we must do is stop the flow of Jewish lies and Jewish poison and Jewish filth into every American living room and every American classroom. That is an enormous task, an extremely difficult task. We are taking now one small, first step toward the accomplishment of that task by countering the lies and the poison with these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts. Only a small fraction of our people hears these broadcasts now. We need to reach many more of our people before we can take the next step. You can help us reach that next step sooner by telling your friends and neighbors and co-workers about these broadcasts. Please do it!

Diversity Is Our Strength

Three or four years ago the slogan most diligently promoted by the controlled mass media was "diversity is our strength." Posters with this slogan and a broad, multi-hued band of stripes representing skin colors of various races were displayed in classrooms and workplaces all over the country. Clothing advertisements in all of the slick, yuppie magazines pushed the same theme. The idea was that the fewer White people and the more Blacks and Browns and Yellows we have in America, the stronger and more prosperous we'll be.

I had friends who laughed at this propaganda campaign. They couldn't believe that anything so stupid would catch on. I didn't laugh, because I had learned long ago that P.T. Barnum was right on target when he said that no one had ever lost a nickel by underestimating the intelligence of the American public. Actually, it's not that the public is stupid in the sense that they can't learn how to tie their shoes or get across the street safely. It is that the public will believe anything if they believe that others believe it. That's the lemming factor. And this "diversity is our strength" brainwashing campaign was pushed hard. You saw this foolishness wherever you looked. And pretty soon it was clear that the lemmings had begun to believe it. My hate mail began containing indignant questions such as, "Why are you against immigration? Don't you know that diversity is our strength?"

This promotion by the Clinton government and the media of the nutty idea that the more diversity we have the stronger we are didn't really change any policies or trends. I suspect that the aim of the media bosses in launching it was to head off growing restlessness about the refusal of the government to control America's borders. Illegal immigrants were pouring into the country -- and of course, still are -- and the Clinton government was pretending not to notice, but many ordinary citizens were noticing and weren't happy. The media bosses decided to stifle the criticism of the Clinton government's immigration policies by persuading the lemmings that immigration, legal or illegal, is a good thing, as long as the immigrants aren't White, because non-White immigrants add to our "diversity" and thereby make the country stronger.

And the government kept doing just what it had been doing, and the diversity has kept increasing. The consequences are catching up with us, and they aren't good -- but the diversity-mongers are maintaining their pretense that we're becoming stronger and stronger by becoming less and less White. A few days ago I saw a brief report on the CNN news program I watch about the increasing diversity in America's classrooms. More and more of the children in America's schools were born in the Third World, or their parents were, and, oh, isn't it a wonderful thing? Just imagine how much stronger our schools are than they used to be!

Well, yes: we have a lot more metal detectors in the schools than we used to. I guess that's a sign of strength. We've had more school shootings since the beginning of the Clinton era than in the whole prior existence of the United States. The experience of dodging bullets undoubtedly strengthens the students. The pregnancy rate of unwed White female teenagers in the schools is approaching the Black rate. Probably that's a sign of strength too.

One of the nuttiest expositions of the "diversity is our strength" creed that I've heard is the one put forth by Federal Judge Patrick Duggan last December in his ruling on a discrimination suit against the University of Michigan by two White students who were denied admission while less-qualified non-White students were admitted. The judge, in ruling against the White students and in favor of the university's racial quota system, abandoned the old liberal argument that quotas are needed to make up for supposed past injustices to Blacks and other non-Whites. The reason for making the university more "diverse," according to the judge, was not to benefit minorities. It was to benefit the university and its White students. The real goal of our universities is not to educate students in the traditional sense but rather to condition them to become "active participants in our pluralistic, democratic society once they leave."

Judge Duggan believes -- or says he believes -- that racial diversity strengthens the university and the White students in it by rubbing their noses in as much diversity as possible and thus conditioning them for life in the New World Order of democracy and multiculturalism where there will be no White majority in America or anywhere else, if he and his kind are successful. It's worth noting that Judge Duggan, if his name means anything, is not a Jew but an Irishman. Furthermore, he was appointed to the Federal bench not by some far-left Clinton nutcase but by Ronald Reagan. He doesn't have to pretend to believe such destructive foolishness in order to keep his job. And unfortunately, there are lots of other judges and bureaucrats, both Jewish and non-Jewish, who believe or pretend to believe the same thing. At least, that's the party line they're pushing. That is frightening.

"Diversity is our strength." You know what that reminds me of: "War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength." In case you don't recognize them, those were the official slogans of the government of Oceania in George Orwell's novel *1984*.

Let me tell you what kind of "strength" comes from our diversity. Alienation is the primary product of diversity. People who live in a homogeneous society, where the people they work with and interact with every day are similar to them -- that is, look similar, have similar values and attitudes, react in similar ways to events -- people in a homogeneous society tend to bond with the people around them. They tend to feel a sense of community. They tend to feel a sense of security from having people like them around them. They seek the approval of the people with whom they have bonded. They feel a sense of responsibility and protectiveness toward these people. With good leadership and reasonably good human stock, the community is strong.

Take away the homogeneity, and you greatly reduce the likelihood of bonding. Instead of a community you have simply a collection of individuals, and each of those individuals is thinking, at least at a subconscious level, "It's every man for himself." Without homogeneity you no longer have a common set of shared values. Antisocial behavior goes way up: schoolyard shootings and drug usage, for example. Neurotic and psychotic behavior goes way up too. Diversity is a real boon for the psychiatrists. Borderline people, who would adjust reasonably well in a homogeneous community, are much more likely to go over the edge and become neurotic or psychotic as the diversity increases.

Without homogeneity the individuals in the society have a weaker sense of identity, a weaker sense of who they are and of what they belong to. They're much less likely to find positive role

models among the real people around them: among their teachers and neighbors and community leaders. They're much less likely to have constructive goals or to lead purposeful and useful lives.

Our people's instincts remain pretty much the same even as our environment changes and becomes more "diverse." Our young people still seek role models. We still seek to bond with others and to share their values and attitudes. When we no longer can find what we seek among real people around us, many find their role models and their values and attitudes in the artificial world of the media. Which is to say, instead of natural role models, they find artificial role models designed by the men who control our mass media: role models designed by the masters of brainwashing who are deliberately destroying our civilization. That too is frightening.

You want more specifics? Classroom diversity -- the thing I heard CNN bragging about and the thing Judge Duggan thinks is a real bonus for White students -- has made a wasteland out of America's public schools and is rapidly doing the same thing to our universities. I'm a physicist myself, and so when I was a student I spent most of my time in very specialized mathematics and science courses. But for most university students -- certainly, for those taking a general course of study -- the most important courses are history and literature. Those are the subjects which more than any others strengthen a student's sense of identity and his feeling for the civilization he has inherited from his forebears. Those are the subjects that give him a knowledge of and appreciation of the traditions of his people and a sense of responsibility to protect their cultural and racial heritage.

It is for exactly this reason that history and literature are the subjects that have suffered most at the hands of the diversity-mongers. The last thing in the world they want is for White students to develop a strong sense of identity or a sense of community with their own kind. That frightens people such as Judge Duggan as much as his nightmare vision of a multicultural world in which a White minority must adapt to the whims and ways of a non-White majority should frighten any normal, spiritually healthy White person.

So how do the diversity-mongers prevent, say, White children in a sixth-grade classroom from beginning to develop a sense of racial identity and an interest in the history and traditions of their own people? Well, the answer is obvious: give the White kids a big dose of diversity. Put lots of Blacks and Vietnamese and mestizos in the classroom with them. Then, instead of teaching them about things European -- instead of having them read about Greek mythology -- about Zeus and Apollo and Aphrodite -- and about the empire-building exploits of Alexander and Caesar in the ancient world and about the nation-building accomplishments in the New World of Patrick Henry and George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, pump them full of fraudulent Black history: not just during Black History Month, but every month of the year. Teach them about how the heartless, mercenary White plantation owners rounded up millions of happy, carefree Africans, put them in chains, and made them work as slaves in order to enrich their White masters. Teach them how the thieving gringos stole half of the United States from the peace-loving mestizos and the other half from the Native Americans, and about how the Yankee imperialists economically exploited the cultured, altruistic peoples of Asia.

Instead of having them read the stuffy literature of dead, White males, give them a big dose of lesbian resentment against our patriarchal society. Immerse them in Ebonics and the ravings of Black nationalists. Teach them that in music Puffy Combs and Dr. Dre really have it all over Mozart and Beethoven. Make their heads spin. Condition them to become "active participants in our pluralistic, democratic society," as Judge Duggan said. But be sure the metal detectors are working, because not everyone reacts well to the conditioning.

In past broadcasts I have emphasized the Jewish role in this destructive business of diversity-mongering -- and, indeed, one can hardly over-emphasize that role, because the media under Jewish control have been the major driving force behind the "diversity is our strength" propaganda campaign. But we should note that the Jews are not the only ones promoting this destructive wickedness.

It really hurts me to talk about this, but the fact is that a very substantial portion of the White people who should be providing leadership for us now have turned against their own race -- and it's not just the judges and the politicians and the bureaucrats. Much of the rest of the White elite -- the wealthy and the powerful and the influential -- have sided with the Jewish media bosses in the campaign to force diversity on the rest of us. In some cases the reason for this treason is religious or ideological. Although there undoubtedly is a correlation between wealth and intelligence, wealth alone does not guarantee independence of mind, nor does it guarantee principled behavior. Just as there are blue-collar lemmings and white-collar lemmings, there also are some very wealthy lemmings.

Beyond this, I am sorry to say, there still is much class prejudice, socioeconomic prejudice, in America and also in other White countries. Just as there are people who are resentful by nature and hate anyone they perceive as having more than they have, or being more talented or better looking or more successful, so also are there snobs, who really believe that their wealth makes them better and more deserving than those who have less wealth. They really believe that they don't need the rest of their race. They believe that they can continue to be wealthy and privileged on their own strength alone. They do not see themselves as merely a small and temporary part of something larger and more permanent and infinitely more important than themselves. They are completely self-centered. They support the Jews' open-borders policy because it ensures that they will have not only cheaper labor in their factories, but also a steady supply of gardeners for their estates; cooks and cleaning women for their mansions; chauffeurs for their limousines. Their attitude is that the competition from non-Whites will keep the working-class Whites in their place and compel them to work a little harder for a little less pay.

Even the prospect of large-scale miscegenation does not displease them. Blending the non-wealthy Whites with the non-Whites to produce a dull and degenerate, coffee-colored working class increases the distance between the masses and the elite and magnifies their own sense of superiority. In other words, they believe, with Judge Duggan, that conditioning for life in a "multicultural, democratic" world is what's good for the *hoi polloi* -- but of course, not for the elite.

We're all familiar with the phrase "limousine liberal." Unfortunately, it's not just wealthy liberals who believe that the social experiments they're perfectly willing to impose on working-class and

middle-class Whites shouldn't be imposed on them and their rich friends. There are all too many rich conservatives with the same attitude. For them, pushing for more diversity in America means being able to wrap themselves in the cloak of Political Correctness and having a favorable press -- or at least, avoiding the unfavorable press which is an ever-present hazard for rich conservatives who do not support Politically Correct policies. Just like the rich liberals, their attitude is, yes, indeed, force the working-class White kids to go to school with Blacks and mestizos if that's what the Jewish media demand, but **my** kids will go to private schools in Switzerland with personal bodyguards.

I'm sure that wealthy people weren't always inclined toward race treason the way so many today are. In normal times the wealthy were much more connected to the other social classes. The wealthy may have been selfish, they may have been unfair, but they understood that they were part of the race. They understood that their fate was tied to that of the other social classes. They were at least as concerned about the fate of the nation, the fate of the race, as any member of the middle class. They identified with their nation and with their race. But today most of them do not. They are as alienated as everyone else. The attitude of the wealthy, like that of the other classes, has become, "it's every man for himself."

And when I imagine myself in their shoes, I think I can understand that attitude. They look at the absolutely insane behavior of our society, of our government, and of most of our people. It scares the hell out of them, just the way it does any non-lemming, any person still able to think for himself, regardless of his social class. They see the government refusing to enforce its own immigration laws. They see our cities filling up with non-Whites from the Third World, and nobody's doing anything to stop it. The media are telling everyone it's wonderful that we're getting so much more diversity. The government is telling everyone it's wonderful. The Christian preachers are telling everyone it's wonderful. And the lemmings are parroting what they hear: "Isn't it wonderful that we're getting so much more diversity!"

The wealthy man observes this insanity, and he thinks to himself: "Everyone else may be crazy, but I don't have to let this insanity destroy me and my family. I'll just use my wealth to insulate myself from it. Why should I worry what all of these insane people do to themselves, as long as I can escape from it myself? Our civilization is sinking fast, but fortunately I have a lifeboat, and it's every man for himself."

And I must admit that I have come close to thinking that way myself. I took a trip out to Los Angeles not so long ago -- the first time I'd been there since I was a graduate student at Caltech back in the 1950s -- and let me tell you, if you like diversity, Los Angeles is the place for you to be. What a cesspit of diversity! The entire infrastructure out there is non-White: the cab drivers and the bus drivers and the sales clerks and the waiters and the cooks and the road crews and all of the hotel and motel workers. About the only White people I saw were a few men in business suits carrying briefcases. And these few Whites seem to have no clue as to how vulnerable they are. They think everything is normal, the way it ought to be.

Anyway, you see people of otherwise normal intelligence mindlessly parroting such idiotic nonsense as "diversity is our strength" while the ravages of diversity are so apparent all around them, and your first impulse is just to give up. You think to yourself, a race so stupid, so blind,

so easily and willingly manipulated and controlled by the Jews, doesn't deserve to survive. But then you remember, hey, I'm part of that race. I'm not wealthy enough to have my own lifeboat, and most of you aren't either. We aren't able to insulate ourselves with money from the insanity all around us. If the ship sinks, we drown -- or get eaten by the sharks. We don't have the luxury of being able to look down our noses at the foolish behavior of the rest of our people. We are obliged to do something to change that behavior. If we want to save ourselves we must compel many others to save themselves as well, whether they want to or not.

When a man wants to save himself, the first thing he must do is try to understand his situation. When he wants to help others save themselves, the first thing he must do is help them understand their situation. That is what we in the National Alliance are trying to do: we are trying to help all of our people understand their situation. That's a difficult task, but also a necessary task. You can help with that work too. It is your responsibility to help.

As Ye Sow . . .

First, I want to admit to an error I made in last week's broadcast. I attributed to the circus impresario P.T. Barnum the statement that no one ever lost a nickel by underestimating the intelligence of the American public. At least two alert listeners have since pointed out to me that the statement actually was made by the journalist and writer H.L. Mencken. The statement for which P.T. Barnum should be remembered is that a sucker is born every minute.

Last week we talked about the rewards of increasing "diversity" in America. The primary reward is the growth in alienation as young Americans fail to develop a healthy sense of racial identity and fail to find satisfactory role models. Diversity goes up, and homogeneity simultaneously goes down. And as homogeneity disappears, so does the individual's sense of community, of belonging, of identity.

And we also talked about many of the side benefits of diversity: rising suicide rates, a greatly increased incidence of neuroses and psychopathologies, more schoolyard shootings, a growing pregnancy rate among unwed White teenagers, the confusion and loss of values, lowered academic standards, the trashing of the history and literature curricula in our universities, and a number of other consequences of the diversity being visited upon us by the government and the Jewish media.

And America isn't the only nation ruined by the diversity-mongers. If you've been paying attention to the news of what's happening in the Balkans, you will have noticed that the bloodshed and misery begun there by the determination of Madeleine Albright and the Clinton government to ram multiculturalism down the throats of the Serbs is still spreading. The killing going on in Macedonia now is a direct consequence of the Clinton government's bombing of Belgrade in order to force the Serbs to accept the multiculturalization of Serbia's Kosovo province. If you remember, the excuse given by Madeleine Albright and her kosher crew was that the wicked Serbs were mistreating the Albanian minority in Kosovo, who merely wanted to live in multicultural bliss with the Serbs.

Well, of course, the Albanians wanted no such thing. They wanted exactly what the Serbs wanted: namely to have Kosovo all to themselves. So as soon as Madeleine's hired gunmen shifted the balance of power in Kosovo and forced the Serb army out, the Albanians, instead of hugging their Serb neighbors began killing and terrorizing them. The Serbs fled for their lives, and now the Albanians run Kosovo, except for a few all-Serb enclaves. And more recently the Albanians have decided that what worked in Kosovo should work in neighboring Macedonia, where they also have a sizable minority. And so now we have Slavs and Albanians killing each other in Macedonia. What the Clinton government's effort to multiculturalize Kosovo has done, in other words, is cause the bloodshed and violence and unhappiness in the area to increase greatly. Before Madeleine there was a more-or-less peaceful status quo. Serbs occasionally killed Albanians, and Albanians occasionally killed Serbs. Now there is chaos and wholesale bloodshed.

Without outside coercion, people generally choose to live among their own kind. Sometimes they fight against other ethnic or racial groups, but the fighting is minimized by maintaining separation and allowing the various groups to run their own affairs and live according to their own customs. Then a multiculturalist comes along and tells everyone that it is wicked for people to mind their own business, that what they should do instead is mind everyone else's business, and the result is great unhappiness for everyone concerned, except for the multiculturalist, who sees his work as minding other people's business and forcing people to live with people they don't want to live with.

Actually, the multiculturalists began their lethal meddling in the Balkans a long time ago. After the First World War they thought it would be nice to take a bunch of different peoples, Croats and Serbs and Slovenes and Montenegrins and Albanians and Macedonians -- some Muslim, some Catholic, some Eastern Orthodox -- abolish the borders between them, and force them all to live together multiculturally in a new, artificial country called Yugoslavia. The communists held this artificial, multicultural creation together with the threat of bayonets and firing squads, but after the collapse of communism, the various groups which had been forced to live together were at one another's throats, fighting to have their own territories where they could live by themselves again without outside interference.

Actually, there's more to the story. There are two types of multiculturalists. There are the cold-blooded butcher types, like Madeleine Albright and her kosher crew, who have no ideological commitment to multiculturalism, but who use it as a weapon in their ongoing war against the rest of the world. And there are the wet multiculturalists, the ideological multiculturalists, who really believe that no one should be permitted to mind his own business. They really believe that mixing all sorts of different people together and then having the government enforce their togetherness is the right way.

When the bloodshed begins, the Madeleine Albright types laugh up their sleeves, and the wet types tear their hair out and try to figure what went wrong. After the Mardi Gras race riot in Seattle a month ago, the Madeleine Albright types were concentrating on keeping the news suppressed: keeping it from reaching the rest of the country, lest it cause some of the sheep to have second thoughts about the advantages of more "diversity." The wet multiculturalists were wringing their hands in distress and whining, "Oh, why can't we all just learn to get along with each other."

The wets are still trying to figure it out, still making excuses for the Blacks, still trying to explain their behavior in a Politically Correct way, and they are distressed at the reaction they are getting from a substantial portion of the White public. Many Whites are continuing to express outrage in letters to newspapers and on the radio talk shows in Seattle over the failure of the police to protect Whites and to arrest Blacks in the riot from fear of being accused of "racial profiling." They also are complaining about the reluctance of local prosecutors to charge Black rioters with "hate crimes," although many Blacks were shouting, "Let's get a Whitey," as they attacked Whites.

Actually, Seattle provides an amusing illustration of multiculturalism at work. The city is filled with very wet soccer moms and White yuppies, all claiming allegiance to multicultural ideals.

Now they're trying to find excuses for why it didn't work. For wet multiculturalists to be happy in the long run, they need to practice their multiculturalism at a distance: they need to get the government to impose it on other people. When it comes home to roost in their own backyards, they have problems dealing with it.

Well, there also are other chickens coming home to roost. Ever since the Second World War the United States has been a hardworking attack dog and collection agency for the world's Jews. The whole world had treated the poor, innocent, inoffensive Jews so terribly, that the U.S. government would force the rest of the world to pay reparations to the Jews for mistreating them. First it was the Germans who were forced by the U.S. occupation army to cough up tens of billions of dollars for the Jews. Then it was the Swiss, who were threatened by the U.S. Congress with boycotts if they didn't pay the Jews. And so it went. The French had taken some of their property, and the Jews wanted it back. The Swedes had traded with Germany during the war, and had been paid by the Germans with Jewish gold, and the Jews wanted it back.

I predicted a couple of years ago that eventually the Jews would get around to us. Most people thought me wrong when I made that prediction. After all, it was the United States Army that pulled the Jews' chestnuts out of the fire in Europe during the Second World War. If the United States had remained neutral and had made plain its intention to remain neutral, there need never have been a war in Western Europe. Germany need never have fought France and Britain and the United States. Germany would have smashed the Soviet Union, destroyed communism, and chased the Jews out of central and Eastern Europe forever. But the United States, under Franklin Roosevelt, secretly pledged its support to Britain if Britain would fight Germany until America could find an excuse to get into the war. It was American bombs that destroyed German cities and killed millions of German civilians. It was American intervention that permitted communism to survive and that also permitted hordes of communist rapists and murderers from the East to swarm over a defeated Germany. It was America that wreaked a Jewish vengeance on Germany and the German people for daring to raise their hands against the Jews. And after the war it was America that gave billions of dollars of aid to the fledgling state of Israel and made it possible for the Jews of Israel to prevail over their neighbors and seize Arab land.

So how could the Jews possibly have the gall to demand reparations from America, which always has been their biggest benefactor? What possible basis could they have for demanding reparations from us? People thought me silly for making such a prediction. Well, those chickens started coming home to roost last year, when the Jews filed claims against Ford and IBM and other American companies which had had subsidiaries in Germany before the Second World War. Because the German government had forced Jews to work in German defense industries during the war -- and those industries included some of the German subsidiaries of American companies, the Jews claimed back wages from the American parent companies. But that was just the preliminary skirmish. Now a whole flock of chickens has arrived.

In a lawsuit filed a few weeks ago in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Jewish groups representing so-called "Holocaust survivors" are demanding $40 billion dollars. The U.S. government, the Jews claim, failed to bomb and destroy the rail lines leading to Auschwitz, the big labor camp in Poland where the Germans produced synthetic rubber and other war materials using Jewish workers and where, the Jews claim, four million of them died in gas chambers.

According to the Jewish complaint, if the Americans had bombed the rail lines to Auschwitz, then the Germans wouldn't have been able to send all of those Jews to Auschwitz to be gassed, and they presumably would have survived the war. The Americans didn't bomb the rail lines to Auschwitz because there were many anti-Semites leading the American war effort, and they didn't want to do anything to save the Jews.

To me it sounds like a lame-brained argument: They say that if the Americans had bombed the rail lines to Auschwitz then the Germans, being a pretty dull and unimaginative bunch, wouldn't have been able to figure out what to do with the Jews they intended to send there to be gassed. But the Americans didn't bomb the rail lines because they didn't really want to save the Jews. That's the argument being made, and the Jews want $40 billion from the U.S. government. The specific charge being made by the Jews against the Americans is "complicity in genocide."

It sounds preposterous, but I think it'll work. Can you imagine anyone in the media laughing at the Jews' claim that the Americans should pay them $40 billion for "complicity in genocide"? I think the media will take it all very seriously. Can you imagine any American politician speaking out against the Jews' claim? I think they will fall all over themselves to support it as the case begins to generate more headlines in the months ahead.

I think that the Jews will get their money, and it will come from our pockets, and it will serve us right. And then the feeding frenzy will begin. And why not? The rule is, never give a sucker an even break, and we certainly are the world's champion suckers.

I don't mean to imply that in this latest claim the Jews are simply holding out their hands and saying, "Giff us your money!" There will be all sorts of the standard legalistic hocus-pocus generated with smoke and mirrors in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in the coming weeks and months. They will spend months presenting a huge amount of evidence and testimony to prove that we really are guilty of "complicity in genocide" and that we really do owe them $40 billion. That's easy enough to do, of course, when you have your opponents so terrified of being labeled "anti-Semites" that they won't put up a defense.

For example, one batch of evidence the Jews will present in court is that in 1943 and 1944 430,000 Jews were deported from Hungary to Auschwitz, and all that would have been required to prevent these deportations would have been the bombing of the rail bridges from Hungary to Poland. The Americans had air superiority and easily could have bombed the bridges if they had wanted to, but they didn't. The Americans, therefore, are guilty of "complicity in genocide" for the claimed gassing of those 430,000 Jews from Hungary. Furthermore, the Jews claim, those 430,000 Jews had $2 billion worth of valuables with them when they were deported: gold jewelry, coins, precious stones, and so on. After the war that $2 billion in valuables was looted by American troops. The Jews want it back -- from us. I think that it's poetic justice for the Jews to gouge that money out of a bunch of cowardly hypocrites like us who are afraid to stand up to them and have been their bullyboys against the rest of the world for so long.

And there are other chickens coming home to roost soon. For more than 50 years we have helped the Jews plunder and murder the other peoples of the Middle East: not just the Palestinians, but the Egyptians and the Iraqis and the Lebanese and the Syrians and the Jordanians and the rest.

And they've all just taken it. We kick them in the teeth at the behest of the Jews, and they don't kick back. We've assumed that they will keep on taking it forever without kicking back. A big part of the reason they've let us kick them in the teeth for so long is corrupt leadership. We've been paying off several of the governments over there to let the Jews do whatever they want to do. The Egyptian government of Hosni Mubarak even has passed laws prohibiting Egyptians from writing or saying anything critical of the Jews. That hopped-up little excuse for a king the Jordanians used to have until recently was afraid he would lose his status as an international jet-setter and playboy if he got out of line. The Saudis and many of the other oil sheikhs of the Persian Gulf are making too much money selling their oil to the Americans to give us any trouble. Just last month the government of Lebanon banned an international conference of historical scholars scheduled for Beirut, because in their writings some of those scholars have deviated from the Politically Correct line laid down by the Jews on who was to blame for the Second World War and what happened during that war. The Jews asked the Lebanese government to ban the conference, and that's what the Lebanese government did,

But all of that is beginning to change. A new generation of young militant artists and intellectuals is opting out of the corrupt and shameful subservience that has been the rule for Arabs in the Middle East for so long. These young militants are capable of much more than simply strapping explosives around themselves under a coat and then walking into a crowd of Israelis and blowing themselves up. They are writing poetry and music and novels and essays and editorials and film scripts that their corrupt political leaders have declared illegal, but that nevertheless are circulating in hundreds of thousands of copies among their people. Young militant film directors are making films that their governments have banned but that nevertheless are being seen on videos that go from hand to hand. Illegal songs that denounce Israel, the Jews, and the United States are being sold openly on CDs in Cairo and sung defiantly in public by young people. At the top of the charts now is the song "I Hate Israel." It was inspired by televised scenes of the Jews shooting a 12-year-old Palestinian boy to death in the arms of his father last September.

Songs and films may not seem like much against U.S. aircraft carriers and Israeli terror weapons, but this rapidly growing militancy among young Arab intellectuals and artists is very significant. In the past the suicide bombers have been mostly young religious fanatics, poor and uneducated, and they weren't much better at building an effective bomb than the average Ku Kluxer in this country. The new generation of bomb-makers will be brighter, better educated, wealthier, and better connected. Some of them, like Osama bin Laden of the older generation, also may be religious, but the important thing is that the affluent sons and daughters of the corrupt Arab leadership are finding it fashionable now to be nationally conscious, to support the oppressed Palestinians and Iraqis, and to take action against the newly perceived enemies of their people.

I have no specific knowledge of what those actions will be, of course, but I suspect that they will be more sophisticated and more carefully planned and executed than the suicide bombings of the past -- or even the World Trade Center bombing in New York in 1993. If we see unexpected outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease at 50 different locations at the same time in the United States, with the consequent devastation of our entire livestock industry, we'll know that some of our chickens have come home to roost. George Bush and the other corrupt flunkies of the Jews in America can rattle their aircraft carriers and rage about "cowardly acts of terrorism," and the

corrupt leaders of the Arab world can imprison or shoot their own sons and daughters in an effort to hang onto their wealth and power, but the chickens will keep coming. That is a promise.

It's foolish even to think about trying to keep the chickens away at this late date. Historical events usually are connected. One follows from another. The course of history can be changed, if one looks ahead far enough, but it's like changing the course of a moving locomotive. We won't accomplish much by pushing on the side of the locomotive as it's going past, but if we get far enough ahead and move the tracks in front of the locomotive, we can change the direction in which it will go.

We ceased being vigilant a long time ago. We became shortsighted. We allowed weak men and corrupt men to lead us for too long. We allowed the Jews into our society. We will pay the price for that, and it will be a terrible price. But perhaps even now we can plan ahead and do something about moving the tracks in front of the locomotive.

Shocking Differences

During the past couple of weeks we've spoken a bit about the "diversity" being pushed so vigorously by the government and by the Jewish media, and I apparently made some irreverent remarks on this very sensitive topic which greatly offended some of our more Politically Correct listeners, because I've received a number of letters from listeners who were practically in tears.

The general tenor of these letters is: "Why can't we all just learn to get along with each other? We're really all the same. The only difference between us is skin color; why is that so important to you? Why do you hate people just because they're from a different country? By coming here with their different customs they enrich our lives." *Et cetera.* Some of the letters were more on the weepy, hand-wringing side, and some were more on the belligerent, hateful side, but they were all written by folks who are distressed that I want to stop the flow of non-White immigrants into America, boot out the ones who're already here, and then hunt down and hang the people who arranged to bring them here.

Some folks just can't understand why I want to do that. I must have spoken with a dozen interviewers for the mass media who asked me: "What's wrong with multiculturalism? Why do you think it's bad?" That's exactly what I was asked by a pretty, young woman reporter for a German television news program last week. And I believe that she was sincere. She really didn't understand. That's the lemming factor. The girl wasn't stupid. It's just that her brain is wired in such a way that she is incapable of absorbing any information or reaching any conclusion that is Politically Incorrect.

If multiculturalism and diversity were not promoted by the controlled mass media -- if wanting to have a clean, White America were still Politically Correct, the way it was here, say, 50 years ago, and also the way it was in her country until 1945 -- then she would be able to understand perfectly well why multiculturalism is socially, culturally, and racially destructive. She would agree completely with me. But because it is unfashionable to understand such things now, she can't. And I don't mean that she doesn't want to understand; I mean that she can't understand. That is the way lemmings function.

I've often thought about how we might rearrange the wiring in a lemming's brain and permit him or her to understand what is blocked out by the overwhelming compulsion to conform, to be fashionable. I've spoken in the past, only half jokingly, about the oak-table-leg method of persuasion: about putting a lemming on a diet of 500 calories a day and beating him half to death with an oak table leg about once a day until he gets his thinking straightened out. That's the method the communists used in their so-called "labor reeducation" camps, and it seems to have worked pretty well. It's also the method the Allies used on the German population after the Second World War to make them realize the error of their ways in supporting Hitler. Eventually they had most of the Germans blaming Hitler for their suffering instead of the people who were raping, beating, looting, and starving them.

Well, of course, I can't use trauma and privation as an educational method, but perhaps it is nevertheless possible to shock a lemming to his senses. I don't know, but it is something you

might like to try for yourself. So with that in mind let's talk for a moment about the Chinese. The Chinese are a people with whom we are rapidly becoming more and more closely involved, both through trade and through immigration. And the properly conditioned lemming will tell you that there's absolutely nothing wrong with that. The Chinese, after all, are exactly like us, except that they speak a different language, are a little darker, and have slanted eyes. They add wonderfully to our "diversity" here. They enrich our culture by their presence.

Well, actually they're not quite like us. They have different customs, and those different customs come from a different way of looking at the world, a different attitude toward life, and that different attitude evolved over the course of thousands of generations of living in a different environment from the environment in which our ancestors lived. For example, the Chinese eat babies and see nothing wrong in it. And what they do to cats and dogs they get their hands on is too horrible, too sickening, for me to describe here. What they do to cats and dogs is much worse than just eating them. But to get back to babies: I had heard reports from time to time about the Chinese custom of eating babies in the belief that it is an especially healthy thing to do. For a modern nuclear superpower, the Chinese have some strange ideas about health. These ideas have nearly wiped out a number of species of wild animals because of the insatiable Chinese demand for their body parts. Ground rhinoceros horn is in such demand that it has seriously threatened the rhinoceros with extinction. The same sort of demand exists for tiger penises and various bear parts.

Human babies are harder to get for eating, and I imagine that there are laws in China about killing babies for that purpose. But there seems to be no law against eating aborted human fetuses. A number of hospitals in China that perform abortions sell the aborted fetuses for eating. The smaller fetuses are cooked in a soup. The late-term fetuses are eaten more like roast suckling pig. The Chinese government understandably is a little bashful about having Western journalists publicize this sort of thing, just as it is bashful about having Western journalists film what the Chinese do to cats and dogs. Not to worry, though: Western journalists understand that it would be the worst kind of "no, no" to publish such information in the West; it might dampen the public's enthusiasm for more togetherness with the Chinese.

Despite the effort on both sides to keep these peculiar customs of the Chinese from becoming better known in the West, information is available to the diligent seeker. I recently acquired photographs taken in a restaurant in China of a Chinese man eating what is quite plainly recognizable as a late-term human fetus. The photographs are shocking and disgusting to me, and I imagine that they also will be shocking and disgusting to the average American lemming. They won't be shocking to Chinese, of course. Eating fetuses is no stranger to them than, say, the habit of eating snails in garlic sauce is to a Frenchman.

The significance I see in the Chinese habit of eating fetuses, even if only the wealthier Chinese can afford them, is more than simply a difference between us and the Chinese in culinary tastes or in ideas of what's healthy. A society that sees nothing wrong in eating babies, a race that finds this habit acceptable, is profoundly different from ours. The difference is far deeper than language or skin color or facial features.

Now, I don't hate the Chinese because they aren't White. I don't hate them for being different. I don't even hate them because they see nothing wrong in eating aborted babies. That's their business. I do have stronger feelings about what they do to cats and dogs, and if I had the power to do so I would depopulate China in order to put a stop to that. But if they want to eat Chinese fetuses, I don't care -- so long as they do it in China, not here. But they will be doing it here if we permit the criminal insanity of multiculturalism to continue. And it won't be just Chinese who'll be doing it. Think how much the customs and the morals of White Americans already have changed under the influence of the multiculturalism we already have here.

I'm not telling you that if more Chinese come to America we'll all be eating babies. I believe that most of us, even our lemmings, will retain an instinctive block against that sort of thing. But the Chinese nevertheless will change our culture. More important, they will change our attitudes, our morals. If we have a lot of Chinese immigrants in America eating fetuses, you can bet your bottom dollar that any White American who publicly expresses his disgust, his disapproval of this habit, will be denounced by our Jewish media as a "hater," a "bigot," a "racist," and so on. Christian preachers will be issuing a call for more tolerance. Politically ambitious prosecutors and police officials will announce to the media that they are looking into the possibility of filing "hate speech" charges against the White person who made the offensive remarks.

You know that's what would happen because it's what already has been happening with other phases of the campaign to multiculturalize America. The lemmings adjust to it the same way frogs in a kettle over a fire adjust to the gradually increasing temperature of the water. But at this time the idea of eating babies probably still will shock most lemmings, just as taking a frog from a kettle of cold water and dropping him into a kettle of boiling water will shock the frog.

Would you like to try it? Send me a 9-inch by 12-inch, self-addressed envelope with 55 cents postage on it, and I'll send you two photographs, each approximately eight by ten inches in size. One is of a Chinese man in a restaurant in China carrying a plate with a large, late-term human fetus. The other photograph shows him sitting at a table and eating the dismembered fetus. The head of the fetus is still attached to the torso, and the features are clearly distinguishable. They are horrible, shocking, disgusting photographs. I'll send these photographs to you free if you send me your envelope with 55 cents postage on it and promise to show the photographs to other people and get them to listen to an *American Dissident Voices* broadcast with you.

I want to emphasize to you again: I don't hate Chinese because some of them in China eat babies, and the rest of them think that's all right. I don't hate Blacks because of some of the things they do in Africa that I find disgusting. That's their business -- as long as they stay in China or in Africa, as the case may be. I just don't want them here. I don't want to see them. I don't want to hear them. I don't want to smell them. I don't want to hear liberals or Jews making excuses for them. I don't even want to think about them.

Well, the Chinese are not the only exotic ingredient in America's multicultural stew. The Jews are a much more important exotic element because they wield so much more power in American society through their control of our mass media of news and entertainment. And there are people who will tell you, "So what? What difference does it make if the Jews control Hollywood and television? They're just like us, except that they have a different religion." That is what the

lemmings have been taught to believe about the Jews. But in fact, the Jews are as profoundly different from us as the Chinese are, and the difference consists in much more than the Jews' uncanny ability to accumulate money. The Jews, like the Chinese, have a fundamentally different way of looking at the world, and this difference is based in thousands of generations of separate evolution in a different environment.

I'll give you just one example of this difference today. This is something I first noticed when I was a junior high school student in Dallas, Texas. The school I attended was in one of Dallas' wealthier suburbs, and there were a number of Jews in the school. What I and several of my classmates noticed about the Jews was their uniquely Jewish sense of humor. One doesn't expect much delicacy in the jokes told by 14-year-olds, of course, but the thing that made the jokes that appealed especially to the Jews stand out was their scatological content. Nearly every Jewish joke involved excrement in one way or another. As I said, this Jewish tendency was so pronounced that I and my Gentile classmates noticed it and commented on it, even though we didn't understand it. And it wasn't that we had an exceptionally large number of budding Howard Sterns among our Jewish classmates. The inclination toward scatology is a general Jewish characteristic. Jews themselves, including Jewish psychologists, have commented on this Jewish trait often, explaining it in terms of the collective Jewish experience throughout history. It is real, and it is quite noticeable.

The Jews who control America's entertainment media are men who as much as anything else want to make money, and they understand the need to keep their Jewishness from being too obvious in the entertainment they produce for Gentile consumption. At least, they used to understand that, but in the last decade or so they've become a lot cockier, a lot bolder. They believe that they have such a tight grip on the minds and morals of the Gentiles now that they can do and say anything they want on the television screen without danger of a Gentile reaction. They believe that they now can let all of their Jewishness hang out. And I'm not talking just about the Howard Stern types. I'm talking about the ultra-rich and powerful mainstream media moguls, Jews such as Michael Eisner and Gerald Levin and Sumner Redstone. Sumner Redstone's MTV has been described by students of the media as the single most powerful influence on the attitudes and behavior of teenaged White girls.

I don't watch MTV myself, and I suspect that most White parents of teenaged girls, even very liberal and trendy parents, also don't pay attention to what their daughters are being indoctrinated with by Sumner Redstone's MTV. An example of which I recently became aware was brought to my attention by the filing just last week of a lawsuit against MTV in Los Angeles Superior Court. Let me give you the details: three months ago, on January 21, MTV was taping a pilot for a new show called *Dude, This Sucks.* Some teenaged girls were visiting the studio during the taping. A studio employee instructed them to stand on the stage in a certain place for a part of the show in which a pair of performers known as the "Shower Rangers" were to go through their routine. The girls were not told what the performance would be or how they would be involved in it.

The "Shower Rangers" were two men dressed in Boy Scout uniforms. They came on stage, turned their backs to the camera and to the teenaged spectators on the stage, dropped their trousers, bent over, and let fly with a shower of semi-liquid feces, spattering the unsuspecting

girls from head to foot. Apparently they had dosed themselves with a powerful laxative prior to the performance.

To Jews, including billionaire Jewish media moguls like the owner of CBS and MTV, Sumner Redstone, this sort of thing is hilariously funny. It's their idea of humor. Unfortunately for MTV, however, the girls who were sprayed by MTV's "Shower Rangers" weren't amused, nor were their parents. Last week two of the girls sued. One of them told the court:

We were having a good time until the second act of *Dude, This Sucks* went on. All of a sudden I was smelling something disgusting, and I started to gag. I looked around at my friends. They were covered in something. As I looked down at myself I realized that I was too.

Another of the plaintiffs, 14-year-old Kelly Sloat, spoke of the humiliation the girls felt when they returned to school:

Everyone knew about it, even some of the teachers. Most of the kids were cracking jokes or wouldn't come near us because, even though we washed off the feces, they said we smelled. I will never, ever forget what a horrible experience this was.

The girls' lawsuit charges MTV with "infliction of emotional distress, negligence, and battery.

I would charge MTV and Sumner Redstone with much more than that. I would charge Mr. Redstone and his fellow Jews with a deliberate effort to degrade White culture, White standards, White morality. I would charge them with attempting to destroy all traditional ideas in young people's minds of what is right and just and noble and beautiful and replace those traditional ideas and values with a Jewish concoction of filth and degeneracy designed to make our young people accept a Jew-dominated, multicultural pigsty society. And in my book, that's a hanging offense.

And I assure you that when the time for hanging comes, it will not be just this one incident with the "Shower Rangers" which leaves Sumner Redstone and all of his kosher crew dancing on air. This incident is merely an illustration of a general pattern of behavior over a long period of time. I chose this illustration not just because it is current, but because it is a matter of court record. You can verify all the details for yourself. You certainly won't get those details from the other Jewish media.

I also chose this incident because it cannot be written off as an aberration, like some piece of Howard Stern scatology. Sumner Redstone is a mainstream Jew: one of the wealthiest, most powerful, and most influential Jews in the world. He is a leader of the Jews, a Jew to whom nearly all the other Jews look up. No one can call him an aberration. He is the essence of Jewish influence on our society. He is a Jew who is welcomed with open arms at the White House, regardless of whether a Democrat or a Republican is in residence. And he believes that what teenaged White girls need is more exposure to the "Shower Rangers." That will loosen them up, make them more open-minded, and prepare them for sex with Black boys.

And if you've been paying any attention at all to the trends in entertainment for teens, you'll understand that there's nothing exceptional about the "Shower Rangers." They are just one more step in the direction the Jews have been going all along: not just Sumner Redstone, but all of them, from the time they first began taking over control of our entertainment media.

In the 1930s Gentile leaders, most of them Christians, were able to threaten Jews effectively with boycotts if they violated standards of decency. One of the most effective leaders of this effort was Joseph Breen, who helped establish the Production Code for Hollywood in 1934. Breen knew exactly what he was up against. Of Jewish filmmakers Breen wrote in 1932:

These lousy Jews ... are simply a vile bunch of people with no respect for anything but the making of money.... These Jews seem to think of nothing but money-making and sexual indulgence.... [They] are the men and women who decide what the film fare of the nation is to be.

The Production Code constrained the Jews for a couple of decades, but with the advent of television the Jews gained far more influence over public attitudes and behavior than the churches had. The Jews could safely ignore the Code, and in the 1960s they began pushing again in the same direction Sumner Redstone is still pushing with the "Shower Rangers."

So you see, Jews really are different. They're not just like us any more than the Chinese are. And let me tell you something: I and a lot of other White Americans have had just about as much of the Chinese and the Jews and the Blacks and the rest of the multicultural filth here as we will tolerate. We've been pushed about as far as we're willing to let ourselves be pushed. We want our country back, and we intend to take it back, and if a lot of soccer moms and yuppies and Politically Correct journalists who can't understand that get in the way, they're going to be hurt.

Riots and Revolution

Everyone in America knows about Cincinnati. That is, everyone at least has seen the sanitized images of the Cincinnati race riot that have appeared on television screens across the country. In that regard the Cincinnati riot is different from the Seattle race riot of nearly two months ago. News of the Seattle riot was successfully suppressed by the controlled media outside the Seattle area.

In other ways, however, the riots were very similar. Although the controlled media decided not to try to suppress the news from Cincinnati, it is clear that the sympathies of the media bosses were as much with the Blacks in Cincinnati as they were in Seattle. Here's one small example of that: The 19-year-old Black thug whose shooting by a White policeman was the Blacks' excuse for rioting in Cincinnati had a long arrest record. There were 14 more arrest warrants outstanding for him at the time he was shot. The policeman who shot him, in other words, realized that he was dealing with a habitual criminal, and he responded to what he believed was an attempt by the Black to draw a weapon from his waistband by shooting him.

None of this was mentioned on the television news coverage of events in Cincinnati, of course. The Black who was shot was described by the media as "an unarmed Black youth" -- or, in the case of Cincinnati's Channel 9 television news program, as "an unarmed African American teenager." And here's the clincher: Instead of using one of the readily available police mug shots of the Black, the media managed to dig up a photo of him in a formal suit with a big, innocent smile on his face, presumably taken at some high-school dance -- and that is the photograph shown repeatedly to Americans on their television screens: not the police mug shots of a hardened, 19-year-old Black criminal, but a photograph of smiling, well-dressed, teenaged Black innocence. You can be sure that some Jewish news director got a bonus from a Jewish network boss for digging up that photograph.

At the Black's funeral last Saturday the White governor of Ohio and the White mayor of Cincinnati both appeared among the mourners. That's a symbolic thing. You can be certain that they wouldn't have attended the funeral of some White street thug shot by a Black cop. They attended the funeral, alongside Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam people, Kweisi Mfume of the NAACP, and members of the New Black Panther Party, and they looked appropriately contrite and said nice things about the deceased for one reason only: they were frightened to death that the Blacks would continue rioting.

And why were they afraid of that? They could have stopped the riot dead in its tracks any time they wanted. That is, physically they could have stopped the riot. Even though 43 per cent of the population of Cincinnati is Black, the police could have wound up the riot within half an hour, and the Blacks who survived the gunfire would have been trembling behind closed doors, afraid to show their faces. Militarily it would have been a trivial matter.

But both Mayor Charles Luken and Governor Bob Taft understood that politically they were at the mercy of the Black rioters. They knew which side the Jewish media were on. They knew that if they took strong measures against the rioters they would be crucified by the media. So just as

in Seattle the cops, under orders from the politicians, simply let the riot run its course. They arrested 200 or so Blacks they caught looting stores or setting fires when they could do so without danger of any real conflict, but it was more a matter of picking off stragglers than it was any real attempt at riot control. For the most part the police just watched. They watched while Blacks stopped cars with White drivers, pulled the drivers out of their cars, and stomped and beat them mercilessly. They stood by and watched the Blacks beat a White woman "to a pulp." Those words -- "to a pulp" -- aren't mine; they came from the April 12 edition of the *Cincinnati Post.* The rule governing the cops was: don't provoke the Blacks.

Just as in Seattle, most Whites in Cincinnati behaved like sheep waiting to be led to the slaughter. The ones who were pulled from their cars and beaten practically begged for it. A White driver would see a group of Blacks in his path milling around in the middle of the street with stones and bottles in their hands, and instead of stepping on the gas and scattering the Blacks as he plowed through them, he would stop and roll down his window to ask them to move so that he could get through.

Some Whites behaved even worse than that. A few Politically Correct soccer moms and yuppies were eager to demonstrate that their sympathies lay with the Blacks rather than with the police. One White woman carried flowers to the alley where the Black criminal had been shot by the White policeman, and as she was leaving a Black woman in a parked car threatened her: "This ain't no crosswalk. You walk in front of me, and I'm going to run over you." That's from the April 16 issue of the *Cincinnati Post.* A group of White yuppies visiting the shooting scene were confronted by a Black Panther, who told them menacingly: "Whites are walking too freely down this street." An impartial deity looking down on such scenes from above to decide which race should inherit the earth certainly would not choose the Whites.

Perhaps we shouldn't expect better behavior from Cincinnati's Whites in view of the example set for them by their so-called "leaders." While Governor Taft and Mayor Luken were inside a Black church shaking hands with various Black militants at the funeral service for the slain Black, Blacks outside were chanting and carrying signs saying "It's Time to Shoot Back." The only responses from the White politicians were weak, ingratiating smiles.

The Blacks know when they have the upper hand, and Black leaders from around the country flocked to Cincinnati to take advantage of the situation and stir things up a bit. One of them was the Reverend Al Sharpton, who came with his "adviser," Jewish lawyer Sanford Rubenstein.

The local news media, by way of contrast, boasted that they were showing "restraint" in their coverage of the riot. What they meant by that is that they were doctoring their news coverage so as not to make the rioters look too bad. TV camera crews, instead of broadcasting live, were taping what they saw, so that editors back at the studio could snip out scenes that might arouse White viewers. In particular, the scenes that were cut were those showing Blacks beating White motorists, especially White women.

The word got around despite this censorship, however. In fact, the knowledge that the news they were seeing had been censored caused White viewers to be more responsive to wild rumors than they otherwise would have been. The radio talk shows provided a forum for many Whites to vent

their anger. They talked about buying more guns, about forming vigilante groups and shooting rioters since the police wouldn't do it, and so on, but as usual it was just empty talk by Whites made feckless by a soft, protected lifestyle that any real effort to organize them for dealing forcefully with the Blacks would have sent most of them running for cover.

The city's White businessmen behaved in the way we have come to expect from White businessmen. All that matters to them is profits, and riots are bad for profits. They see appeasement as the way to deal with every Black disturbance or disorder. While a White police spokesman was calling publicly for tough police action against the rioters and more support for the police from the politicians, the politicians were meeting behind his back with the local business tycoons to work out a plan for selling out the Whites and buying off the Blacks. In an interview by the *Cincinnati Enquirer* and also by a local radio station, Fraternal Order of Police President Keith Fangman expressed the police disappointment with the pusillanimous behavior of the mayor and the city council, and especially with an anti-racial profiling ordinance the city council had passed just two weeks earlier in response to Black and Jewish demands.

Speaking of the low morale of his fellow policemen, Fangman said:

Quite frankly, many of those on the council have inflamed the situation in the past few months with talk about Cincinnati police officers murdering African American males but not telling people the truth about all the officers that have been shot at by these African American males. We're fed up. The only thing to improve morale is for the council to come forward and admit that the racial profiling ordinance was nothing more than a political stunt. We're in the middle of a riot, and I can guarantee you that we are stopping, detaining, and questioning people in the areas where there is unrest. Two weeks ago the council called that racial profiling. Now that the city is burning, the council doesn't know what to say.... We are not going to negotiate with these terrorists, and that's what they are. These are nothing but terrorists out there on the street. If we give one inch to these terrorists in the form of negotiations, then we've got no one to blame but ourselves when we turn into another Detroit or Washington, DC.

Well, of course, negotiation and appeasement and bribery were exactly what the mayor and the politicians on the city council had in mind. While the police were held back from dealing forcefully with the rioters, the politicians and the businessmen were negotiating with Al Sharpton and his Jewish lawyer and the head Black in the local chapter of the Urban League and all the rest. The mayor, Charlie Luken, already has spoken about the need to root out racism as the key to avoiding future riots. Instead of ditching their new racial profiling ordinance, the mayor and the other politicians are talking about ways to enforce it more rigorously. Executives from the Procter & Gamble Company and Toyota Motor Manufacturing of North America and other members of the Cincinnati Business Committee have announced that they will provide additional jobs and economic opportunities for Blacks. They will hire more young Blacks this summer, and they will give more contracts to Black-owned businesses.

And I don't have to tell you whose jobs will be given to those Black rioters this summer. I don't have to tell you who won't be getting the contracts that will be given to Black-owned businesses. One thing which the businessmen and the politicians didn't announce publicly but which I see coming is a behind-the-scenes promise of political and police power to the head Black rabble

rousers. The first tidbit to go to a Black will be the job of the current White chief of police. Next in order will be a Black mayor for Cincinnati. And in fact, Cincinnati will go the way of Detroit and Washington, DC, just as the president of the Fraternal Order of Police warned.

Will that be good for business? I don't think so. Certainly not in the long run. But White businessmen these days are almost as shortsighted and irresponsible a lot as White politicians. They feel no sense of responsibility to their race or to the future. They just want quick fixes. And they are as terrified of being thought Politically Incorrect as are the politicians.

So what should those of us with a longer view of the situation do?

I'm getting a lot of letters from hyperactive idiots who are jumping up and down and telling me, "Don't just talk! Do something about the Blacks! Do something about what's happening in Cincinnati!"

I think they want me to go to Cincinnati with a few members of my organization, the National Alliance, and start shooting Blacks, so that they can have the vicarious thrill of watching it on television. Well, let me tell you, if I thought that the time had come for the shooting to start, it wouldn't be Black rioters I'd be gunning for. I'd be gunning first for White politicians and businessmen. Before going after our external enemies, I'd deal with our internal enemies. Only after we'd cleaned out the traitors inside our gates would I aim for those outside. And even then it wouldn't be Black rioters I'd be shooting. I appreciate Black rioters. I'm just sorry the weather in Cincinnati has been so cool and wet and the riot there didn't last longer and take a bigger toll. There's nothing more educational for our people than a good Black riot. I'm hoping for a long, hot summer. This should be a good summer for riots, with the economy heading downhill and the Blacks convinced that White Republicans stole the election from their candidate, Al Gore.

No, in this pre-revolutionary period the Blacks are good for us. The first outsiders we must deal with are the people who control our mass media of news and entertainment and pump their poison and their filth and their lies into our people around the clock. When we have rooted the last of these Semitic poisoners and everyone in their supporting infrastructure out of our society, the rest will be only a mopping-up operation.

Anyway, the time for shooting isn't here yet, and that's too bad, because a great deal more damage will be done to our people and to our civilization between now and then, and the longer the shooting is postponed, the less we'll have for starting over after the smoke has cleared. We really need to focus now on the things that it is time for. And the most important of those things is communicating with our people: first developing the means for communication with them, developing every possible medium which we can use for reaching them, and then using all of those media as effectively as possible. I'm sure we'll never reach the Politically Correct lemmings like the woman who was threatened with being run over when she put flowers on the spot where the Black was shot. She didn't learn a thing from that experience. She went home and cried her eyes out over the unrequited love she has for the Black race. She needs to be reprogrammed by the mass media, but that can't be done as long as the hereditary enemies of our people continue to control the media. Now they are working day and night to create more deranged White women like her. And there's also not much to be done with the Whites who like

to let off steam by sounding tough on the radio talk shows or with the hyperactive idiots who urge me to start shooting. Talkers seldom are doers.

But there still are responsible, level-headed White men and women in America capable of thinking for themselves: millions of them, actually. For the most part they keep their mouths shut now because they are isolated and they feel intimidated by the constant pressure to conform, the constant pressure coming from the mass media to be Politically Correct. But they are capable of seeing what's happening around them. They don't have blinders on, like the lemmings do.

My job now and for the immediate future -- our job -- is to reach out to these millions of isolated and intimidated non-lemmings, these millions of responsible and level-headed White men and women, and to help them see more of what is happening around them, to give them more information, to help them digest and assimilate and understand that information, to help them draw responsible conclusions from it. And our job is to lessen and eventually end their sense of isolation by letting them know that they are not alone, that there are millions like them who are not dancing willingly to the tune played by the Jewish pied pipers of the controlled media. And at the same time that we inform these millions, our task is to begin networking them, to help them begin working together, to help them encourage and reinforce each other.

When we have accomplished that to any significant degree we will have gained new capabilities and will be able to do other things, but for now our task is to inform and explain and inspire -- and to connect, unite, organize.

Let's finish today with a thought about our task of combating the influence of the Jewish mass media. The Jews understand one thing about mass propaganda that many people don't understand. In its early stages the task of propaganda is to persuade, to change attitudes and opinions. But after the propaganda has succeeded in doing that -- after it has all of the lemmings dancing to the same tune -- it has a different purpose. Its new purpose is to create a pervasive atmosphere of ideological uniformity in which any non-conforming idea, any fact which does not fit the party line, will stand out and be noticed so that the forces of Political Correctness, the Thought Police, can swarm over it and suppress it. That's the way it worked behind the Iron Curtain during the communist period. The lemmings were conditioned to respond instantly and report to the secret police any dissonant expression, any non-conforming statement or tendency, anything at all that was not perfectly in tune with the pervasive propaganda that saturated their thinking and their perceptions.

And that's the way it's quickly becoming in America today. My organization, the National Alliance, publishes and distributes many printed materials to inform those thinking millions of isolated individuals, to provoke them to think harder and to reach conclusions. Without the pervasive blanket of Jewish propaganda from the mass media, our leaflets and pamphlets and books and other materials -- even the *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts -- might go unnoticed. There's so much material of all sorts being published, people are bombarded with so much information, that it's difficult to be noticed, to catch the attention of the people one is trying to reach. But the Jews help us by providing a contrasting background of lies against which the truth stands out starkly. Their propaganda keeps the lemmings hypnotized, but it also makes it easier for the non-lemmings to notice anything contradictory to the party line.

In this regard I've mentioned on earlier broadcasts the reaction we always get from the lemmings when we distribute a sticker which says simply, "Earth's Most Endangered Species: the White Race -- Help Preserve It," and gives our address. There shouldn't be anything alarming about that, but it alarms the lemmings every time, because it stands out against the pervasive Jewish propaganda background which tells the lemmings over and over, "Black good, White bad, Black good, White bad." The notion that the White race ought to be preserved is contrary to that Jewish propaganda background and is therefore noticed -- by the millions we are trying to reach as well as by the lemmings.

That is at least a small silver lining in the cloud over America. Help me take advantage of it. Help me reach out to other responsible Americans. Tell your friends about my broadcasts.

Patriot's Choice

When I speak with or correspond with people from various parts of the United States the issue on which everyone seems to agree is immigration. Everyone has his own horror story about what the influx of non-White immigrants has done to the community in which he lives or to his workplace. People I know who work in Silicon Valley as highly skilled professionals complain to me about the enormous influx of Asians, who are taking away their jobs: Asians from India in particular. People in the health-care professions and in the academy also complain about Asians. Ninety per cent of the interns in many hospitals are Vietnamese or Chinese or Pakistani. University faculties are being filled with Asians, leaving fewer and fewer opportunities for White American scholars to have academic careers.

At the other end of the socioeconomic scale, mestizos from Mexico and other parts of Central and South America, are taking over virtually all of the minimum-wage jobs in the construction trades and landscaping, in poultry processing plants, in cleaning, in food service, and in many other areas where unskilled labor is required. There are large parts of the United States where there are no White motel or hotel workers to be seen, except perhaps at the registration desk, and no White waiters or waitresses, and no Whites in the kitchen.

The public schools in these parts of the country hit hard by non-White immigration have become disaster areas, with White children outnumbered by Browns and Yellows, and Blacks. Neighborhoods, even whole towns, which used to be entirely White -- and clean, safe, quiet, and decent -- have become almost entirely non-White in the past two decades.

No one that I speak with or correspond with is happy about this situation; most are angry, and some of them are quite angry. Of course, I don't speak with everyone in the country. I don't talk with the Christian ministers who preach that we all are God's children and therefore shouldn't object to sharing our land, our schools, and our incomes with our non-White brothers and sisters. I don't correspond with the owners of the poultry-processing plants, who complain that Whites aren't willing to do the hard, smelly work in their plants at a reasonable wage, and so they bring in non-Whites who are happy to have the work. And I have no dealings with either the Democratic Party bosses who want more non-Whites coming into the country because nearly all of them will vote Democrat or with the Republican big businessmen who welcome more non-White immigration because it keeps the cost of labor down.

But I do speak with enough people that I am quite certain that the great majority of White Americans would like to see an end to the flood of non-Whites pouring across our borders. And I'm including in that White majority even the Politically Correct soccer moms and yuppies, because in the privacy of the voting booth even they would vote to end the flood. Actually, I wouldn't be surprised if the majority of Democratic voters, who are substantially less White than Republicans, would vote to stop non-White immigration.

But of course, the voters aren't given a chance to express their feelings on non-White immigration or on many other sensitive issues. That's strange, isn't it? The conventional wisdom is that politicians seek votes and will champion any cause they believe will win them votes. Why

is it that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans are given a chance to vote their feelings on the immigration issue? It might be understandable that the Democratic Party would want to steer clear of that issue, considering it divisive. Even though a platform calling for an end to non-White immigration -- or even to all immigration -- would be popular among the Democratic Party's White voters, it might be much less popular among the large number of non-White Democratic voters. But Republican voters, who are overwhelmingly White, certainly would favor a halt to non-White immigration. Why then is George Bush at least as strongly in favor of open borders as Bill Clinton was? Why does he resist enforcing the immigration laws we already have as strongly as any Democrat, when that's certainly not what the majority of the people who voted for him want?

It's an interesting question, and its examination helps us to understand better the way our system of government works in America. There's a lot of baloney in the air about "the will of the people" and similar foolishness. Most people have a foggy sort of notion that the country is governed by "the people" through their elected representatives -- and in a sense I suppose that's true, except that "the people" are not the citizens enfranchised by the Constitution, and it would be more accurate to describe the politicians through whom they govern as "bought" representatives. What the people who actually govern have learned is that the voters, who only imagine that they are the ones who govern, are very easily manipulated.

When election time rolls around, if the question of immigration is a key issue -- if one of the candidates pledges to keep America's borders open and to welcome with open arms everyone who comes across those borders, legally or illegally, and the other candidate pledges to use the U.S. Army to seal the borders and completely stop the flow of illegal aliens -- so that the voters really have a choice, then we might correctly say that the voters govern. But of course, the voters are not given such a choice. The bought politicians who are candidates do not offer the voters a choice on the issues that are really important. Instead they offer various schemes for reducing the cost of prescription drugs for senior citizens or for handing out school vouchers or for implementing some other government welfare program.

They distract the voters with unimportant issues. And most of the voters are very easily distracted. For months before a major election the voters are saturated with trivia from their television screens. Unimportant issues are held up as important, and opinion polls on these issues are presented every day. How many people favor school vouchers, and how many are against? How many people favor changing the limits on the size of campaign contributions? Should violent video games for children be restricted? But never the question: Should the government seal the borders and round up and deport illegal aliens?

It's interesting that no candidate will take such a position, even though it would be a very popular one and would win him many votes. It suggests that there are forces at work other than "the will of the people."

In some states so-called "popular initiatives" are part of the election process. If an organized group of voters can gather enough signatures they can put certain issues on the ballot regardless of the politicians. They may even put a Politically Incorrect proposition on the ballot, if the public feels strongly enough about it to overcome the television propaganda against it.

That has happened. In California, in 1994, White citizens concerned about the swamping of their state by illegal aliens from Mexico, put a very mild popular initiative on the ballot -- Proposition 187 -- which would restrict certain government-provided benefits to illegal aliens. Despite a flood of television propaganda describing the initiative as "racist" and despite violent and threatening demonstrations against it by Mexicans already in California, the initiative was approved by the voters. Then a Jewish Federal judge stepped in and nullified the will of the voters by declaring the initiative un-Constitutional and unenforceable. The White voters of California were too late with too little resistance, and the Brown tidal wave that they had tried far too feebly to stop swept over them and submerged them anyway just a few years later.

In most parts of the country, White citizens aren't even given an opportunity to try to stop the alien takeover and destruction of their society. Immigration, of course, isn't the only really important issue on which most voters aren't given a choice. It's just one I chose because most White voters agree on it, and the fact that they aren't permitted to vote on it provides an especially strong bit of evidence that the notion that the country is governed by the will of its voters is not valid.

Other really important issues never are even formulated clearly enough for the public to have an opinion on them. The question of national autonomy is a good example. If the voters were asked clearly: Do you believe that the United States should maintain its autonomy, that it should preserve its separate existence as a nation, that it should safeguard all of those resources which enable it to act independently in its national interest? -- if the voters were asked that question, I have no doubt that the majority would respond affirmatively. But of course, the voters aren't asked that question. The candidates don't ask it, and neither do the controlled media. The trivial issues presented to the people to keep them from thinking about the issues of autonomy and sovereignty are things such as: Isn't it nice that the government's free-trade policies have made it possible for us buy plastic hair curlers made in China for so much less than they used to cost us?

The fact that so-called "free trade" has driven into bankruptcy American industries essential to our national autonomy and is continuing to damage other vital industries is never discussed by the candidates or by the media. Mr. Bush pursues free trade as enthusiastically as Mr. Clinton did.

We understand, of course, that there are people in America who believe that national autonomy and national sovereignty are bad things -- at least, bad for Americans -- and who want to do away with them. They want White Americans to be dependent on Black and Brown and Yellow people in other parts of the world. They want America's wealth to be redistributed to the poorer nations of the world. They want American citizens to be subject to international tribunals. They want our national defense to be in the hands of international military forces. They don't want us to have the ability to act independently: militarily, economically, or in any other way.

They are the globalists. They constitute only a small minority of the White population of America. They never could have their way -- they never could impose their policies on the rest of us -- if they appealed to "the will of the people." But they don't need "the will of the people" because they have the Jewish mass media on their side. Because the Jewish media are behind them, both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party favor globalist policies, and no major

candidate, no Democratic or Republican politician, dares to ask the voters whether or not they really want to abolish America's borders, do away with America's autonomy, scrap America's sovereignty. And so the voters never have a choice in the matter. The insiders simply do what they want behind the scenes, and no one asks any embarrassing questions, because the controlled mass media are on their side.

One more example of a vitally important issue on which the people, the voters, are not given a choice, is the issue of Israel. American voters never are asked: Do you believe that America should support -- diplomatically, militarily, and financially -- a foreign country which approves of and engages in the police torture of prisoners during interrogations, which approves of and engages in the collective punishment of families or even whole communities when a single member of a family or a community breaks the law, and which approves of and engages in state-sponsored terrorism on an international scale? Most American voters would emphatically reject such support, but they are never given the choice.

And the reason they never are given the choice of whether to support Israel is exactly the same reason they are never given a choice on immigration or on national sovereignty. The insiders, the Rhodes scholars and the other deracinated, conscienceless elitists operating behind the scenes with the support of the Jewish media bosses, reserve the truly important choices for themselves. They let the voters occupy themselves with school vouchers and Medicare prescriptions and the pros and cons of violent video games. But we never are asked whether or not our nation should be permitted to continue its independent existence or what the nature and makeup of its population should be in the future. The globalists already know what they want, and they don't want our opinion on the matter or our interference in their pursuit of their goals.

The point of everything I'm telling you today is this: White Americans who insist on operating according to the old rules, of letting themselves be governed by the current system based on party politics and elections, are playing a loser's game. By adhering to and supporting this system they are betraying their nation and their race. The system already has been taken over by the sworn enemies of their nation and their race. To support the system, to collaborate with the system is to be a traitor to one's people. It is to betray the ideal of self-government established on this continent by our forefathers.

That, I know, is a hard conclusion for most patriots to accept. They respect the hallowed institutions of their nation. They like to do things in the accepted way, the traditional way. It goes against their grain to challenge established authority or to break the law in any way. They just aren't emotionally or psychologically equipped to combat the sort of subversion that has overtaken us. And I'm talking now about the patriots who aren't lemmings; I'm talking about the ones who are still capable of independent thought, still capable of examining the evidence and reaching their own conclusions. It's very difficult for them to accept the fact that the deadliest enemies of their nation and their people have subverted and taken over the institutions by which their people have governed themselves. But, difficult to accept or not, it has happened.

I'll go a step further: Even if there had not been a conscious, deliberate, and successful attempt to subvert our institutions and take over our government -- even if we did not have these deadly enemies in our midst determined to use our own governmental institutions to destroy us -- the old

rules still would be invalid. In ancient Greece, perhaps -- in medieval Iceland, perhaps -- with the electors comprising a carefully defined subset of a population of substantially higher quality than we have in the United States today, mass democracy may have been a viable choice. In the age of television it is not.

Most of the members of every viable society are and always have been what I call lemmings. Lemmings do not make up their minds independently. They are psychologically incapable of doing that. Instead, they look around them and try to understand what other people are thinking: their peers and their authority figures. And then that's what they think. They think whatever they perceive to be accepted by those around them. They conform their own opinions and behavior to the opinions and behavior of others. That's one thing to know in a traditional society, where the norms observed and accepted by the lemmings are real norms: where the lemmings are conforming themselves to the real people around them, where they are conforming themselves to the fellow members of their own community and by so doing are giving stability and strength to the community.

In the television age it's something altogether different. In the television age the virtual community of the television screen increasingly replaces the real community, the natural community, in determining what the lemmings conform themselves to. It's what the lemmings perceive which is important, and the people who control what appears on their television screens determine to an increasing degree what the lemmings perceive. This fact of life nullifies the validity of the democratic idea even when there is no evil intent. In other words, even if the masters of the mass media of news and entertainment were benevolent, the power in their hands would be sufficient to change "the will of the people" to whatever the media masters wanted it to be, and the whole concept of mass democracy would be meaningless. And with Jews controlling the media, democracy is not only a fraud; it is an unmitigated disaster carrying our society, our civilization, and our race toward final oblivion.

So what is a patriot to do? Should he ignore all the evidence of an enemy takeover and continue supporting the current system? And again, I'm talking only about those patriots who do notice the evidence. Do you remember what I told you about the mayor of Cincinnati and the other White politicians there and the treacherous way they behaved after the recent Black riot in Cincinnati? Earlier this week -- on Monday -- the first "hate crime" indictment stemming from that riot was filed. Who do you think was indicted? Do you think maybe it was one of the Black rioters: perhaps one of those who pulled a White woman from her car and beat her to a pulp? If that's what you think, you are dead wrong. The first and so far the only person to be indicted for a "hate crime" during the riot is a White man who fought back against the Blacks: a White man who was angered by what he saw the Blacks doing and decided not to just stand there and watch them destroy his city. He is 20-year-old Craig Carr. He picked up a brick, threw it at a Black, and expressed his feelings about Blacks generally. And the local White politicians and bureaucrats saw their opportunity to deflect charges of "racial profiling" against themselves based on the fact that nearly all of the people who had been arrested during the riot are Black. They would file the most serious charges against a White man. That should please the media bosses!

Should an observant patriot simply ignore that sort of behavior and continue supporting the system? Should a patriot continue to respect the old rules simply because the system is continuing to follow them: at least, in outward form?

That's what the White politicians and the White bureaucrats are doing: the White mayors and prosecutors and judges, and not just in Cincinnati, but everywhere. They are ignoring the evidence and continuing to follow the old rules because they know which side their bread is buttered on, and that's all that matters to them. Along with the system, they have become corrupt. Black rioters and illegal aliens and the Jews controlling the media are not their enemies. To them the White man who fights back is the enemy. To them the observant patriot who chooses to be a **real** patriot is the enemy. To them I am the enemy -- and of that I am proud.

I know that they would like to lock me up and silence me. And believe me, there is nothing better that I would like to do to them than make them dance on air with their hands tied behind their backs: all of them.

So again, what is a patriot to do? How is he to reconcile his instinctive respect for the old forms and institutions with the present reality? What is the solution?

Well, I'll tell you. I'll tell all of you patriots trying to make a choice: White revolution is the only solution.

Feces, Fetuses, Etc.

Let me begin by responding to a few listeners who had trouble believing the bizarre things I reported three weeks ago, when I wanted to illustrate the fact that there are profound psychological differences separating the various human races, and these differences have evolutionary origins: which is to say that they are inborn, genetically determined differences that were established over a long period of time during the evolution of the various races in various parts of the world, where there were differing evolutionary environments.

In particular, I illustrated the psychological differences between the Chinese and Europeans, and between Jews and Aryans. In the case of the Jews I used the often-remarked Jewish tendency toward scatological humor, which is a much greater tendency than appears in Aryans. I cited as an example of this tendency a new MTV program, *Dude, This Sucks.* I mentioned that in the filming of a recent episode of this program two men -- the "Shower Rangers" -- who previously had been dosed with a powerful laxative, came onto the stage dressed as Boy Scouts. On cue they turned their backs to the audience, dropped their trousers, bent over, and sprayed a group of unsuspecting teenaged girls on the stage with feces.

The Jews who scripted the Shower Rangers' act apparently thought this feces shower was hilariously funny. This is the sort of thing that Jews usually consider funny. I pointed out that the Jew ultimately responsible for the Shower Rangers is the owner of MTV, billionaire media mogul Sumner Redstone, who also owns CBS and many other mass media. He is one of the most influential Jews in the world, a Jew who, whenever he visits the White House, always gets a big hug from whichever *shabbos goy* is President at the moment. I also could have blamed the feces-spraying incident on MTV's homosexual Jewish program manager, Brian Graden, who, of course, takes his orders from Redstone.

Some listeners just couldn't believe that an ultra-rich, ultra-influential Jew such as Redstone could be involved in such a low-class act as the Shower Rangers: Howard Stern, maybe, but not Sumner Redstone. One thing I didn't point out in my broadcast three weeks ago is that the Jew Howard Stern also works for Sumner Redstone. Redstone undoubtedly is a very sophisticated and very clever Jew, but the Shower Rangers is indeed the sort of filth he regularly produces for the consumption of Aryan teenagers, whether their parents are paying attention or not. It is indeed the sort of filth he and his fellow Jews who control our media, our advertising, and the conditioning of our children think is very funny. Talk to a swimming pool maintenance man in Hollywood or someone who is responsible for security at one of the New York condos where these rich Jews live and play. You'll get an earful.

Whether Sumner Redstone and Brian Graden believed that the Shower Rangers would be a bold new step toward conditioning Aryan teenagers to laugh at the same things Jews laugh at or whether they naively believed that Aryans and Jews already laugh at the same things, there can be no real dispute about the fact that the Shower Rangers were part of an MTV program and that they performed as I said. The performance I described is the subject of a lawsuit filed against MTV in Los Angeles Superior Court at the beginning of last month by two of the girls who were sprayed.

The people who told me that Sumner Redstone never would condone something like the Shower Rangers, that he is too smart and sophisticated for that, were confirmed in their belief by the fact that they couldn't find any news of the spraying incident in Los Angeles newspapers. Are you surprised that the media bosses cover for each other? But actually, Jews do talk about these things with one another. If it's too much trouble for you to get a copy of the court documents, then scan some of the Hollywood "insider" newsletters, which are chock full of news reports on things such as which media mogul's son was so drunk at his bar mitzvah last Saturday that he barfed all over the Torah scroll, or which queer ad-agency executive has just been diagnosed as having AIDS, or who is rumored to have made an out-of-court settlement with a *shikse* starlet to avoid a paternity suit. Several of the Hollywood newsletters carried all the details of the Shower Ranger episode last month. Believe me; it happened. And believe me, it is typical of the people who control Hollywood and the television entertainment industry and the conditioning of America's children -- and, incidentally, all three branches of our government.

When I spoke about the psychological differences between Chinese and Europeans, I focused on the eating habits of the Chinese. Specifically, I mentioned their habit of eating aborted human fetuses and also domestic dogs and cats and body parts from various wild animals, including those belonging to endangered species, and I gave tiger penis and rhinoceros horn as examples.

I also remarked that what the Chinese do to cats and dogs is much worse than merely eating them. Some listeners questioned this statement. "What could the Chinese do to cats and dogs that would be worse than eating them?" I was asked. What's worse is the way the cats and dogs are treated before and during being killed for eating -- and also before and during being skinned for their fur. And I should warn you that I'm a bit of an extremist on the subject of cruelty to animals. I abhor cruelty, whether the perpetrator is Chinese or European. I abhor the practices of White men who trap fur-bearing animals. I am horrified especially by the killing of big cats to make fur coats or jackets for rich women, but I am extremely hostile even to the breeding of mink and other small mammals just so that they can be skinned to help the female lemmings who can afford it be more fashionable. The fact that there are White people who are cruel, callous, and indifferent to the suffering of animals and who are unmoved by the killing of such beautiful and magnificent creatures as the big cats, however, doesn't mean that we are just as bad as the Chinese in this regard. There are substantial differences. In general, there seems to be no feeling at all among the Chinese and other Asians for the feelings of animals. There seems to be no understanding, no comprehension, of the White man's sympathy for animals. To the Chinese an animal is simply an object, which may or may not have any economic value. If it does have economic value, then it should be used in any way that is profitable.

In addition to this general inability to sympathize with animals, the Chinese do have their peculiar culinary habits and their peculiar notions about diet. The consequence is that cats and dogs intended to be eaten or skinned are treated in an almost unbelievably inhumane manner. The cats generally are strangled or drowned before being skinned, so as not to damage the fur. Some dogs, who do not have a cat's ability to inflict damage on their tormentors with their claws, are actually skinned alive. And there is the Chinese gourmet's peculiar notion that the more painful a death the animal suffers, the more tender and tasty is the meat. So, to please the customer, a dog or cat will be selected from a cage in a restaurant, then taken into the kitchen to

have all its bones broken before it is slaughtered. The customer, seated at his table, can enjoy the screams of agony coming from the kitchen as he awaits his meal.

There's a great deal of very unpleasant information on this sort of thing available at the Web site of the Humane Society of the United States. That's hsus.org. The Humane Society even has sent undercover investigators with video cameras into China to record some of the horrible things that are done to cats and dogs there.

The subject on which I received the most questions was my report on the eating of human fetuses by Chinese, who believe the practice is healthy, just as they regard powdered rhinoceros horn as an aphrodisiac and tiger penis as a potency enhancer. Some people who wrote to me just didn't believe that the Chinese could be so different from Europeans -- or at least, they didn't want to believe it. Some of them accused me of being untruthful. Others simply requested proof. Actually, there's a great deal of evidence available on the subject, but the language difference, along with the characteristic Chinese suspicion of outsiders, does pose some difficulties in gathering it. For this reason I'll restrict my evidence today to an English-language Chinese source, the Hong Kong newspaper *Eastern Express.* All the quotes which follow are from a lengthy article which appeared in the April 12, 1995, issue of the *Eastern Express.* A reporter visited several hospitals in mainland China seeking aborted fetuses for eating and found that they were readily available. I quote from the *Eastern Express:*

Reports that dead embryos were being used as dietary supplements started to spread early last year with reports that some doctors in Shenzhen hospitals were eating dead fetuses after carrying out abortions. The doctors allegedly defended their actions by saying the embryos were good for their skin and general health.

A trend was set, and soon reports circulated that doctors in the city were promoting fetuses as a human tonic. Hospital cleaning women were seen fighting each other to take the treasured human remains home. Last month reporters from *East Week* -- a sister publication of *Eastern Express* -- went to Shenzhen to see if the rumors could be substantiated. On March 7 a reporter entered the state-run Shenzhen Heath Center for Women and Children feigning illness and asked a female doctor for a fetus. The doctor said the department was out of stock but to come again.

The next day the reporter returned at lunch time. The doctor eventually emerged from the operating theatre holding a fist-size glass bottle stuffed with thumb-size fetuses. She said, "There are 10 fetuses here, all aborted this morning. You can take them. We are a state hospital and don't charge anything."...

The reporter learned that the going rate for a fetus was $10, but when the merchandise was in short supply the price could go up to $20. But these prices are pin money compared to those set by private clinics, which are said to make a fortune selling fetuses. One chap on Bong Men Lao Street charges $300 for one fetus. The person in charge of the clinic is a man in his 60s. When he saw the ailing reporter he offered to take an order for fetuses that had reached full term and that, it is claimed, have the best healing properties. When a female doctor named Yang ... of Sin Hua clinic was asked whether fetuses were edible, she said emphatically, "Of course, they are. They are even better than placentas. They can make your skin smoother, your body stronger, and are

good for kidneys. When I was in an army hospital in Jiangti province I often brought fetuses home."...

A Mr. Cheng from Hong Kong claims he has been eating fetus soup for more than six months. To begin, the man, in his 40s, would make the trip to Shenzhen frequently for business and was introduced to fetuses by friends. He says he met a number of professors and doctors in government hospitals who helped him buy the fetuses. "At first I felt uncomfortable, but doctors said the substances in fetuses could help cure my asthma. I started taking them, and gradually the asthma disappeared," Cheng said....

Zou Qin, 32, a woman from Hubei with the fine skin of someone several years younger, attributes her well preserved looks to a diet of fetuses. As a doctor at the Lun Hu Clinic, Zou has carried out abortions on several hundred patients. She believes fetuses are highly nutritious and claims to have eaten more than 100 in the past six months. She pulls out a fetus specimen before a reporter and explains the selection criteria. "People normally prefer fetuses of young women, and even better, the first baby and a male. They are wasted if we don't eat them. The women who receive abortions here don't want the fetuses. Also the fetuses are already dead when we eat them. We don't carry out abortions just to eat the fetuses...."

Dr. Warren Lee, president of the Hong Kong Nutrition Association, is aware of the unsavory rumors. "Eating fetuses is a kind of traditional Chinese medicine and is deeply founded in Chinese folklore....,' he says."

Well, there is much more in the April 12, 1995, article from the *Eastern Express,* an English-language newspaper published in Hong Kong. If that's not enough for you, try digging into Chinese folklore for yourself. As the man said, eating fetuses has deep roots in Chinese tradition.

While I'm on the subject of racial differences, let me mention something I didn't talk about three weeks ago. I spoke only about the differences between Europeans and Chinese and between Aryans and Jews. I didn't mention White-Black differences. They really are in a category by themselves. I am sure that many people really believe that we're not very different from the Chinese. And there also are many people who believe that the only difference between Aryans and Jews is that Jews go to church on Saturday instead of Sunday and are a little better at making money than we are. Those are the people who just couldn't believe what I told them about eating fetuses and about the connection between Sumner Redstone and the Shower Rangers. But no one really needs to be persuaded that there are major differences between Whites and Blacks.

Everyone understands that the Blacks are quite different from us: even the whiny college girls who wring their hands and ask me, "Oh, why can't you understand that we're really all the same, that there is only one human race?" Despite their desperate need to be Politically Correct, they understand that the Blacks are as different from us as night from day. The egalitarians prove by their own behavior that they really don't believe in equality.

I'll give you a current example of that. I'm sure that you remember our recent talks about the race riot in Cincinnati last month. Last week I pointed out that although it was only Blacks who were rioting, and that the rioters targeted Whites, pulling White men and women from their cars and

beating them severely, the only person charged with a "hate crime" in Cincinnati in connection with the riot was a White man, 20-year-old Craig Carr, who became enraged by the rioters and threw a brick at a Black. The Blacks rioted and attacked White men and women solely because they were White, but no Black was charged with a "hate crime" on that account. A White man fights back, and he is charged with a "hate crime." This was a clear case of Blacks and Whites being held to quite different standards of behavior.

An even more recent case was that of a Black professor at Northern Kentucky University. And I should tell you right at the start that when any Black is held up as a "professor" at a White university, my upper lip develops an involuntary curl. I instinctively assume that what I am confronted with is not a scholar who is at the academy on his merits, but rather a beneficiary of Political Correctness who is better suited to picking cotton than to teaching White students anything. That certainly seems to be the case with Professor Clinton Hewan, a coal-black native of Jamaica who is a tenured associate professor of political science at Northern Kentucky University. The university is just across the Ohio-Kentucky state line from Cincinnati, and so the riot was a matter of considerable interest on the campus of the mostly White university.

The riot, if you remember, was sparked by Blacks angry over a fatal encounter between a Black street thug with a long arrest record and 14 outstanding arrest warrants, 19-year-old Timothy Thomas, and a White policeman who was attempting to arrest him. The Black was ignoring orders to stop and raise his hands, and when the White policemen saw him reach for his waistband, he shot and killed the Black. Professor Clinton Hewan, of course, cheered the Black rioters. He already was well known on the campus as an agitator for Black causes and an outspoken critic of so-called "White racism," a handy catch-all label for anything Blacks find troublesome. In 1998, for example, when the university failed to give him tenure, he hired a lawyer and loudly and repeatedly announced that tenure was being denied to him because of the efforts of "White racists" on the faculty. The university predictably caved in and granted tenure to Clinton Hewan.

After the riot Professor Hewan called for the assassination of the White policeman who had shot the Black thug, Timothy Thomas. He told the campus newspaper, the Northerner, that Thomas's family should "quietly stalk that S.O.B. and take him out.... The family should go out and get that policeman."

Now, can you imagine the reaction on the Northern Kentucky University campus and in the local media if a White professor had reacted to the riot by telling the campus newspaper that the police should have put it down the same way the Israelis customarily put down demonstrations by Palestinians: namely, by identifying the Black leaders in the crowd and having snipers "take them out." Or suppose that a White professor had told the newspaper that when the Black agitator, Jesse Jackson, came to Cincinnati to take advantage of the publicity, White vigilantes should stalk him and "take him out." Tenure or no tenure, that White professor would be out of a job in a hurry. But what do you think happened to Professor Hewan?

Nothing, of course. The White president of the university, Dr. James Votruba, announced that he found Professor Hewan's call for the assassination of a White policeman "troubling," and that he

intended to "look further into the matter." Well, not too much further. After all, three years ago Dr. Votruba had given the university's "Strongest Influence Award" to Professor Hewan.

My point is that liberals, soccer moms, yuppies, newspaper reporters, and university administrators, all of whom will swear on a stack of Bibles that they absolutely and positively believe that Blacks and Whites have the same intelligence, the same ability to solve problems and to innovate, the same degree of self-discipline, the same morality, and the same way of looking at the world, don't believe a word of it, and the proof of that is in the sort of preferential treatment they always give to someone such as Professor Hewan. They don't hold a Black to the same standards to which they hold a White man, because they know -- even though they won't admit it -- that the Black needs an advantage in order to maintain the illusion of equality. They know that the Black doesn't have the same intelligence, the same degree of self-discipline, or the same way of looking at the world that a White man does, and so they always try to compensate in some way for that shortcoming in order to maintain the illusion of equality, of sameness, but in fact what they do is make the differences even more manifest to the perceptive observer.

The Morality of Survival

The biggest thing in the news now is the imminent killing of the young soldier Timothy McVeigh by the Bush government. Even though I've never met or corresponded with Timothy, I've had dozens of reporters calling me for interviews in connection with the killing, because he read one of my novels, *The Turner Diaries*. The reporters seem almost gleeful. One of those awful, heterosexual White male gun nuts who doesn't follow the party line is to be killed, and isn't it wonderful! The columnists and editorialists like to use words such as "evil" and "monster" in their references to McVeigh. One can imagine them all dancing the hora with their Jewish bosses as the hour of the killing approaches and then cheering in unison as the poison flows into his veins.

Why this enormous hatred for Timothy? They say it is because he killed 168 people. I say it is because he refuses to say that he is sorry: he refuses to whine and make excuses and beg for his life, like they would have done. I say that it is because he did what he did for an impersonal reason, for an ideal, and ideals make them uncomfortable. I say that it is because he has acted as a man of principle should act and is willing to face the consequences for his actions, and that really goes against the grain in this age of democracy and hypocrisy and feminism and endless talk, with people never meaning what they say.

Someone like Bill Clinton, who orders the bombing of Belgrade and kills thousands of civilians in order to divert attention from his domestic problems, is forgiven immediately by the media bloodhounds because Bill Clinton is not a man of principle. Bill Clinton is not a threat to the rotten system that feeds the bloodhounds. They can understand and empathize with a mass murderer like Bill Clinton, but not with a soldier like Timothy McVeigh.

If the media people really believed that everyone who kills lots of other people is "evil" or a "monster," they should have had a field day when Ariel Sharon became the head Jew in Israel recently. Sharon is the Jew who, as Israeli defense minister, set up and supervised the massacre of some 3,000 Palestinian civilians -- mostly women, children, and old men -- in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in 1982. Has any journalist, the editorial writer for any major newspaper or magazine, had anything at all to say about that recently?

You know, I'm not trying to justify the killing of civilians. I'm just trying to explore the fundamental crookedness of the mass media in dealing with the subject of killing. Here's another example: the current media hullabaloo about the killing of 20 or so Vietnamese civilians in 1969 by a Navy SEAL team commanded by Lieutenant Robert Kerrey, who later was governor of Nebraska, then a U.S. Senator, and then a presidential candidate in 1992.

In 1969 a Vietnamese family had their throats cut to keep them from raising an alarm during Kerrey's raid in the Mekong Delta, and then 15 or 20 other civilians were shot. The raid had failed to achieve its purpose of assassinating a Viet Cong official, but Kerrey received a Bronze Star anyway. Now, amid a dispute about whether the Vietnamese civilians who were killed had simply been in the way during a fire fight or Kerrey had ordered them to be rounded up and shot, there is a great deal of hand-wringing and soul-searching going on. The media really have made

a circus out of the affair. One could almost believe that the folks in the media are horrified by the killing of civilians. But really, they aren't.

When it serves their propaganda purposes they will act like humanitarians and make a big fuss about killing civilians. They will act as if they believe it to be a terribly reprehensible thing for which the perpetrators should be punished. They went through that act all during the Vietnam War. Their attitude was that White Americans were baby-killers wreaking havoc among little Brown people in Vietnam for no good reason. The media certainly sympathized with the demonstrators who carried Viet Cong flags in Washington during the time that the Viet Cong were killing American servicemen in Vietnam at the rate of 100 a day.

And now they are making a big fuss about whether Kerrey and his fellow SEALs deliberately killed those 20 or so Vietnamese civilians 32 years ago or not, just as they are implying that Timothy McVeigh also is a monster who deliberately murdered the children in the day-care center in the Oklahoma City Federal Building. But, as I already said, no one in the controlled media has condemned Clinton for ordering the bombing of Belgrade or for the strafing of refugee columns in Kosovo.

Speaking of strafing, at the end of the Second World War U.S. fighter pilots considered it a great sport to shoot civilians along the roads and highways of Germany. Whether it was a refugee column fleeing the invading Red Army or simply a German farm wife and her children walking along a country road, American pilots would shoot them. It was considered a sport. Everybody knew about it, but no one ever was prosecuted as a war criminal because of it. The media never expressed disapproval -- and in fact, it was because the media tacitly approved of such atrocities and implicitly encouraged them with their anti-German hate propaganda that pilots felt it was acceptable behavior. Quite a difference from the party line taken by the media in the Vietnam War!

Did American pilots ever do any soul-searching or hand-wringing about these casual acts of murder, the way Robert Kerrey is now about his 1969 raid on a Mekong Delta village? If so, I haven't heard about it. What about the far more murderous carpet-bombing of German cities during the war? These bombing raids were designed to kill as many German civilians as possible. Since the war I have spoken with two or three American bomber pilots who told me that they realize now that they were fighting on the wrong side during the war, and they bitterly regret having participated in the mass murder of Germans for the benefit of the Jews.

I am sure that most American bomber pilots never have felt a twinge of guilt for what they did during the war, however, because most of them were lemmings. Lemmings do not have an internal compass to tell them what is right and wrong. As long as the media tell them that they did the right thing in bombing German cities, they feel no guilt. It is the ambiguous attitude of the media toward the Vietnam War that causes all of the anguish Robert Kerrey feels about his actions in 1969.

There are many people who would excuse both the American pilots who carpet-bombed German cities and strafed German refugee columns and American soldiers such as Kerrey who killed Vietnamese civilians, simply because all of these things were acts of war, and in a war anything

is permitted. Murdered civilians are simply "collateral damage." Certainly most of the controlled mass media would go along with that view so far as the murder of German civilians is concerned, and as I said, their view of the Vietnam War is at least ambiguous.

What about Timothy McVeigh? No one can argue seriously that he bombed the Federal building in Oklahoma City because he wanted to kill or terrorize civilians. Neither terrorism nor killing civilians was his goal. He bombed the Federal building to punish the Federal government for its murderous behavior in burning the Branch Davidian church in Waco, Texas, two years earlier. He wanted to send the government a message that its behavior would not be tolerated. And part of that message would be the killing of the government's secret police agents -- FBI and ATF agents -- who worked in the building. The fact that his bomb would kill not only secret police agents but also civilians, including the 19 children in the day-care center, was regrettable but unavoidable: collateral damage. Timothy was at war against the government, and in a war civilians are killed even when they are not deliberate targets, as they were in America's war against Germany. But of course, none of America's controlled media accept that view of the matter. Timothy is "evil"; Timothy is a "monster." The American pilots who strafed German refugee columns were just soldiers doing their job.

Is this one-sided view of things based on naivete? It's certainly not based on patriotism. The media proved during the Vietnam War that they have no pro-American bias based on patriotism. And it's not based on naivete either. It's based on a conscious and deliberate intent to deceive.

I'll give you an example. Four years ago, in my broadcast of May 24, 1997, I told you about a terrible atrocity which occurred in Italy toward the end of the Second World War. In May 1944 Allied forces bombed and shelled the sixth-century abbey of Monte Cassino to rubble, forcing the German defenders there to withdraw. Among the Allied troops was a division of Moroccan soldiers. Even then the Allies wanted to have "diversity" among their forces in order to show the world that they believed in racial equality.

Well, the Moroccans weren't much as fighters, but they were pretty good at cutting the throats of prisoners after the fighting was over. And they also excelled at raping civilians -- and prisoners too, occasionally, buggery being an established tradition among them. The night after the Germans had withdrawn, the Moroccans -- 12,000 of them -- left their camp and swarmed over the mountain villages around Monte Cassino. They raped every village woman and girl they could get their hands on, an estimated 3,000 women, ranging in age from 11 years to 86 years old. They murdered 800 village men who tried to protect their women. They abused some of the women so badly that more than 100 of them died. They selected the prettiest girls for gang-raping, with long lines of dark-skinned Moroccans waiting their turn in front of each one, while other Moroccans held the victims down. And they raped some of the young men as well.

Now, is this the sort of thing that our controlled media regard as "collateral damage," which must be accepted as inevitable in time of war? No, the media bosses understood that not even the brainwashed American public would be happy with that explanation, so they simply suppressed the news, just as they suppressed the news of the massacre of Whites by Blacks in Wichita, Kansas, last December. Look in the standard chronologies of the Second World War, and you will find no mention of the rape of the women of Monte Cassino. Even the accounts prepared by

the U.S. War Department -- accounts which detail the battle for Monte Cassino -- have excised any reference to what the Moroccan soldiers did to the villagers there after the battle. Now, that's not naivete; that's crookedness. That's deliberate intent to deceive.

Here's another example, which I've also talked about in earlier broadcasts: that's the mass murder of the Polish military, professional, and intellectual elite by the Soviet secret police in April 1940: some 25,000 Polish leaders altogether, the cream of the Polish nation. The Soviet secret police had rounded up the Polish writers and professors and military officers immediately after the Soviet invasion of Poland in September 1939. All of these Polish leaders, seen by the communists as a potential threat to the Soviet rule of Poland, were transported to Russia and herded into concentration camps. Then a few months later they were taken to execution pits, methodically murdered, and covered up in mass graves.

Almost immediately rumors of this enormous atrocity reached the West, when the prisoners no longer answered mail from their relatives. The controlled media in the West suppressed the rumors. The relatives of the media bosses were riding high as communist commissars in the Soviet Union, and the Poles were the traditional enemies of the Jews. The media bosses didn't care what happened to the Polish leaders, and they didn't want to say anything bad about their brethren in the Soviet Union.

Then, in June 1941, the German Army invaded Russia, determined to stamp out communism and end the Soviet-Jewish threat to Europe. Two years later, in 1943, after pushing deep into Russia, the Germans stumbled across a series of mass graves near the Russian village of Katyn. They found the corpses of more than 4,000 of the 25,000 Polish leaders who had been arrested by the Soviet secret police in 1939 and had not been heard from since April 1940. The Germans called in the International Red Cross and forensic experts from several neutral nations and also brought in British, French, and Polish officers from German POW camps to view the evidence. And that evidence was overwhelming. The communists had deliberately murdered the leadership stratum of the Polish nation in order to make the Poles easier to rule. The observers reported back to their own countries what they had seen -- and the media not only suppressed the reports but blamed the genocide on the Germans instead of on the communists and Jews.

So what's the point of all this? Do I expect the controlled mass media to change their ways? Am I advocating that they treat all atrocities in an evenhanded way? Do I expect them to regard Timothy McVeigh as a prisoner of war rather than as a monster and a terrorist?

No, of course not. The people who control the mass media are behaving in a perfectly sensible way. Evenhandedness is a ridiculous concept to them. In their view, an atrocity is something your enemies do. Whatever the people on your side do is justifiable. During the Second World War the Germans were their enemies, and the Americans were on their side, and so whatever the Americans did to the Germans was justifiable or, at worst, "collateral damage." Whenever the Germans played rough, however, it was an atrocity, a war crime.

The media bosses realized, of course, that many Americans would not accept such a simplistic view, and so they suppressed news of atrocities committed by their allies -- by the Moroccans

and by the Red Army, for example -- and they exaggerated any rough tactics by the Germans, even inventing atrocities where none had been committed.

During the Vietnam War, a generation after they had beaten the Germans, the media bosses had as their primary motive the final destruction of the old America, the Gentile America, with its traditions and morals and exclusiveness. They needed to destroy America's self-confidence, confuse its sense of identity, break down its remaining resistance to domination by the media masters. So they treated the Vietnam War with ambiguity. The Americans no longer were the "good guys," as they had been portrayed during the Second World War. Any killing of Vietnamese civilians by Americans was not treated as "collateral damage," but as a war crime.

And now, with the government totally under their control, anyone who is against the government is their enemy. So far as the media bosses are concerned, the government can burn as many Branch Davidian churches as it wants. That's just "collateral damage" in the government's campaign to keep the population intimidated. And anyone who strikes back at the government is a "monster," a "terrorist."

As I said, all of that is perfectly sensible. They know who they are and where their interests lie. They understand the stakes in this struggle for mastery of the planet. They understand that we are engaged in a total war, and they are determined to win. They are rational people. They do whatever is advantageous for them.

I believe that it's about time for us to understand where our interests lie. We need not only to understand the facts -- to understand who did what to whom and why -- but we also need to get rid of the foolish attitude that all atrocities are equally deplorable. When we regain control of our mass media, we should not have to suppress any news or ignore any facts. If our people kill some of our enemies, we should be able to discuss it frankly. We may or may not approve of it, depending upon whether it serves the interests of our people or is an unnecessarily bloodthirsty act of indiscipline. But we should not treat it as morally equivalent to our enemies killing us.

The doctrine of moral equivalence is suicidal folly promoted by our enemies. Every day I encounter White people infected with this doctrine. "Why are you opposed to Mexicans coming into our country? We came from Europe and took their land away from them, and now they're taking it back. What's wrong with that?"

Well, there's not much to be done with idiots who can't figure out what's wrong with that. But the rest of us need to get our thinking straightened out. We need to understand that we are at war, and that we must win the war. We must never again permit ourselves to be tricked into committing atrocities against ourselves, as we did during the Second World War. We must never again permit ourselves to be manipulated into feeling guilty for what we do against our enemies, as the media have manipulated those who, like Robert Kerrey, killed Vietnamese.

And, incidentally, we should understand that however tactically wrong the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City may have been, and however regrettable the killing of innocent civilians in that bombing, Timothy McVeigh is no monster. He is a soldier, and what he

did was based on principle. He justified his actions on the same basis that soldiers always do: he was at war against a government that is at war against his people.

I know that most Americans prefer not to think about that. Most Americans don't want to choose sides in this war. Most just want to pretend that there is no war and get on with their lives, and it's easier to follow the lead of the media and regard Timothy McVeigh as a monster than as a soldier. But there is a war, and in this war the rule is: Whatever is good for our people is good, and whatever harms our people is evil. That is the morality of survival.

It is too bad about the innocent civilians who died in Oklahoma City. It is too bad about the Polish intellectuals and officers who were murdered by the Soviet secret police. It is too bad about the German civilians who were carpet-bombed by American fliers. It is too bad about the many, many more innocent civilians who will die in the years ahead. It all could have been avoided if we had gotten our thinking straightened out earlier.

Sharing the Affliction

The degeneracy and the general nuttiness that increasingly afflict American society afflict everyone in that society, even those who are deliberately promoting the degeneracy. Like the sailor who drills holes in the bottom of the ship to get even with his crewmates, against whom he has a grievance, and then drowns along with the rest of the crew when the ship goes down, the Jews in America often are obliged to suffer along with their intended victims.

Feminism provides a good example of that. Jews played a hugely disproportionate role in inflicting that malady on American society. Not only was nearly every significant feminist writer and publicist of the past half century a Jewess, but the Jewish media bosses enthusiastically endorsed it all; they made feminism one of the cornerstones of Political Correctness. And yet I suspect that both Jewish men and women suffer approximately as much from this disease they unleashed on us as we do. I suspect that there are as many frustrated and embittered Jewesses per capita as there are frustrated and embittered Gentile women who have tried unsuccessfully to be what the feminists told them they should be but that Nature did not intend them to be. And I suspect that at least the same percentage of Jewish males have been burned by contact with feminists as Gentile males have.

Homosexuality is another example. Homosexuality is as abhorred in Jewish tradition as it is in Aryan tradition, despite the prevalence of homosexual practices among the Semitic tribes from which the Jews sprang. The prescribed punishment for homosexuals in the Jewish Bible is stoning to death. And our ancestors in northern Europe used to drown them. But of course it is above all the Jewish arbiters of Political Correctness who have taught young Americans that homosexuality is "normal" and that we must never speak disparagingly of homosexuals or homosexual behavior. And the Jews, more than anyone else, are the ones who have changed the whole environment in which young Americans grow up in a way that encourages sexually ambivalent youngsters to become even more confused and get on the wrong track. And yet in spreading this sickness among our people they themselves have become infected by it. In fact, homosexuality seems to be substantially more common among Jewish males in America today than among our own men -- which is the only favorable result that I can see of the campaign to make homosexuals a favored class.

An amusing example of the way in which the Jews have bitten themselves inadvertently in their exertions to take a bite out of us came to my attention just a few days ago. There's a Jewish school on the Upper West Side of Manhattan, the Rodeph Sholom Day School. It's affiliated with a Reform synagogue. It accepts non-Jewish students as well as Jews, and some rich, trendy, Gentile yuppies send their kids there. The tuition is $15,000 a year for pre-kindergarten kiddies and $20,000 for sixth graders. Two weeks ago, just a week before Mother's Day, the students at Rodeph Sholom were sent home with notes informing their parents that in the interests of Political Correctness there no longer would be any observances of Mother's Day or Father's Day at the school. Previously the younger children had designed Mother's Day and Father's Day cards in class, and there had been other school programs of activities in connection with these two holidays.

The note sent home with the students announcing the end of these programs said, among other things:

Families in our society are now diverse and varied. We are a school with many different family makeups, and we need to recognize the emotional well-being of all the children in our school.

The note went on to say that the recognition of holidays such as Mother's Day and Father's Day:

may not be a positive experience for all children.

Well, many parents complained, and what emerged more clearly was that the dropping of Mother's Day and Father's Day was intended to avoid making children living in homosexual households -- that is, children with "two mommies" or "two daddies" feel left out. Actually, a more important reason for the move was to avoid offending the homosexuals who were paying the very substantial tuition for these unfortunate children. One of these homosexuals, who with his male partner had an adopted son at the school, came forward and boasted that he had persuaded the school to drop its Mother's Day observance.

You know, I referred to this bit of nuttiness at Rodeph Sholom Day School as "amusing" because it is an example of the Jews' own chickens coming home to roost. What they are doing to destroy our society is deliberate. It's calculated. It's the sort of thing they've done in every Gentile society through the ages. Their aim is to break down the structure of our society, make our people abandon our values and our morals and forget our traditions, eventually forget who we are. Their aim is to get White kids to wear backward baseball caps and baggy shorts and listen to rap music and worship Black rappers and basketball players. Their aim is to get teenaged White girls to have Black boyfriends. That is the softening-up process they use to make it easier for them to take over our society and exploit our people. Promoting the notion that homosexuality is "normal" and that every sort of freak must have his feelings protected -- that everyone else must be prevented from doing or saying anything that may offend a freak or make him feel like a freak -- is part of the process.

The core idea the Jews are insinuating into the minds of our people is that no sexual orientation, no race, no set of moral values, no type of family structure, no standard of beauty, no cultural tradition -- that is, no art, no music, no literature -- is better than any other. They're all equivalent. A "family" consisting of two adult homosexuals and an adopted child is just as "normal," just as deserving of public acceptance and respect -- and insurance benefits -- as a family consisting of a White man and a White woman and their natural children. Under the skin Blacks and Whites are the same. A painting by Rembrandt or Vermeer has no more inherent artistic value than the daubings of a Chagall or a Rothko.

That's the message -- and its corollary, of course, is that we all should let our guard down against the Jews. We should not be suspicious of them. We shouldn't regard them as different or dangerous and try to keep them out. We shouldn't try to stop them from taking over. They may seem a little different, but that's only superficial. Really, we're all equivalent. No group is better than any other group.

Indoctrinating a host population with that poisonous message has been the Jews' key to taking over, sucking dry, and destroying society after society. Let me elaborate on that statement about the Jews' modus operandi. It is also their modus vivendi. It seems almost to be genetically programmed survival behavior. Destruction is not their primary goal, but rather sucking. But the fact is that the method they use for softening up a society so that they can suck its blood is inherently destructive. When they approach any healthy, homogeneous society, in which the people have a strong sense of identity and community, the Jews are outsiders. They are different, and they are regarded with suspicion. If they try sucking any blood, they'll be slapped down hard.

So their first task is to undermine the people's sense of community and identity and at the same time to destroy their homogeneity, to make the society more diverse. Then the Jews can slip in unnoticed and take over. But by that time the society no longer is healthy; it has been poisoned. The people no longer have the will to resist.

The Jews are unique. Their modus operandi is unique. That's one of the reasons they have been so successful at breaking into other people's societies. Their hosts -- their victims -- aren't prepared to counter them. We've experienced nothing quite like the Jews during our evolution. They take us by surprise every time. But even a people as different from us as the Jews have some characteristics in common with us. Most human societies have some characteristics in common. Certain characteristics are essential for group survival in all societies. A sense of group identity and exclusiveness, for example. The Jews have it to an extraordinary degree, and we used to have it before the Jews went to work on us. Another common survival characteristic is a strong family structure.

When the Jews set out to undermine these characteristics in us, they inevitably become affected to some extent by their own poison. That's what happened to the Rodeph Sholom Day School, for example. They think it's fine to promote families with two mommies or two daddies among us, but they are not so happy when that sort of pathology also takes hold among them.

You may be surprised to hear this, but sometimes I receive letters of protest from Jewish listeners. They tell me, "Hey, we're not all like the Jews you talk about in your broadcasts. Some of us are decent, hardworking family people, who are as unhappy with what's happening to America as you are. Don't blame all of us for what a few are doing. We're not all like Sumner Redstone and Gerald Levin and Michael Eisner and David Geffen and Steven Spielberg. We're not all like Madeleine Albright and Elie Wiesel and Marc Rich and Ariel Sharon."

Well, I can accept that. There are somewhere between six and seven million Jews in the United States: about two and a half percent of the population. One expects a lot of variety among that many Jews. There are the evil monsters -- the Sumner Redstones and the Steven Spielbergs -- working day and night to weaken and mislead and corrupt our people in order to make us easier prey for their people. And there are many Jews who pay very little attention to what the Redstones and the Spielbergs are doing. They're too busy just tending to their own affairs.

And I'm sure that some of those hardworking Jews are not happy that they're being splashed with the same filth that the Redstones and the Spielbergs are happily heaping onto their Gentile neighbors. They may be somewhat less likely to be affected than the Gentiles, just as many

venomous reptiles are immune to their own venom, but still it is clear that some of the Jewish parents of children at Rodeph Sholom Day School on New York's Upper West Side are not pleased that their kiddies are being taught that it's just as good to have two daddies who bugger each other in the living room as it is to have a traditional family with a natural father and a natural mother living together.

I should tell you, however, that although I understand their feelings, I am not especially sympathetic. Sumner Redstone and Elie Wiesel and Madeleine Albright haven't done their damage just by working alone, as individuals. They have worked as members of the Jewish community, the Jewish tribe. Without the support of their tribe they could not have made such a cesspit of our society. Sumner Redstone's earliest predecessors were pushcart peddlers in New York. The pushcart peddlers formed the basis on which the next generation of pawnbrokers began accumulating money. And the pawn brokers led to bigger moneylenders and then to the big investment bankers, with the power to finance wars and revolutions. And then came the master corrupters, like MTV owner Redstone, with billions of dollars to buy television networks and newspaper chains and film studios.

And even with his billions, Redstone couldn't corrupt America's teenagers by himself. His whole media empire is staffed from top to bottom with members of his tribe. It is the unhappy parents of the Jewish kiddies at Rodeph Sholom Day School who form the manpower pool from which the Redstones draw their recruits. You can't help your fellow tribesmen make a cesspit out of the society you're living in and hope to avoid the stink entirely. And the fact is that it's not just a few billionaire Jews making our society stink. Nearly every time a case comes to light involving large-scale fraud or vice or corruption, there are Jews playing the lead roles. For a minority making up only two and a half percent of the U.S. population, their involvement in vice and corruption is really phenomenal. As a race we certainly have our own weaknesses and vices, but the Jews seem to be attracted irresistibly to our vices so that they can exploit them and at the same time exacerbate them.

There's a sensational example of this in a trial that just began this week in the U.S. District Court in Atlanta. It's the racketeering trial of Gold Club owner Steve Kaplan and some of his associates. Kaplan's rise to wealth and power in the vice industry follows the classic Jewish pattern. His father was a magazine peddler in New York's Grand Central Station. Young Steve lusted after money and status, and he cultivated his father's underworld contacts to get himself started as a nightclub operator. Eventually he was able to buy into Atlanta's Gold Club, and then in 1994 he elbowed his co-owner out.

Under Kaplan's ownership the Gold Club became the principal vice club in Atlanta. Featuring nude dancers and overpriced drinks, it became a favorite hangout for Atlanta's degenerate yuppie set. Then Kaplan began inviting Black basketball players to the Gold Club, giving them free drinks. Soon he began pressuring the White strippers he employed as entertainers to have sex with the Black basketball players he invited. The White yuppies would come to the Gold Club to socialize with Black basketball stars, such as Dennis Rodman, Patrick Ewing, and Charles Oakley, and Kaplan would provide White girls to the Blacks to keep them coming back. He made his club into a multicultural brothel: White girls for Black celebrities. He also engaged in credit-card fraud, loan sharking, and the bribery of local police and politicians.

Atlanta, of course, had brothels and corruption even before the Jews began flocking there after the Second World War and made it the New York of the South. And there are topless and bottomless honky-tonks owned by Gentiles in many American cities. But it was Jews who multiculturalized prostitution, just as it was Jews who multiculturalized professional sports, and Jews who built up commercialized sex into such a huge business. The latter two activities have had an enormous boost from the Jewish media, of course.

My point is that while vice is by no means exclusively Jewish, Jews have exploited it far out of proportion to their numbers, and they have been the principal agents of change in multiculturalizing it. We'll get quite a few instructive tidbits in this regard during the Kaplan trial, which is expected to last several months.

Don't expect to see Kaplan behind bars when it is over, however. He has $50 million to defend himself, and, for a Jew, being tried in Atlanta is the next best thing to being tried in New York. The Jews have the court system in both places pretty well skewed in their favor. An indicator of this is that Kaplan is still out on bond, despite the fact that as a loan shark he ordered the beatings of at least 20 people who failed to make a payment on time, and in the current case he has sent people out to track down and intimidate potential witnesses against him. But the judge clearly believes that this nice Jewish boy doesn't need to be locked up to keep him out of mischief during his trial. And just in case the jurors need to be reminded that Kaplan is entitled to special consideration because all Jews are victims of bigotry, in his opening statement on Tuesday of this week Kaplan's lawyer, Steve Sadow, told the court that the only reason Kaplan is being prosecuted is that he is "a stereotypical New York Jew."

The lawyer for a Black Atlanta cop who is one of Kaplan's codefendants took a similar approach. The cop is a defendant because he took bribes from Kaplan and tipped off Kaplan whenever a license inspection or other visit from city officials to the Gold Club was scheduled. His lawyer complained that the trial is "racist" because all of the sports celebrities the prosecution plans to call as witnesses -- the sports celebrities who had free sex with Kaplan's White strippers -- are Black.

You know, I really don't like people like Steve Kaplan or his lawyer. I wouldn't like them even if they weren't involved in the corrupting of our people. There's something about stereotypical New York Jews that rubs me the wrong way. I don't like them at all. I don't want them around me or my people. I doubt very much that I would like the people who run Rodeph Sholom Day School, even if they weren't busy spreading the notion that homosexual families are "normal" and ought to be accepted. And even when it comes to Jews of the sort who write me to protest that they aren't like the Jews I talk about in my broadcasts, I never can forget that they are in fact still Jews. They are members of Steve Kaplan's tribe, and without the tribe Steve Kaplan wouldn't be able to do what he does. They may tell me that they don't approve of Kaplan, but in fact I see too many Kaplans in their tribe, and I don't see any real effort on the part of the rank-and-file tribe members to change that.

In Israel they are able to do exactly what they want, to make their own laws to suit themselves, and people like Kaplan flourish there. Israel is the world center of the White slave trade. In Israel it isn't illegal to own slaves, to buy and sell human beings, so long as they aren't Jews. White

women -- our women -- are kidnapped from eastern Europe and taken to Israel to be used the way Kaplan uses White women in Atlanta. Kaplan really would be at home in Israel. I think we ought to send him there. I also think that we ought to send the people who run the Rodeph Sholom Day School there. I think that we ought to send the rest of the members of the tribe there too, even the ones who tell me they don't approve of people like Kaplan. I think that we ought to give them one warning: release all of your White slaves, turn over all of your illegal nuclear weapons, close down your illegal biological warfare laboratories, and behave yourselves. Otherwise we'll put a quick and permanent end to your mischief. And I think that we ought to stick to our word.

A Riot in York

Thirty-two years ago, back in the summer of 1969, the Blacks were rioting in York, Pennsylvania, just as they had rioted in many other American cities during the 1960s, with the encouragement of liberal and Jewish elements in the media, the government, and the universities. Democratic President Lyndon Johnson, just six months out of the White House, had provided an enormous stimulus to this Black disorder during his administration with his so-called "Great Society" programs of special rights and special governmental protections for Blacks.

The general feeling among Blacks in 1969 was that the White man was too soft and too comfortable to fight, and that he could be persuaded to buy them off if they raised enough hell. Certainly, this had been their experience during the past few years. Every time they burned an American city, the White politicians and the White businessmen not only would not punish them but would offer them more handouts and more privileges in an effort to persuade them not to riot again. White businessmen especially, always calculating which policy would yield them more profit, would rather buy the Blacks off than have them hurt business with more rioting. And the White politicians, of course, always danced to whatever tune the media were playing, which definitely was a pro-Black tune. So it is not surprising that the motto of Black leaders at the time was, "We've got the White man on the run. Let's keep him running." And so they rioted and burned and looted in one American city after another during the 1960s.

And they were rioting in York, Pennsylvania, in July 1969. On July 18 a 22-year-old White policeman, Henry Schaad, was shot dead by Black rioters in York. Another White policeman in York, Charles Robertson, furious over the murder of his colleague, is alleged to have given rifle cartridges to a young White man he knew and told him that he hoped he would kill as many rioters as possible. Three days after the murder of Henry Schaad, on July 21, a Black woman was shot to death, presumably by one of several White men firing at the car in which she was riding. No one ever was convicted for either killing.

Today Charles Robertson is the elected mayor of York -- and he has just been indicted by an ambitious York County district attorney for the killing of the Black woman in the rioting 32 years ago. Mayor Robertson is not accused of actually shooting the Negress himself, but of being an accessory to the shooting by encouraging White resistance to the Black rioters with his statements and by giving ammunition to one young White man.

Now, in 1969 a charge of that sort wouldn't have flown at all. It would have been laughed out of court. In 1969 Whites still believed that they had a right to fight back when Blacks rioted and began killing White policemen. Whites still believed that they had a right to protect themselves and their families. White policemen still believed that they had a right to express their feelings about Black rioters -- and in fact, to say whatever they wanted to say. But that was 32 years ago. In the past 32 years the demographics of York County has changed -- the demographics of the whole country has changed, has become darker -- and so has the attitude of the public toward such issues as free speech and self-defense. Thirty-two years of Jewish television propaganda has taken a toll.

Today Jews and liberals -- both Democrat and Republican liberals -- are just itching to prosecute Whites for things they couldn't have prosecuted them for successfully in the 1960s. They are enormously proud of themselves for having won a conviction a few days ago against a White man accused of bombing a Black church in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1969. But this itch to prosecute goes far beyond shootings and bombings. Today they want to prosecute people for Political Incorrectness. They're not quite ready to say that in public, but whenever they can find a case they believe they may be able to win, where they can call it something other than Political Incorrectness, where they can stretch things a bit and call it something else -- say, being an accessory to homicide -- they'll go for it. So today the prosecution of the White mayor of York is a cause célèbre among Pennsylvania Jews and liberals -- especially Republican liberals, because Charles Robertson is a Democrat.

If we look back 32 years, the White liberals who today are so smugly pleased with themselves for having indicted Mayor Charles Robertson were campus liberals in 1969. They were occupying deans' offices, demanding more Black faculty members, burning their draft cards, cheering Black rioters, and generally tearing up our society. Charles Robertson was a working-class White cop whose job it was to keep our society from being torn up. Sometimes he was called on to drag White liberals kicking and screaming from a dean's office. Sometimes he had to thump one of these young, White liberals with his nightstick. They called him "pig" and screamed curses at him. They hated him for doing his job. Today, as liberal district attorneys and judges and newspaper editors, they are getting even.

Actually, it's much worse than that. When Mayor Robertson was indicted, members of my organization, the National Alliance, distributed some of our publications in York. We often distribute our materials in an area where some relevant current issue already has caught the attention of the public. Usually the materials we distribute are topical, focusing on the current issue, but sometimes we distribute materials with a more general message, and that was the case in York. We didn't have a topical leaflet prepared, so our members posted a few hundred signs around York bearing a general pro-White message. We thought that it would be good for the people of York to know that amid all the liberal gloating over the indictment of their mayor, there still are many White people who don't feel bad about being White.

The signs we posted in York a couple of days ago bore the simple message: "Earth's most endangered species: the White race. Help preserve it." That's all that was on our signs, except for information about contacting the National Alliance. Nothing inflammatory. Nothing provocative. Nothing that should be offensive to anyone, Black or White. And yet the liberals went berserk. The local newspaper, the *York Daily Record*, screamed about our "racist signs," referred to the National Alliance as a "hate group," and then quoted approvingly the local president of the NAACP -- the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People -- who suggested that the National Alliance is a dangerous organization that the citizens of York should be wary of. Of our signs he said:

There are enough people in the general populace that don't subscribe to this kind of talk. It's offensive to them and what they believe.

Did you catch the irony in that? The local president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People finds the signs of the National Alliance calling for the preservation of the White race to be offensive and says that there are many people in the general population who also find them offensive. But of course, they certainly don't find the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People offensive, do they?

Well, the *York Daily Record* didn't find any irony in the statement by the president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that our signs calling for the preservation of the White race are offensive. And the sad fact is that many of the White citizens of York also didn't find any irony there either. The majority of the Whites in York, just as everywhere, are lemmings. They don't think, except as the controlled media tell them to think. They find offensive whatever the media -- whatever their authority figures -- tell them they should find offensive. But they certainly don't think about it. They certainly don't ask themselves why preserving the White race should be offensive, but advancing colored people should not be offensive. It would frighten and confuse them terribly if anyone -- the National Alliance, for example -- tried to make them think about such things. They are much more comfortable just parroting the party line, and that party line, in its essence, is, "Whites are bad, Blacks are good."

That may sound simplistic -- and of course, the mass media are careful never to state it that clearly -- but in fact that is precisely the essence of the message with which they have been brainwashing the White public, not just in York, but everywhere, during the past 32 years and more. And the brainwashing has been effective, which is why the liberal establishment has decided that it is now politically advantageous to prosecute Mayor Charles Robertson when it wasn't politically advantageous to do so 32 years ago.

And it's also why no one in the York political establishment is interested in finding and prosecuting the murderer or murderers of White policeman Henry Schaad. Eight other White men besides Mayor Robertson have been indicted in the past few days by the York district attorney, but all of the indictments have been in connection with the shooting of the Negress 32 years ago. No one has been indicted for the murder of Henry Schaad. I have a strong suspicion that I could walk into the York County prosecutor's office with a videotaped confession from a Black who shot Henry Schaad on July 18, 1969, and no one in the prosecutor's office would be interested.

And I suspect that the same lack of interest would be displayed by everyone at the *York Daily Record.* Prosecuting a Black for the 32-year-old murder of a White cop -- or writing about it -- simply would not be politically advantageous. In fact, nearly every news report I have read about the background of the arrest of Mayor Robertson fails even to mention the murder of Henry Schaad. They focus entirely on the Negress who was shot three days after Schaad, and they paint the whole thing as just another instance of racist Whites victimizing poor, inoffensive Blacks.

A good example is the account in this week's issue of *Newsweek* magazine. There's no mention of the murder of Henry Schaad by Black rioters on July 18. Instead, *Newsweek* deceptively suggests that the riot was caused by the shooting of the Negress on July 21, that the Blacks of York were all happily and peacefully behaving themselves until a Black woman was murdered

on July 21, and that's what started the riot. The *Newsweek* story -- that's on page 30 of the May 28 issue -- states that then-policeman Charles Robertson has been charged with:

supplying White gang members with bullets, urging one to "kill as many n-----rs as you can," and fomenting a race riot.

That really makes it sound like the riot didn't start until Robertson had given cartridges to a White gang member and urged him to start killing Blacks, doesn't it? But in fact the riot had been underway for some time, and the Black rioters already had murdered Robertson's colleague Henry Schaad at the time Robertson is accused of "fomenting a race riot."

Do you think that was just sloppy reporting by *Newsweek?* I don't think so. I think it was a deliberate attempt to deceive, a deliberate attempt to place the blame for the riot on White racists, a deliberate attempt to continue the brainwashing of the White public with the "White is bad, Black is good" party line.

Well, we already had a pretty good idea that the media people and the politicians are liars and crooks. What is much more worrisome is the current state of mind of the lemmings. I mentioned a minute ago -- and I've mentioned on many earlier broadcasts -- lemmings don't think, and lemmings make up the great majority of our population: probably around 97 percent. Of course, when I say lemmings don't think, I am oversimplifying. Lemmings aren't necessarily stupid; it's just that they are constitutionally incapable of forming or holding an opinion that is contrary to their perception of what the people around them believe -- and their perception comes from their television screens. They worship authority, and the faces and voices that speak to them with such certainty and self-confidence from their television screens are their authorities. And the same thing applies to the other mass media, not just television.

Take someone who reads *Newsweek* magazine for example, an intelligent lemming -- a stockbroker or a high school teacher or a small businessman, but still a lemming -- and tell him that the story about York's Mayor Charles Robertson has been deliberately falsified. He won't believe you. Show him original accounts of the riot from 1969 newspapers. These newspapers are still available. The lemming still won't believe you. Instead he will become confused and frightened. You are trying to prove his authority wrong! You are trying to make him believe something contrary to his authority, something contrary to what all his peers believe! That's very disturbing indeed to someone who all his life has been an unquestioning slave to ideological fashion.

Then tell your lemming -- your stockbroker or high school teacher or small businessman -- that the reason *Newsweek* magazine lies about important issues, such as racial conflicts, is that it is under Jewish control, that it is owned by Katherine Meyer Graham's Washington Post Company, and that like all of the Jewish mass media its aim is to undermine White solidarity, White self-confidence, the White sense of identity and community, and to instill feelings of White guilt and White self-hatred in its readers, so that they will not resist Jewish domination of their society.

Tell him that, and you will see the light of understanding go on in his eyes. Aha! You are one of those awful anti-Semites he has been told about! You are one of those terrible White racists, the

very worst possible kind of person! Aha! Now he understands why you are refusing to believe the story in *Newsweek*, a story all right-thinking citizens should believe! Now he understands why you are trying to confuse and frighten him! And you will hear a loud "clang!" as his mind slams shut.

Try it, and that's what you will experience. Actually, I know that many of you, perhaps most of you, already have had that experience. That is the terrible reality of human nature, the terrible reality of lemminghood. The story in the *York Daily Record* I quoted earlier gleefully described the reaction of many of York's White citizens to our signs with the message, "Earth's most endangered species: the White race; help preserve it." They were frightened and disturbed, the newspaper reported. They began tearing down all of the signs they could find. They called the police to report the signs. Within a day, the newspaper proudly said, most of our signs had been destroyed.

And I suppose that the mass media have a right to be proud. Thirty years ago the White citizens of York wouldn't have reacted that way to our signs: perhaps not even ten years ago. The change in attitude, the increase in feelings of White guilt and self-hatred, the enormous increase in the fear of being thought a "racist," all have been wrought by the mass media in a well planned and carefully orchestrated campaign of brainwashing, a campaign made feasible only by Jewish control of the most important and powerful elements of the media.

I told you that the lemmings are frightened by our signs. Well, I am frightened by the lemmings. I am frightened because I know where this Jewish brainwashing campaign is headed ultimately. It is headed toward our total enslavement and then our annihilation as a race, as a threat to Jewish supremacy. The lemmings already have been brought to the point where they are ready to abandon the First Amendment. They are ready to have "speech crime" laws enacted, so that they will not be confused and frightened by Politically Incorrect speech, such as my "Earth's most endangered species" signs. A good third of them believe now that such speech -- what York's NAACP president would call "offensive" speech -- already is illegal. That's why they call the police when they see one of my signs. My estimate is that another third believe that offensive speech should be made illegal. Lemmings already have memorized the media argument that the First Amendment never was meant to protect offensive speech. They will tell you that talking about preserving the White race is like shouting "fire!" in a crowded theatre. It offends people of color; it might start a riot. Therefore, it should be outlawed. The Constitution was never meant to protect speech that might start a riot.

That is where things are headed. That is where the masters of the controlled media have been headed from the beginning, despite their deceptive pretense of supporting free speech. America is almost there. Most of the lemmings are ready. They have been slaves to ideological fashion all their lives. Lemmings are slaves by nature. They certainly don't need free speech. It only confuses and frightens them. They will be happy to see an end to it.

What about the rest of us: the two or three percent of the population who aren't lemmings? What about those of us who value freedom, those of us willing to fight and kill and risk our own lives in support of freedom? Events such as those taking place in York, Pennsylvania, now can only be worrisome to us. The fearful reaction of so many of the White citizens of York to the National

Alliance's signs can only be worrisome. The threat of the enactment of "speech crime" laws, followed by a government crackdown on all American dissidents and the imposition of total Jewish tyranny is worrisome. And the fact that most of our fellow citizens will happily obey the tyrants and will help in the suppression of anyone -- like us -- who opposes the tyrants is most worrisome of all: the fact that we will be obliged to fight against the majority of our own people.

But we still do have our freedom for a while. The tyrants who are itching to silence us and impose their rule on us still must hide behind a pretense of support for freedom. Let us use our time well, the time when we still can speak the truth and can organize and build for the future without having to break the law or shed blood. Let us not be silenced by fear at a time when silence is not yet demanded of us by tyrants. Let us speak out boldly now -- not to the lemmings, of course, but to those capable of thinking for themselves, to those who value their freedom. Talk to them about the deliberate deception in *Newsweek* magazine, about the irony in the claim by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that our signs calling for the preservation of the White race are "offensive." Talk to them about this broadcast. Make those who are not afraid of thinking think.

Let us speak out. Let us organize. Let us build our strength now, while we still have our freedom, for the coming struggle against those who will attempt to take our freedom away from us. That struggle is surely coming, and it almost is upon us.

Scalp Dance

I've been reading one of the new books that my sponsor, National Vanguard Books, has just added to its catalog. It's *Scalp Dance,* by Thomas Goodrich, and it's a history of the conflict between Plains Indians and White settlers moving west in the years immediately after the American Civil War, between about 1865 and 1879. Much of the book consists of eyewitness accounts by White soldiers, scouts, and settlers involved in the conflict. The book is interesting to me for its information on that period of our history: information about the hardships that our ancestors overcame in conquering this country and building a civilization here, information about the courage and tenacity and ingenuity they displayed in fighting against a ferocious and cruel foe.

The book also is interesting as an anthropological study, a study of the racial differences, the behavioral differences, the differences in mentality and attitude between the Indians and the Whites. One of these differences of most immediate concern to our ancestors was the almost unbelievable cruelty and sadism of the Indians. The fate of White captives almost invariably was much worse than death: it involved hideous and prolonged torture and mutilation, and for the women, gang rape as well.

The deceitfulness of the Indians also was something that took getting used to. The Indians have often complained that the Great White Father in Washington didn't keep his promises, and of course, that's still true. Politicians always have spoken with forked tongues. But the lies of the White politicians were nothing compared to the everyday deceit and trickery of the Indians. The Plains Indians quickly learned that many of the Whites freshly arrived from the east had been indoctrinated with liberal propaganda about the "noble savage" in their schools and churches. These innocents headed west with their heads pumped full of foolish notions about the basic decency of the Indians and determined to be fair in all their dealings with them.

When a group of Indians spotted a wagon train of such prospective settlers unaccompanied by soldiers or experienced scouts, they would approach with smiles and other indications of friendly intent, sometimes waving a white flag. Almost certainly there were good Christian souls in those wagon trains who told their husbands, "Put away your rifle, you fool! Can't you see that they're friendly? If you're holding a rifle, that will just provoke them." When the Indians got close enough to evaluate the situation fully, they either would strike immediately or mix with the prospective settlers and wait for the opportune moment to begin cutting throats and taking scalps. Then, after a day or so of amusing themselves raping the White women and listening to the screams of the White men staked out on the ground with a small fire burning at their crotches, they would move on and leave the scraps for the wolves and coyotes. Such fools soon enough were weeded out of those Whites who settled in the plains and survived Indian attacks, but there seemed to be an inexhaustible supply of them back East, where the preachers continued pumping new heads full of dangerous nonsense. It's really too bad that the preachers and other propagandists of the "noble savage" school didn't head west themselves to try out their ideas on real savages.

This is the aspect of *Scalp Dance* that I found most interesting. One can see some fascinating parallels between the experiences of our pioneer ancestors and what's happening to us today. Basically we White Americans today are the same people as those White pioneers pushing west 130 years ago and fighting the Indians for the right to do so. Probably we're not as tough as they were, because our lives have been softer than theirs were even before they started west from Philadelphia or Boston or Baltimore. And dysgenic breeding certainly must have lowered our quality a trifle: kids who wouldn't have survived long enough to breed then are the most prolific element in the overmedicated, overprotected White population today. But still, today we're about 90 percent of what we were in 1870.

Back then we got our act together and pretty well took care of our Indian problem. It cost us a huge amount of pain and tears and blood, but we prevailed. We destroyed the savages, we conquered the land for our people, and since then five generations of our people have lived on that land. Today, however, we have problems that in some ways are very similar to our Indian problem then. The difference is that today we're not getting our act together.

As I said, we licked the Plains Indians; we gave them a beating from which they never recovered and never will. Today the mongrels, the mestizos, pouring across our southern border are related to them, of course: they're a similar sort of Indian, along with some Spanish admixture. If we had our act together we'd stop that mestizo invasion in its tracks, and then we'd clean out every one of them who has managed to sneak across in the last 50 years, along with all the descendants of those who sneaked across, regardless of whether they were born south of the border or north of the border. We'd herd them back across the border the same way we herded the Plains Indians onto reservations. And the mestizos would stay south of the border, because we would stop playing the silly games the U.S. Border Patrol plays with them today. Even if one did manage to get across without being shot, what could he do? He would be recognized immediately, just because he wouldn't be White, and then he'd be shot.

That is the way our ancestors who whipped the Plains Indians would have dealt with the mestizo invasion. Of course, the reason the mestizos are invading our country today is because our ancestors whipped the Plains Indians. It's not just that the Plains Indians would have as gladly scalped any mestizos as White men coming into their territory, it is that after our ancestors whipped the Indians they built a civilization on the prairie, with farms and ranches and towns and railroads. They made the prairie productive in a way that neither the Plains Indians nor the mestizos ever could. It was after the Whites had eliminated the danger of being scalped and had created wealth north of the border that the mestizos came pouring across, hoping to share in the White man's wealth.

Which is to say that, when our ancestors solved their Indian problem, they prepared the way for our mestizo problem today. That's the way the world always has been: one problem always leads to another, and there never is a time without problems or dangers or struggle. The objective always must be to survive, to assure the survival of one's people, to prevail, and to grow stronger, so that one's people can overcome the next problem.

So why aren't we prevailing today, when our ancestors would have? I said a moment ago that they got their act together, and we don't seem to be able to do that. What does that mean, specifically?

Certainly, our ancestors had weaknesses, and they made mistakes. They weren't an ideal bunch of survivors, by any standard. Because their government was a democracy, it was corrupt, with politicians then, just as today, concerned almost entirely with being elected or re-elected and willing to say or do anything to that end. But at least the politicians then couldn't expect to win many votes by catering to non-White minorities or to homosexuals or to feminists, and there were almost no Jews in the country.

In the eastern cities there were many muddle-headed liberals, including many in the schools, teaching the equality of races and individuals. We had just gone through a horribly bloody and destructive civil war, in which the notion of racial equality had infected the minds of many citizens on the winning side, although by no means a majority of them. We had Christian preachers, then as now, morally disarming our people by preaching that the Indians were our "brothers" and that we just needed to be nice to them, and then they would be nice to us. We had newspapers insinuating this poison into the minds of our people. But we didn't have television, and not even the newspapers were unanimous in their liberalism.

Most important, there was no hostile element inside our ranks strong enough to consolidate our weaknesses and to exacerbate them to the point where we became powerless in the face of our external enemies. We had, for all practical purposes, no Jews, and the Jews who already were here had not yet fastened their grip on our mass media. That is the key difference between then and now.

Many of our people were confused then and had wacky ideas. Many of them had sectarian grievances against their fellow Whites as a result of the Civil War or that they had brought over from Europe with them, and these sectarian or nationalist grievances were more bitter than any grievances they might develop against the Indians. We had traitors among our own people: businessmen who sold rifles to the Indians so long as they could do so at a profit.

But we had no malevolent element working to turn all of these weaknesses against us and destroy us. These weaknesses were not glorified and preached to our children and to our young people with the intent of crippling them morally. We did not have a strongly coherent, racially self-conscious minority in our midst promoting policies intended to increase alienation among our people, intended to weaken our sense of identity, intended to undermine our feelings of solidarity with our own people, intended to keep us confused and divided and make us easy prey for this predatory minority.

We did not have Jewish television. We did not have Sumner Redstone and MTV. We did not Michael Eisner and the Weinstein brothers and their films promoting racial mixing and homosexuality and feminism. We did not have Gerald Levin and his Warner record companies promoting rap music among impressionable young Whites. We did not have a Jew-dominated Madison Avenue promoting all of the same, destructive filth in magazine advertising. We did not have a Jewish lobby controlling the political process and the government in this country. Our

university campuses were not in the grip of Political Correctness. The teachers and administrators in our public schools were not forced to march in ideological lockstep, forced to indoctrinate the kids in their charge with the same sort of lies and poison with which their parents were being indoctrinated by television.

Again: we did not have Jewish television then, and we do have it today. That is why we were able to get our act together in 1870 and beat the Plans Indians and claim the prairies for our people, and it is why we are not able to get our act together today and can only stand by in confused helplessness as the mestizos swarm into America and take back the land that our ancestors won for us with so much blood and pain and sacrifice and heroism.

That's the same reason we let Blacks and Asians infest our schools and can't figure how to stop it. It's the reason we let our cities go to hell as the Blacks take them over. It's the reason we let them commit outrage after outrage against our people and don't know what to do about it except give them more welfare and other unearned benefits. If in 1870 Blacks had gone on a rampage the way they did in Cincinnati a few weeks ago or in Seattle a few weeks before that, beating White women senseless, we would have simply cleaned them out. There wouldn't be a Black left alive in a city where they had done that sort of thing. Today we just watch them destroy our country and brutalize our women while we sit on our hands in confusion.

Every vice and weakness we had in 1870 we have a hundred times worse today -- and today we have a satanically clever and vicious gang of predators orchestrating those vices and coordinating those weaknesses in order to keep us morally paralyzed and unable to resist their predation.

You know, I've had a number of people tell me that if permit ourselves to become a minority in America during the next few decades, as the demographers predict, it will be because we aren't fit enough to survive. If the Blacks and mestizos and Vietnamese and Koreans are taking our country away from us, it's because they're more fit than we are, and this land will be the breeding ground for future generations of their people instead of ours. More to the point is the claim that if we let the Jews come into our country, infiltrate our society, gain monopoly control of our mass media, and then use that control to paralyze and to destroy us, it is proof that they are the fitter race, and it is proper for them to replace us as masters of the planet.

Some people tell me that in a smug, mocking sort of way. They're the totally alienated, the people who don't care at all who is master of the planet except as it affects them as individuals, and who think it's funny that I or anyone else should be worried what happens to our race after we die. But others are quite serious when they say to me: "Doesn't the fact that the Jews were able to sneak in and get control of our media and then our government, that they are able to persuade our women to sleep with Blacks, that they are able to make 200 million White lemmings parrot whatever nonsense the Jews choose to feed them through their television screens, that they are able to do all of these things to us while we do nothing in response -- doesn't this prove that the Jews are smarter than we are, superior to us as a race, and more fit to survive? Doesn't that mean that our extinction and the Jews' survival will be in accord with the natural order?"

Well, let's look at it another way. Suppose that you are driving with your wife or girlfriend along a city freeway late at night, and you accidentally take a wrong exit and find yourself driving through a Black neighborhood, with Blacks swarming all over the streets and sidewalks. And then you have a flat tire. And because of the restrictive laws in your state you don't even have a firearm in your car to protect yourself. And when the Blacks realize your predicament, they surround your car and begin smashing the windows with bricks, so that they can pull you and your woman out. Does this in itself mean that the Blacks are superior to you?

Imagine that your child is playing in your yard. A neighbor's pit bull gets loose from his chain, comes into your yard, attacks your child, and mauls him to death. Does this prove that the pit bull, as a breed, is superior to you and your kind, as a breed?

In a sense, whoever survives in such an encounter is superior to the loser. But we ought to look at the matter in a broader framework before we draw final conclusions. We know that, as a breed, we can destroy the pit bulls of the world as a breed whenever we decide that's what we ought to do. We know that the only reason the Blacks are a danger to us now is that there are other forces involved over which the Blacks have no control.

It is true that the Jews slipped in, got the advantage over us, and now are pushing us rapidly toward extinction -- but we aren't there yet. If we give up now -- if we say, "Oh, look, the Jews have gotten the advantage over us," and then we do nothing about that -- then we have proved ourselves unfit to survive. But in fact, the Jews' advantage is a precarious one, based entirely on their control of the mass media of news and entertainment. If they lose that control, then they also lose their control over our government, and then they will be the ones headed for extinction.

They understand that, of course, and they are determined to hang on. An amusing example of this occurred just a few days ago, when there was a series of changes of executive personnel in the media giant NBC. NBC itself is divided into news and entertainment divisions. The president of NBC News, Andrew Lack, moved up to become president of NBC. Neal Shapiro, executive producer of "Dateline NBC," moved up to become president of NBC News. Jonathan Wald, who was the executive producer of the show "NBC Nightly News" will take over NBC's "Today Show." Jeff Zucker, who held the "Today Show" position earlier, is now president of NBC's entertainment division. And so on, for many other executive positions at NBC: a real game of musical chairs. The interesting thing is that all of the executives involved are Jews. And that's pretty much the way it is with the other media giants too. They really believe that they've got it all sewed up, and that no one can challenge them. That's why their propaganda has become so blatant recently.

But you know, things change. Sometimes they change unexpectedly and radically -- even things that seem to be all sewed up. And when the future of the race is at stake, I'm not the only one likely to do something radical.

One of the outstanding combat pilots of all time was Hans Ulrich Rudel. He logged more than 2500 combat missions during the Second World War and was the most highly decorated pilot of that war. He sank a Soviet battleship, and he destroyed more than 500 Soviet tanks. He was shot

down behind Soviet lines several times and was severely wounded. He finished the war flying with only one leg.

When he was down behind enemy lines, surrounded by Red Army troops advancing with submachine guns, his gunner surrendered and then perished in the *gulag.* But Rudel never surrendered, no matter how hopeless the situation seemed. His motto was: "Only he is lost who gives himself up for lost."

It is a motto that it would be well for those to ponder who believe that the Jews are so powerful that we never can force them to remove their fangs from our necks and then get them off our backs. "Only he is lost who gives himself up for lost."

Behind Liberalism

When anyone wants to eliminate a problem or overcome an obstacle, it's usually a big help to him to understand the nature of the problem or the obstacle. If he misunderstands the nature of the problem and bases his attempt to eliminate it on that misunderstanding, he's far more likely to fail than if he tackles the problem with a thorough understanding of its nature. That's self-evident, and probably my worst enemies would agree with me on that. And yet there are some very important problems that are frustrating us in our efforts to solve them simply because most of us have made no serious effort to understand their true nature. We have just assumed that the nature of the problems is self-evident when in fact it is not.

The most important example of this is the assumption that the reason our civilization is self-destructing is so-called "liberal" social and political policies. There is a general belief that we have a preponderance of liberals in our government, in the media, among school administrators, among Christian preachers, and so on, and that most of the White public goes along with the destructive policies of these leading liberals because most members of the public also are liberals.

And I'm using the word "liberal" to designate a person who has a particular set of beliefs, much in the way a Christian has a particular set of beliefs. That is, a Christian believes, among other things, that a man named Jesus of Nazareth, born approximately 2,000 years ago in Palestine, was the son of God; that he walked on water, resurrected the dead, and performed other miracles; and that after he was crucified at the demand of the Jews he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven. And a liberal believes, among other things, that all featherless bipeds are "equal" -- that is, that they all are born with the same potential and would be equal in their accomplishments if they all had the same advantages and opportunities.

And as I said, there is a very common assumption made that the ongoing destruction of our society and our civilization is the consequence of applying the fallacious belief system of the liberals to the formulation of public policy. But this very common assumption is incorrect -- or perhaps it would be better to say that it misses the point. Liberal policies certainly are destructive, but they aren't the ultimate driving force behind the assault on Western civilization and our race. And so any attempt to restore our society to health and save our civilization from ruin based on an effort to change the beliefs of liberals -- to convince liberals of the incorrectness of their ideas -- is likely to fail. It is likely to fail because the problem is only superficially, but not fundamentally, the consequence of a group of people -- namely, liberals -- basing their policies on a particular set of incorrect ideas, such as the innate equality of all featherless bipeds. The problem is not one of belief, but one of psychology, of human nature, and of the skillful psychological manipulation of that nature by hidden agents.

I am sure that there are real liberals: that is, people who have thought about the world around them and then consciously adopted the liberal ideology. They constitute a fraction of a percent of the people who adhere to liberal policies and pay lip service to liberal ideas. The rest -- that is, nearly all so-called "liberals" -- are liberals for the same reason that Catholics are Catholics and Lutherans are Lutherans and Buddhists are Buddhists. It has nothing to do with the ideologies of

the various religions and everything to do with psychology. With a few rare exceptions, a Catholic is not a Catholic because he has thought about the world around him and decided that Catholicism is what makes the most sense. He is a Catholic because his parents and his neighbors are Catholics. He is a Catholic -- or a Lutheran or a Buddhist -- because he is a lemming, and lemmings don't make up their own minds about anything. They believe -- really believe -- whatever they think the people around them believe.

With liberals today it's not so much a matter of believing what one's parents or neighbors believe as it is believing what one perceives to be fashionable in one's peer group, and the perception most often comes from one's television screen. It is possible to persuade an occasional liberal that his view of the world is incorrect and his policies are destructive and he should straighten out his thinking, just as it is possible to persuade an occasional Lutheran that Martin Luther really was the Antichrist and that Lutherans should beg the Pope for forgiveness and return to Holy Mother Church. It's a hard sell in either case. And as I said, it misses the point.

The point is this: Liberals are tools. Most of them are not inherently evil or destructive, any more than a hammer used to smash a statue by Phidias is evil or a match used to burn a great library is evil. Liberals are morally neutral, like the hammer and the match. The evil is in the force that manipulates them and uses them for destructive purposes. The evil is in the mind that plans the destruction and then uses the liberals to carry it out. And that force is the force that controls our mass media of news and entertainment. That mind is the mind that formulates the slant of the news and the content of the media entertainment; the mind that determines which news will be reported and how it will be reported, and which news will be suppressed; the mind that determines which trends will be made fashionable and which ideas will be deemed Politically Correct.

And it is that force, that mind, that malevolent spirit that we must counter: that we must be aware of in making our plan to restore our society to health and halt the ruin of our civilization. When I said a moment ago that our problem is not one of belief but one of psychology, of human nature, I meant that we should not focus our efforts on trying to change the beliefs of the liberals but rather on exposing and then destroying the malevolent entity that manipulates the liberals by exploiting their psychological compulsion to conform to perceived norms.

That's a fact, but as I said at the beginning, most people who are interested in eliminating the problem fail to see it that way. They still want to fight the liberals rather than the hidden force behind the liberals. What I'll do now is try to persuade you that my understanding of the nature of the problem is correct by providing a few examples or illustrations of the way in which the problem manifests itself.

We might note first the global nature of the problem, the global way in which it is being orchestrated. Almost everywhere one looks in the White world, one sees the same destructive forces at work, the same governmental policies, the same wrongheaded attitudes and fashions being promoted by the media. There are, of course, local differences of detail. The United States had a large population of Black slaves until 136 years ago, and no country in Europe has that sort of history. One would expect this difference to have a strong effect on racial attitudes and policies, but in fact the policies of governments throughout Europe and the party line promoted

by the mass media of news and entertainment throughout Europe are in broad outline the same as those in the United States.

The denial of racial differences and the doctrinaire promotion of egalitarianism are as much policies of the mass media and the government in Germany, in France, and in the United Kingdom, for example, as in the United States. Most European countries have no common border with a non-White country, as the United States does, and yet one sees the same insanely destructive policy regarding non-White immigration nearly everywhere in Europe that one sees in the United States. Nowhere is non-White immigration popular, and yet every government pursues a policy of bringing non-White immigrants into the country and then favoring and protecting them after they are in. One sees the same sort of corruption of the society by Turks, by Arabs, by Blacks, by Pakistanis, by Vietnamese, by Chinese, or by other non-Whites in the big cities of Sweden or Denmark or England as in the United States. The majority of the Whites everywhere are against it, while their supposedly democratic governments and the media are for it.

A good example of this is what's been happening in northern England recently, where Asian gangs have been attacking and terrorizing Whites, and the government and the media have been trying to blame it on "White racists," such as members of the British National Party, the BNP. In fact the dynamics of the current racial rioting in the Manchester, England, area and in nearby Leeds is remarkably similar to the racial conflicts we've seen in places like Seattle and Cincinnati recently in this country. In Seattle and Cincinnati, Blacks were attacking Whites -- specifically targeting Whites, especially young, White women, for vicious beatings fueled by racial hatred -- while the media tried hard to persuade the public that race had nothing to do with the attacks, and the politicians were making promises of more handouts to the Blacks and looking for Whites to arrest in connection with the rioting so that they could not be accused of "racial profiling" because they arrested more Blacks than Whites. In the Manchester suburb of Oldham, with a population of nearly a quarter of a million--15 percent of which consists of Asian immigrants brought in by the British government against the will of the British people since the Second World War--gangs of Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, and Indians have been attacking Whites, while the media and the politicians have been trying to blame it on Whites, who supposedly provoked the Asians. Change the names of the cities, and the news stories in England about the Oldham race war or the race riot just three days ago in Leeds could have been written in this country about the riots in Seattle and Cincinnati.

I'll read to you excerpts from a couple of news reports that came from Oldham during the last two weeks. An Associated Press International story from Sunday, May 27, reported:

At the height of the clashes -- which continued off and on for seven hours, into the early hours of Sunday -- up to 500 youths fought pitched battles with police in full riot gear. The fighting left the main thoroughfare in the town's Glodwick district littered with broken bricks, shards of glass, and the hulks of several burned-out cars.

Paul Barrow, proprietor of a pub that was trashed in the fighting, said rioters burst in and began beating his patrons. "The first of them got through the door and attacked the customers with whatever they could get their hands on -- bottles, stools, and glasses," he said.

Did you hear anything about that? I'm sure that you would have heard plenty and would still be hearing about it if 500 Whites had been the ones rioting and beating up Asians. And do you know how the rioting started? The same Associated Press International story says:

The riot apparently was sparked when a gang of white youths attacked a home in a neighborhood where most residents are of Pakistani, Bangladeshi, or Indian origin, police said. Soon after, a group of about 100 youths from the neighborhood attacked a pub mainly patronized by whites.

Actually, gangs of Asians have been attacking Whites in Oldham for months. Most of these attacks have been ignored by the media, although an especially vicious incident earlier this year did make national headlines. In that incident Asians nearly killed a 76-year-old White man, Walter Chamberlain, when they smashed his face with bricks while screaming anti-White insults at him.

I'll read you another news report, this one from the May 30 issue of London's *The Times:*

White families barricaded the windows of their homes with planks of wood last night as residents in the Oldham riot zone retreated behind ethnic lines....

Earlier Jack Straw, the home secretary, tried to blame racial conflict in the town on intervention by the British National Party, but angry local white people told a different story. After Chief Superintendent Eric Hewitt said on television that all but a few of the 20 people arrested overnight were white, *The Times* sought the views of the town's shrinking white community.

People described themselves as being under siege. Neighbors told of sending children to stay with families in Manchester and Ashton-under-Lyne so that they were not injured by bricks flying through windows or kept awake at night by police helicopters....

Mr. Straw told the *Oldham Evening Chronicle* yesterday: "It is plain beyond doubt that relations between different sections of the community can only be poisoned by the intervention of extremists like the BNP. I utterly deplore their attempts to exploit the situation in the town."

Straw's comments about the BNP are nearly identical to those of the local media and government people in York, Pennsylvania, about me and the National Alliance when some of our material was distributed in York recently. I told you about that in my broadcast two weeks ago. If one isn't aware of the underlying forces involved, that sort of global unanimity might be surprising.

By the way, Jack Straw, the United Kingdom's minister of home affairs, who among other things is in charge of the country's police agencies, is a Jew. So was his predecessor as home secretary, Michael Howard. I have no idea how he managed to appropriate a good English name like "Howard," but while he was in office Howard banned me from the United Kingdom. He told me that if I ever attempted to enter that country again I would be arrested. The reason for my banning, he said, is that I might cause a breach of the public order. I told him that I had never in my life caused a breach of the public order anywhere. But the banning still stands. A Jew is able to tell me that I cannot visit the land of my ancestors, and his order is enforced by English policemen!

What do you think is the likelihood that the present Jewish home secretary, Jack Straw, will ban any of the Pakistanis or other Asians who smashed in Walter Chamberlain's head with bricks? Well of course, you know that there's no chance at all of that because the same unwritten rules apply in Britain that apply here. An attack on a White by a non-White is not regarded as a breach of the public order. It's only when a White defends himself against non-Whites that the media begin yapping about "hate crimes," and the government politicians spring into action.

And it's not just Britain and the United States. The same controlling force is at work in Germany, in Scandinavia, in France, in Canada, in Australia, and everywhere else in the White world. From Switzerland to Sweden it is against the law to question the Jews' claims about how many of them died during the Second World War in the so-called "Holocaust" or how they died. In Switzerland people are in prison now for saying, "I'm not convinced that six million Jews were killed in gas chambers by the Germans. I think that fewer than six million Jews died during the war, and most of them died from disease in the concentration camps, rather than from poison gas." Say that over here, and the media will denounce you hysterically as a "Holocaust denier." Say it in Canada or Australia or Switzerland or almost any other country in Europe, and the government will lock you up.

It is not just an amazing coincidence that we have this global similarity in conditions at this instant in time. What we can see is the same organized campaigns, the same well-oiled legislative and social programs, the same hidden forces behind these campaigns in every country. As I said, there are differences in detail, but the same evil minds, the same schemers are at work globally. Take any program, any campaign -- the current campaign by Jewish groups to have more "speech crime" legislation enacted in the United States, for example -- and if you want to see where it is headed, look at any other White country where the same program has met a little less resistance and been able to gain more ground. Where the campaign has gone in one country is where it is headed in every country, because the same malevolent force is behind it.

I'll give you another indication that it's not soft, weepy liberal sentiment that's wrecking our society today, but rather a cold, hard, cunning, evil force behind the liberalism, using the liberalism to push a hidden agenda. It's not some soggy, mushy idea that everything that somehow qualifies as "human" is equal that is the driving force behind the ruin of our civilization, but rather it is a strongly cohesive group of people that consider themselves superior to everyone not in their ethnic/racial/religious group and only use egalitarianism as a wrecking tool against our society. My organization, the National Alliance, has for several years been publishing information on the racial differences in the incidence of HIV infection in the United States. One of our leaflets, which we have distributed widely on university campuses, points out that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely as heterosexual White males to be carriers of the AIDS-causing virus. We've also pointed out that while AIDS among Whites is largely a disease of homosexuals, among Blacks it's largely a heterosexual disease. Well, when we point out this startling difference between Black and White HIV infection rates for heterosexual males, with Blacks 14 times as likely to be infected, liberals don't want to believe it. They don't want to believe it because it is contrary to their primary belief in equality, in the essential sameness of Blacks and Whites.

But of course, the people behind the scenes -- the schemers -- are concerned with facts, with reality, not with nutty notions of equality. The sophomore college girls can squeal in disbelief when we present our information about racial disparities in the spread of AIDS and can denounce us as "haters," but the AIDS professionals, the experts, understand the truth of the matter. I have in front of me, on my desk at this moment, a poster -- a large, colorful poster -- published by the Florida Department of Health, intended for distribution in Black neighborhoods. It says, in large black and red letters "1 in 50 Blacks in Florida has HIV." And it gives an 800 number for Blacks to call for free HIV testing.

So why aren't the White college girls in Florida told that two percent of Blacks are HIV infected? The government is telling the Blacks this but hoping that Whites won't find out. Why is that? Could it be that the people behind the scenes don't want White college girls to be wary of having sex with Blacks? Could it be that they want White college girls to become infected with HIV?

I believe that's exactly what they want. I believe that the people behind the scenes want the destruction of our people by any means, including racial mixing with Blacks. That's why the experts, the people who know the facts about AIDS, are afraid to speak up and tell the college girls that the National Alliance is correct. They are afraid of bucking the Jews behind the scenes. I have seen this fear manifested over and over again, and it is another evidence of the powerful forces that simply use liberalism as a destructive tool against our people.

Murdering Iowa

To most people statistics don't have much meaning. They're just numbers. Tell people that 50 years ago 90 per cent of the citizens of the United States were White, that today only 70 per cent are White, and that 50 years hence less than half the U.S. population will be White, and it doesn't move most of them. They can't remember what it was like 50 years ago, when the United States was unquestionably a White man's country, and they don't have enough imagination to visualize what it will be like when Whites are a minority and are completely at the mercy of Blacks, Asians, mestizos, and Jews. Tell most people about this trend toward a darker and darker America, and they will just shrug. They don't see how America's changing demographics will affect what they can buy at the mall or watch on television. What is happening to America is happening so slowly that they aren't alarmed.

That's most people. In a few places in America, however, the changes are occurring more rapidly, and people are forced to pay attention. Many of these people are alarmed. I receive letters every week from listeners who lament what has happened to the towns or the neighborhoods they grew up in. They tell me that 15 years ago every family in their neighborhood was White. The streets were clean and safe. They could leave their doors unlocked without worry. Their kids could walk to school or play with other kids in the neighborhood in safety. They could take a stroll in the evening with a wife or a girlfriend without danger of having lewd comments directed at them.

Today half their neighborhood has become non-White. Streets and yards are littered with trash, bars have been installed on all first-floor windows, Their kids get beaten up and have their lunch money stolen, and no White man in his right mind will expose his woman to the catcalls and deliberate jostling by the non-White thugs who roam the streets and hang out in the malls.

We've come to expect changes of this sort in the decaying cities of the East Coast or in California or Florida or Texas, where the impact of non-White immigration has been especially heavy during the past few decades. But the White heartland also is being corrupted now. In fact, there is a deliberate campaign to corrupt and pollute the White heartland as quickly as possible.

Iowa is an excellent example of this. One of the Whitest states in the country, a land of corn-fed, blue-eyed, blond farm boys and girls, Iowa is looked upon with undisguised hatred and distrust by the multicultural planners and diversity mongers of the East Coast. From their point of view Iowa, with less than three per cent minorities in 1990, was far too White, far too Aryan. Something really had to be done about Iowa. And so they're doing it, with the help of their natural allies in the statehouse, in the Christian churches, in big business, and in the media.

Under Iowa's new Democratic governor, Tom Vilsack, state officials have launched a campaign to bring more non-Whites into Iowa. Recruiting teams are sent to ghettos and barrios around the country to persuade Blacks and mestizos to move to Iowa. The government in Washington is pumping money into a number of special programs in Iowa to help in the process of multiculturalization. Non-Whites are even being recruited in Mexico, Africa, and other non-White areas and then brought to Iowa as government-approved immigrants. A story which

appeared last month -- that was May 4 -- in the *Chicago Tribune* praising the efforts to darken Iowa contained interviews with several of these non-White immigrants, including a physician from Ghana married to a White woman, a meat-packing plant employee from Puerto Rico married to a Filipina, and a high school student from Laos.

Governor Vilsack and the other politicians justify this program to racially pollute Iowa with the argument that Iowa's population isn't growing fast enough through natural increase. Iowa's population increased by only 5.4 per cent during the 1990s, while the population of the country as a whole increased by 9.6 per cent. Without a faster growth in population, claim the multiculturalizers, the economy will be hurt. The pretense is made that there will be no one to do essential jobs. The *Chicago Tribune* quotes Governor Vilsack: "Who is going to farm the land? Who is going to teach our children? Who is going to care for our medical needs?"

This same spurious argument is being used by the enemies of our people in Europe to justify opening the borders of European countries to the Third World. Europeans aren't breeding fast enough to maintain the various welfare programs and social services needed to provide for an aging White population, so fast-breeding Third Worlders should be brought in to keep the population growing, say the multiculturalizers.

Of course, any scheme that depends upon a continually growing population must eventually come to grief, when the land can support no more people. Did you catch that? Any plan, any program, that requires a continually growing population for its success is fundamentally flawed and eventually must fail. But the people pushing such schemes onto a gullible White public don't really care about the long-range prospects. For them the scheme is simply a trick to get as many non-Whites as possible mixed in with the White population as quickly as possible. They believe that once they have done that it will be too difficult -- too bloody -- a task for us to unmix what they have mixed. They will be surprised at what we are willing to do to repair the damage they have done.

Listen: If Iowans need more teachers and doctors, the law of supply and demand will take care of that. Iowans may have to offer higher pay to attract needed White workers from other parts of the country, but that is the way things always have worked. The argument that non-Whites are necessary to keep the economy alive is fraudulent, but the politicians, the Christian churches, the big businessmen, and above all the media -- the untouchable Jewish media -- are supporting this fraud -- this genocidal lie -- and few citizens, in Europe or in Iowa, are bold enough to challenge it.

The fact is that much of the 5.4 per cent increase in Iowa's population during the 1990s has been mestizos brought in by the owners of meat-packing plants looking for cheap labor. This has resulted in those Iowa communities with meat-packing plants being especially hard hit by the multicultural onslaught. Storm Lake, a town of 10,000 residents in northwestern Iowa, is an example. In 1990 Storm Lake was virtually all White, a nice place to live and to raise a family. Today a third of Storm Lake's residents are non-White, and the quality of life has changed accordingly. In all of the 1980s there was just one homicide in Storm Lake. Between 1990 and 2000, as the town went from all White to one-third non-White, there were 10 murders, and other crime also rose proportionately.

This sudden destruction of their community and their life-style in the course of only a decade shocked a few of Storm Lake's White residents into speaking out. The multiculturalists have responded by bringing their road show to town, proclaiming Storm Lake a wonderful example of how a diverse group of people can live and work together, and denouncing anyone who doesn't want to go along with the continued destruction of Iowa as a "racist" and a "bigot." With the Christian clergy and the media noisily on their side and the big businessmen providing support from behind the scenes, the multiculturalists have been moderately successful at shouting down the dissidents even in heavily impacted areas such as Storm Lake.

The local high school students, raised on MTV, have been taught that a White Iowa is a boring Iowa, and that having lots of non-Whites around adds some buzz to an otherwise dull life. The *Chicago Tribune* article that I cited earlier had an interview with a 17-year-old White high school girl in Storm Lake. Looking around at the non-Whites who make up nearly half of her high school classmates, Jill Parman said:

I know that Iowa doesn't look like this, but it would be a whole lot less boring of a state if it did.

Thoroughly jaded young people such as Jill Parman, taught by television that life should, above all else, be entertaining, are quite susceptible to the poison disseminated by the multiculturalists. And the multiculturalists are indeed proud of their ability to use their control of the mass media -- especially television -- to take over the minds of the younger generation and alienate them from their people and from their people's traditions and values. They have become quite self-confident -- arrogant, really -- in their ability to keep dissent within manageable limits as they continue their genocidal work.

An even better example of this than Storm Lake is the small town of Postville, in northeastern Iowa. Postville is undergoing an even more traumatic racial and cultural transformation than Storm Lake. A decade ago Postville was an all-White, all-Christian farming community of 1,000 souls, most of German and Norwegian ancestry. Then Aaron Rubashkin, a Hasidic Jew who owns a kosher meat market for supplying his fellow Hasids in New York City, opened a kosher slaughterhouse in Postville. He had bought Postville's bankrupt meat-packing plant from its Gentile owners and converted it to kosher use, because he could get his meat slaughtered much more cheaply in Postville than in New York, even when the cost of shipping the meat from Iowa to New York was included. Today he and his son Shalom run the slaughterhouse, which employs 300 workers, nearly all of them non-Whites recruited by Aaron and Shalom outside Iowa and brought to Postville specifically to work in the slaughterhouse. They also brought more than 30 Ultra-Orthodox rabbis and their families to town. The rabbis do the actual slaughtering of the animals according to Jewish ritual, a shockingly inhumane procedure, which has been outlawed in many jurisdictions.

The White people of Postville feel overwhelmed. Their town has been stolen from them. Ten years ago everyone they met on the sidewalk or in the local pizza parlor was a neighbor, someone they had gone to school with, someone they shared values and traditions with. Now they see Orthodox Jews wearing black hats and prayer shawls and talking to each other in Hebrew. They see Mexicans and Nigerians and Vietnamese lounging against the lampposts and

jabbering at one another in other strange languages. They see their schools, which used to be entirely White, swamped with dusky aliens.

But it is the Jews who are the most difficult for the people of Postville to accept. The Jews are all from New York City. They are loud and pushy. They are fast-talking hustlers. They are arrogant. They make no effort to adapt themselves to the ways of Postville. Instead they demand that Postville adapt itself to them. They even ignore the local laws with contempt. The Rubashkins dump the waste from their kosher slaughterhouse into the local river, polluting it so badly that it no longer is suitable for fishing or swimming or boating. Postville imposed a $2 million fine on the Rubashkins, who simply refuse to pay and keep on polluting, knowing that the governor and the media are on their side.

And unfortunately, some of the White people of Postville are on their side too. The City Council members, for example. And the people at the local newspaper. The newspaper hired a Jewess to write a regular column. When there was a vacancy on the City Council, the council members appointed a Jew to the council, saying that it would be good for the local economy. When local citizens circulated a petition protesting the appointment, they were accused of anti-Semitism by the newspaper. That intimidated most of the White citizens into silence, but not 81-year-old Dorothy Radloff. She said that she didn't want a Jew on the City Council. She went further, saying what many other Whites in Postville were feeling but were afraid to say:

We're just afraid if they get one in, then pretty soon the whole council will be Jewish, and they're going to run the town. They're working to take the town over and push the rest of us out.

But with the support of the newspaper and the other council members and the mayor, the Jew, Aaron Goldsmith, won a special election two months ago. There's something about politicians and journalists. And the gullibility and blind tolerance of our people for getting kicked in the teeth and not fighting back seem to know no limits. Perhaps if the White citizens of Postville, Iowa, had known a little more about the Hasidic Jews who are taking over their town and flooding it with non-Whites, besides the fact that they are pushy and arrogant, the election to the City Council might have turned out differently.

The Rubashkins and the other Jews associated with the kosher slaughterhouse all are members of the Ultra-Orthodox Lubavitcher sect. The Lubavitchers are those strange-looking Jews one sees in New York wearing long, black coats and black hats, with sideburns down to their shoulders. The late leader of the sect, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, was worshipped like a divinity by his followers, including the Rubashkins and all of the other Jews they brought to Postville.

Rabbi Schneerson was a real Old Testament Jew, a Talmud Jew, who preached to his followers the unadulterated doctrines of the Talmud, including the doctrine of Jewish superiority and the doctrine that the Jews are the chosen people of God, ordained to rule all the other nations of the world and own all their possessions. His sermons have been published, although you're not likely to find them in the *New York Times* or any other place where Gentiles might read them. But I'll read you a selection from one of them, just to give you the flavor. Rabbi Schneerson preached:

The body of a Jewish person is of a totally different quality from the body of a member of any other nation of the world.... The Jewish body looks as if in substance it were similar to the bodies of non-Jews, but ... the bodies only seem to be similar in material substance, outward look, and superficial quality. The difference of the inner quality, however, is so great that the bodies should be considered as completely different species. This is the reason why the Talmud states that there is an halachic difference in attitude about the bodies of non-Jews.... Their bodies are in vain ... An even greater difference exists in regard to the soul. Two contrary types of soul exist. A non-Jewish soul comes from three satanic spheres, while the Jewish soul comes from holiness.

Well, Rabbi Schneerson had much more to say in his preaching to his followers about the satanic nature of Gentiles and the holy nature of Jews, but perhaps you've gotten the general idea from what I've just read. The general idea is that Jewish superiority has been bestowed on them by their deity. The Jews are so superior to us that they are justified in doing to us whatever they want. They are entitled to deceive us and plunder us and take all our possessions from us, and it is a transgression against their deity for us to attempt to protect ourselves. That's what the Hasids believe. That's what the Rubashkins and all the other Jews in Postville believe. It's too bad that there was no one to tell the White citizens of Postville what the Jews really think about them before they elected one of the Jews to their City Council.

Perhaps Dorothy Radloff had some inkling of the truth when she told her fellow citizens. "They're working to take the town over and push the rest of us out." Indeed. Unfortunately, too many of her fellow citizens failed to heed her warning. They listened instead to their Christian preachers and their local politicians and their newspaper. They have for all practical purposes lost their town. They are too confused and demoralized and disunited to put up an effective opposition to the Jews. And if they really started to clean up their town and take it back, Mr. Bush would send in the FBI to stop them. They would be arrested and charged with "hate crimes."

At this point we might ask: Why are the Jews and their allies doing it? Why are they hell bent on destroying White areas like Iowa? Why aren't they satisfied with what they have done to California and to the big cities of the East? Why do they want to make the whole country look like New Jersey and New York? Why do they deliberately destroy all-White communities such as Storm Lake and Postville?

I'll read you a few words written by Professor Earl Raab of Brandeis University's Institute for Jewish Advocacy:

The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country.

"We have been nourishing the American climate of opposition to ethnic bigotry for about half a century. That climate has not yet been perfected, but the heterogeneous nature of our population tends to make it irreversible....

In plain language, Professor Raab is boasting that he and his fellow Jews have changed the immigration laws -- and prevented the government from enforcing what immigration laws we still have -- in order to make the American population more heterogeneous, or, to use the more familiar term, more diverse. Their goal is to make Whites a minority in their own country so that the Whites can never combine against the Jews and regain control of their own destiny. You can read more of Professor Raab's sinister scheming in a book that is available from my sponsor, National Vanguard Books. That book is *Alien Nation*, by Peter Brimelow.

Professor Raab and his fellow Jews aim not only at eliminating the White majority in the country as a whole, but also at polluting and corrupting every White area inside the country, so there will be no one capable of organizing an effective opposition to the Jews. They will be the only racially conscious group still able to wield power. What the Jews have done to Postville and are busy doing to the rest of Iowa is just one step in their grand scheme for implementing a Final Solution to the Gentile problem. This Final Solution is not being implemented with concentration camps and gas chambers, but with bought politicians, with corrupt preachers, and above all with television and other mass media. It is being implemented by flooding the country -- and every White area inside the country -- with non-Whites and by encouraging miscegenation. It is being implemented through programs aimed at increasing diversity. It is being implemented by deceiving and brainwashing White people to collaborate in their own destruction.

The hour for our people is late indeed -- but it's still not too late. It's still not too late to fight back.

The Scorpion and the Frog

I was a guest on the Bob Grant Show in New York last week. Bob Grant's talk radio show is enormously popular with his White male audience, despite his rough treatment of some of his guests and many of his callers. A typical comment to a caller who displeases him is, "Get off the line, you jerk!" He once told a Black welfare mother, "If I ever get hold of you, I'll give you a tubal ligation with my bare hands!"

As I said, comments of this sort make Bob Grant enormously popular with his White male listeners, but the Jews and their bedwetting liberal fellow travelers find him much less entertaining, and he has been thrown off several stations as a consequence of Jewish threats against his sponsors. Despite this Jewish hostility directed at him and despite his frequent ridicule of Blacks, he always has been favorable in his remarks about Jews -- perhaps because he knows who owns most of the radio stations, or perhaps because he just doesn't understand what Jews are all about and admires their success and the power they wield over his own profession.

His attitude may be changing for the better now, however. Despite my reputation as being no friend of the Jews, Bob Grant was quite cordial toward me. The hour I was his guest was the afternoon rush hour for New York commuters, and there were many calls from listeners. I am pleased to report that at least three-quarters of the callers were favorable to my positions on race and on Jews. The few Jewish callers, of course, were intensely hostile, and their hostility made a noticeable contrast with the friendliness of the non-Jewish callers. One Jew who called in wanted to know why I blame the Jews for the bias of the news and entertainment media. It's not the Jews who should be blamed, he said, but the shareholders of the media companies: the Jewish media bosses just do what the shareholders tell them to do.

Well, I responded by pointing out that the top Jewish media bosses also are in many cases the dominant shareholders in the media companies, and I gave Sumner Redstone as an example. Redstone is the majority shareholder in his Viacom Corporation, which in turn owns MTV, Paramount Pictures, and CBS. I described MTV as being the most destructive of all media influences on young, White Americans. I said that MTV deliberately and consistently encourages miscegenation. I said that this racially destructive policy is Sumner Redstone's policy, not that of any anonymous shareholders, that it is a Jewish policy, and that it is the same policy as that of every other Jewish media boss. I was prepared to go on and talk about Michael Eisner and the Disney Company and ABC, and about Miramax and the Weinstein brothers, and about a lot of others, but Bob Grant disconnected that particular Jewish caller.

Then Bob Grant said to me: "I don't understand. You said that Sumner Redstone and the other Jewish media bosses are deliberately trying to destroy our society. Why would they want to do that? They are rich and powerful and influential. This society has been good to them. Why would they want to destroy it? That doesn't make sense to me."

That was the question he asked me, and it was a very reasonable question. It was the question that almost any intelligent, honest person might ask in those circumstances. It was the natural question to ask: Why do the Jews want to destroy a society that has been so good to them --

especially the richest and most powerful Jews? One can imagine some embittered Jewish cab driver or office clerk wanting to strike out at Gentile society because he is resentful over the fact that he can't seem to strike it rich like the more fortunate members of his tribe, but why would those who are riding high -- billionaire Jews such as Sumner Redstone and Michael Eisner -- want to wreck the system from which they are profiting?

When Bob Grant asked me that question, I wished he hadn't. I knew the answer, and it is a simple answer, but it's not the sort of answer one wants to give to people who are driving home through rush-hour traffic. It is simple, but it also is profound. One needs to hear the answer and then to think about it carefully for a month, turning it over in one's mind, thinking of specific examples, trying to find counter-examples, holding it up to the light of one's knowledge of history, before one finally says to oneself, "Yes, that's it. That obviously is why the Jews do what they do and always have done." It takes a month of digesting the answer before one finally assimilates it and believes it and understands it. Rush-hour traffic is not the right environment for that sort of thing.

The answer, in its simplest form, to Bob Grant's question is this: Jews do what they do because they are Jews. A more didactic answer, and the one I actually gave on the Bob Grant Show last week, is one you probably have heard from me already if you've been listening to many of my broadcasts. Here's what I said to Bob Grant: The Jews, throughout their entire recorded history, have lived as a minority among other people. That's their typical modus vivendi: not living among themselves in a Jewish society, but living as a small minority -- usually a rich and powerful minority -- in a non-Jewish society. Israel today is an exception to this pattern, but Israel is an anomaly, something that has existed for only 50 years out of the last 2000 years, and even today it encompasses only a small minority of the world's Jews. Most of them live in the so-called "Diaspora" as members of a Jewish minority in the midst of a Gentile society.

When the Jews approach a healthy, homogeneous Gentile society with the aim of infiltrating it, they are looked upon as outsiders, as aliens, and regarded with suspicion -- and often with hostility if their reputation has preceded them. Facing such suspicion the Jews find it very difficult to gain power or influence so that they can exploit the society. Their way of dealing with this obstacle is to undermine the solidarity of the Gentile society: to destroy its homogeneity, to attack its morality and its traditions, to encourage alienation among its young people. They do everything they can to make the society more "diverse," more multicultural, more cosmopolitan, more rootless, more atomized. This is a slow process, often continuing for several generations, but as it proceeds the society's barriers against the Jews crumble. Ultimately it allows the Jews to control and then plunder the society, to suck it dry before moving on to another Gentile society and beginning a similar process anew.

That's essentially what I said on the Bob Grant Show last week, although I'm sure that the phrasing I used was a little different. And as I said a moment ago, even though my answer is simple and straightforward, it's not likely to be fully digested by someone listening to his car radio while trying to get home in rush-hour traffic. It's a statement of fact, but it needs to be substantiated with a lot of detailed explanation, with many concrete examples, in order to be convincing. What I'll do now is try to provide some of the explanation and some of the concrete facts.

First, let's look at what I said about the Jews being a tribe of perpetual outsiders. This is a notion many people who look only at the here and now have difficulty believing. They say to me, "Hey! The Jews aren't outsiders. They're as thoroughly integrated into the American melting pot as anyone. They are in every facet of American business and professional and cultural and political life. They own stores of every sort. They buy and sell every type of merchandise. They may not be farmers or welders or machinists or carpenters, but they are doctors and dentists and lawyers and teachers and writers and artists and musicians. They are politicians. There are ten of them in the U.S. Senate, four times as many as one would expect from their percentage of the overall population. There are even two of them on the Supreme Court, which is about nine times what one would expect, since they make up only 2.5 per cent of the general population. So how can you call them outsiders?"

That's the sort of response I've sometimes had from people who are able to see only the present situation. The historical record, however, shows something quite different. It shows the Jews worming their way into one country in Europe after another, gradually monopolizing certain sectors of the economy and then using their monopoly to exploit the Gentile population, and eventually being expelled *en masse* when their depredations cause sufficient public unrest.

An example is England. The Jews entered England in the wake of the Norman conquest, purchased various privileges and trade monopolies from the ruling monarchs, and made themselves thoroughly unpopular. By the latter part of the 13th century the people of England had become so exasperated with the Jews that in 1290 King Edward the Great expelled all of them from his realm and forbade them ever to return. One might think that they wouldn't want to go back to a place where they had become so unpopular, but they couldn't stand the idea of all those Gentiles going unfleeced, and they never stopped scheming to get back in. It wasn't until Oliver Cromwell and his forces had overthrown the monarchy in the middle of the 17th century, however, that they were permitted to return to England.

They also were run out of virtually every other country in Europe -- several times from some of them -- but they always were looking for opportunities to sneak back in and return to their old depredations. They especially welcomed the upheavals and dislocations accompanying wars and revolutions because these gave them opportunities to gain footholds in places from which public hostility or the law had excluded them. During the Napoleonic Wars at the beginning of the 19th century Jews followed Napoleon's armies into many places from which they previously had been barred.

Usually they didn't have to wait for a war, however: typically they would depend upon the natural tolerance of their hosts to get a toe in the door, and then they would work slowly and patiently to push that tolerance beyond all limits. They always have had an uncanny instinct for sniffing out their hosts' natural weaknesses and vices and then using them to break down the society's discipline and order, thereby making it possible for them to enlarge their toehold and gain more influence. Thus, the Jews always have had a proclivity for the liquor business, casinos and other gambling activity, prostitution, the White slave trade, pornography, and the like. It is no coincidence that for many years the Jewish Bronfman family owned the biggest producer and distributor of liquor in North America, the Seagram Company. There are many non-Jews involved in the hotel business around the country, but in Las Vegas, where gambling is so

intimately associated with hotels, the business is completely dominated by Jews. In the booming new business of Internet pornography, the biggest operator, the so-called "Bill Gates of e-porn," is a nice, Jewish boy named Seth Warshavsky, who owns clublove.com and many other of the largest pornography sites.

And so it goes. They find their way to whatever corrupts and weakens their hosts, to whatever is morally destructive, to whatever makes their hosts forget their own traditions and values. They attack order and discipline: those things are no fun, those things are old-fashioned, those things are not cool, they tell the young people. They ridicule the concepts of personal honor and personal responsibility. They distract the people from the important things and fill their minds with foolishness. They encourage every alienating tendency, every tendency that separates people from their roots. They preach "tolerance" as the supreme virtue: their hosts should be tolerant of every sort of filth and weakness and perversity. And all the while they worm their way into the host society more and more deeply.

And indeed, in America today they are in very, very deep. At the beginning of the last century there were signs in the lobbies of New York's better hotels: "Jews Are Not Welcome." The better universities had quotas to keep the Jewish presence from becoming too obtrusive. The Jews were pushy, unpleasant outsiders. But they kept on pushing, kept on breaking down the order and structure in the society that was trying in a very feeble and excessively civilized way to keep them out, and today, no less pushy and unpleasant than a century ago, they seem to have achieved the status of insiders everywhere.

And so one might ask, as Bob Grant did, why, having become privileged insiders, are they still bent on destroying our society? Why do even the richest and most powerful Jews -- Jews such as Sumner Redstone and Michael Eisner -- who have access to anything in our society they want, still work day and night to corrupt and degrade us? Why, having wormed their way in, do all of them push for increasing the flood of non-Whites into the United States from the Third World, thereby weakening their own position? Why do they still encourage our young girls to have sex with Blacks, thereby generating hatred against themselves? Why, having gotten so much of our wealth and power into their hands, don't they strive to strengthen our society instead of continuing to destroy it?

Well, there are several reasons for that, but let me again give you the simplest answer, which also is the most profound answer: Jews do what they do because they are Jews.

Do you remember the old fable about the scorpion and the frog? The scorpion wants to cross a stream, but he can't swim. He sees a frog and asks the frog to carry him across on the frog's back. The frog says, "No, I don't trust you. I've heard about how treacherous scorpions are. I'm afraid that if I let you get on my back you'll sting me." The scorpion replies, "Why should I do that? That wouldn't be in my interest. If I sting you, then we'll both drown." So the frog agrees to let the scorpion get on his back and begins swimming across the stream. Halfway across, the scorpion stings the frog. As the frog is dying and beginning to sink, he asks, "Why did you do that? Now we'll both die." The scorpion answers, "I couldn't help myself. It is in my nature to sting." And it is in the nature of the Jews to deceive and to destroy. That is what they always

have done, from the days of ancient Egypt to the present, and it is what they will continue to do as long as they continue to exist as a coherent, self-conscious group.

Now, there also are longer answers to the question, for those who aren't ready yet to accept the profound answer. Many ethnic groups came to America from Europe and at first were considered as outsiders but sooner or later became insiders, and the interests of the majority became their interests. In a sense every group that didn't come here from Great Britain began as outsiders. The German mercenaries from Hessen who fought for King George and stayed here after the American Revolution very quickly became insiders. The Irish, the Poles, and the Italians all went through a similar evolution. Why is it so different with the Jews -- aside from the fact that their roots are not European but are Middle Eastern?

For one thing these other groups, the non-Jewish groups, never had deceit and destruction as their primary tactics for becoming insiders. These tactics are not part of their history. Their aim was to become part of the society, not to break it up so that they could exploit it more easily. This difference is manifested in the difference in self-image between non-Jews and Jews. Every healthy ethnic or racial group has a distinct sense of group identity and a distinct self-image. The Scots and the English, for example, have distinct self-images, with their own distinct ancestral languages, their own historical traditions and customs and so on. But despite their history of conflict and hostility toward one another in Europe, either group can blend into the other and adopt the other's interests without difficulty.

The Jews are different in both degree and kind. For one thing they are much more strongly ethnocentric than any other group. Look in the Yellow Pages under the heading "associations" in any large American city. Compare the number of Jewish associations or clubs or societies or organizations with those of the Irish or the Germans or the Poles. Of course, you also must have some idea of what percentage of the city's population is Jewish or Irish or whatever in order to get a meaningful comparison. For the best statistics, go to a library that has a copy of the *Encyclopedia of Associations.* Jews make up just 2.5 per cent of the population of the United States, and yet you will find more Jewish associations listed than for any other ethnic or religious group. They do stick together and support each other more than the members of any other group.

The Jews also are different in kind. What is the essential element in being a Jew? It is being "chosen." It is believing that one is a member of a tribe or a race or a people that has been chosen by their tribal god to inherit the earth and all that's in it. It is being superior to all who have not been chosen. If you are able to read the Old Testament with an open mind, the message there is quite clear. If you want more detail, read their Talmud. They don't like for you to go poking around in their Talmud, but if you are reasonably resourceful you can find a set of volumes of the Talmud and read what they think about themselves in contrast to non-Jews. If that's too much trouble for you, there are other books available -- books written by race-conscious Jews themselves -- that spell it out for you. My sponsor, National Vanguard Books, carries several such books.

The book *You Gentiles,* by the Jewish leader Maurice Samuel, is excellent for a start. Then there are the very revealing books on the doctrines and practice of Judaism by Israeli Professor Israel

Shahak. And there are dozens of other books, many of them written by Jews themselves, that can help you in digesting and assimilating what I told Bob Grant last week.

But most fundamentally the Jew, like the scorpion and every other creature, does what it is in his nature to do. He has always lived not by settling down on a piece of turf of his own and planting his own crops and building his own house, but rather by breaking into someone else's house. And once in he doesn't try to repair the damage he did by breaking in, but he continues to cause more and more damage as he loots everything of value and then, when there is nothing of value remaining, finding another house to break into -- and then another -- and another. That is his nature.

And, I should add, there is hardly a more important thing for any of us to do now than understand why the Jews are pushing our society over the brink of ruin, and then to oppose them by every means possible.

Mike Wallace's Lesson

Last week I was on the CBS program *60 Minutes II*, with Mike Wallace. I also was on *60 Minutes* five years ago, and both times I came away with the same feeling of unreality, the feeling that I had just been talking to an alien from Mars instead of to another person whose views are different from my own. Mike Wallace and I were on such different wavelengths in both interviews that there simply was no connection between us. He was doing his part of the interviews, and I was doing my part, but we weren't communicating with each other at all. That's what I want to talk about with you today.

If you saw the *60 Minutes II* interview last week this will be easier for you, but I'll try to make things clear even to those who didn't see the interview. Mike Wallace and I talked about various things in last week's interview. We talked about my music company, Resistance Records; we talked about the Oklahoma City bombing and who was responsible for it; we even talked about the role of the Jews in destroying American society; and of course, we agreed on nothing. I tried my best to be civil throughout the interview, however, and I believe that I succeeded in that. Looking at the interview objectively, I was polite, and I expressed myself in a reasonable and calm manner. The principal thing I expressed in last week's interview was my concern about the increasing alienation of our young people, about the alienating influences in our society -- influences such as MTV, which is part of the same Jewish media conglomerate for which Mike Wallace works. I pointed out that my own efforts were aimed at countering these alienating influences and helping our young people find their roots.

Mike Wallace's reaction to me was that I was expressing "hatred" and that my "mouthings" are "vile" to him, as a Jew. To him my concern for my people, for their welfare and their survival, are "hatred" and are "vile." I find it remarkable that he should express himself so forthrightly in front of the huge television audience that we had, that he should make so clear the profound difference between my aims, as a White American, and his aims, as a Jew -- and in the interview last week he explicitly identified himself as a Jew. One might have expected him to say the things he said if the television audience were entirely or even mostly Jewish. But of course, it's not. Jews make up only two and a half per cent of the U.S. population and probably about the same percentage of the people who were tuned to *60 Minutes II* last week.

Mike Wallace is a Jew, with the very special biases and viewpoints Jews have, but he also is a very experienced showman. He has been doing *60 Minutes* interviews for many years, and he certainly should be aware of the makeup of his audience. During both his interviews with me was assuming that most Americans agree with him: that most Americans believe that to express concern for the alienation of our young people is "hatred." He was assuming that any expression of disagreement with the policies of his boss, Sumner Redstone, who is using MTV to popularize "rap" and other elements of Black culture among young Whites and to encourage young White girls to have sex with Blacks -- he was assuming that my expression of disagreement with these policies is "vile" to the American people, to the television audience. In fact, Mike Wallace went so far as to say that I'm insane for having the views that I have. In the interview five years ago he actually called me a "nut" on the air, and in last week's interview he had one of his cohorts,

Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center, come on the air and tell everyone that I'm crazy for believing what I believe.

Now, if I had no contact with the American public besides television, I might be worried that Mike Wallace is right, and that my views are vile to most Americans, and that maybe I am crazy for expressing vile views in public. But I do have other ways of knowing what people are thinking besides watching television. Unfortunately, however, that's not the case with most Americans. Most Americans learn what the public is thinking by watching television. On their TV screens they see reporters stopping people on the sidewalk and asking them what they think about some current event or some government policy, and they believe they're getting a genuine sampling of public opinion, whereas in many cases they're not.

I can go out with a cameraman and do 20 sidewalk interviews. Then when I get back to my studio I can select the three that express the opinion I want the public to believe is the majority opinion and discard the 17 that express contrary opinions. Or if I want to be a bit more subtle in my deception, I can save one of the contrary opinions and put it with the three that say what I want the public to believe, making it look as if 75 per cent of the public have the approved opinion -- that is, three out of four -- instead of the 15 per cent -- that is, the three out of 20 -- which actually expressed that opinion. Most people want to have whatever opinions they believe most other people have. They don't want to have unpopular opinions. They are afraid of being considered odd or different or out of step with everyone else.

That's why skewing the reporting of exit polls can influence the outcome of an election. If the TV reporters tell you early on election day, shortly after the polls have opened, "It looks like Tweedledee is winning by a landslide; nine out of ten voters leaving the polls are saying they voted for Tweedledee" -- if the reporter tells you that, and if you are an average person who hadn't really made up his mind yet, when you go to vote later that day you're more likely to vote for Tweedledee than if you hadn't already been told that most other people are voting for him. Even if you'd been leaning toward Tweedledum, you might change your mind and vote for Tweedledee instead, just to be on the winning side.

Even more effective in deceiving the public as to what other people are thinking is television entertainment. If a leading character -- an alpha character -- in a TV show expresses an opinion, and the other characters agree with him or praise him for his opinion, you are inclined to assign weight to that opinion. You are persuaded at a subconscious level that if you express that opinion yourself, you will gain approval from those around you. And if a character with low esteem expresses an opinion and is then ridiculed or criticized by the other characters for expressing that opinion, you will be persuaded that the opinion is an unpopular one, whether it actually is or not, and you will be less likely to express it yourself.

Is that the sort of thing Mike Wallace was trying to do when he called me a "hater" and a "nut" and said that my views are "vile"?

What do you think?

I think that is exactly what he was trying to do. And I'm sure that he succeeded with some of the people watching *60 Minutes II* last week -- though with fewer members of the audience than five years ago, when I had my earlier interview with him. I say that because I have other ways of sampling public opinion than listening to what Mike Wallace says about it. For example, I mentioned last week that I was on Bob Grant's radio talk show in New York recently, and that three quarters of the callers agreed with me. I was surprised at that response myself, especially in New York.

Of course, seven or eight callers to the Bob Grant Show aren't sufficient for convincing statistics, but I've seen a number of other indications that the public is not quite as willing to march in ideological lockstep with Mike Wallace and Morris Dees as it was five years ago. On *60 Minutes II* last week Wallace's buddy Dees estimated that perhaps two tenths of one percent of the public is out of step. That may have been true five years ago, but the actual figure today is more than ten times that: somewhere between two and five percent of the adult White population. Actually, White Americans are getting off the bandwagon of Political Correctness in droves.

I receive hundreds of letters every week from listeners, and dozens of those letters come from people who had been Politically Correct, people who had been willing to accept as true whatever lies were told them by Mike Wallace or Morris Dees or any other Politically Correct authority figures. They had believed the television image of the world and had tried to conform themselves to it, but no longer. They no longer believe the television lies; they no longer try to conform their ideas to the false image of public opinion presented by Mike Wallace and the rest. They have seen too many contradictions, too much evidence that the world isn't really the way their television tells them it is.

Of course, they should have seen that five years ago, ten years ago, 20 years ago. Television always has lied to us, presented to us a deliberately falsified image of the world and of public opinion. Television since its beginning in the 1950s has been solidly under Jewish control and has been used to promote a false image designed to benefit Jewish interests. From the beginning the American television audience has been told that all races are equal, that mixing of the races is good, and that anyone who disagrees is a "hater." The public, persuaded by television that everyone except a few despicable "haters" believed these things, tried hard to believe them itself. Most people tried to ignore the contradictions; they tried to ignore the evidence that the policies being promoted by the media and forced on them by the government were destroying their society. They tried to pretend that everything was getting better and better, that all the changes being promoted by the media and the government were "progress."

As the contradictions mounted, however, pretending became more and more difficult for many people. The real lemmings were still able to believe the image of the world they saw on their television screens and to ignore everything that contradicted that image, but the thinking minority gradually began to fall out of step. They saw on the one hand Bill Clinton's disgusting behavior in office, and on the other hand the media still treating him like a national leader and the majority of the public still willing to vote for him, and the thinking minority began to balk.

They had seen the Persian Gulf War on television and had asked themselves, "Is this war really necessary?" But they had been willing to go along with the crowd and not question the

assurances they received from their television screens that the war really was necessary and good, and some of them even cheered along with the lemmings when Baghdad was bombed. But then a few years later when Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton began bombing Belgrade and killing thousands of Serb civilians in order to force Serbia into submission to the New World Order the way Iraq had been forced into submission, and the media assured them that this new war also was necessary and good, they balked. The lemmings continued to cheer, but more and more of the thinking portion of the public fell out of step with them.

They had believed all of the "Holocaust" stories they had seen on their television screens in the 1970s and the 1980s, but in the 1990s, as the Jews more and more blatantly began demanding "reparations" from everyone in sight and the media supported every Jewish demand, they began to ask questions: Does the world really owe the Jews a living? Are the Jews really the only deserving victims of the Second World War? Why is it that the Jews are the only ones to receive reparations? What about all of the victims of the communists before, during, and after the war? Why don't we ever hear about them? Is someone trying to cover something up? Are the Jews really the innocent victims they claim to be?

Even the thinking minority had accepted the television portrayal of race relations. Blacks were basically good people who deserved to be integrated into White society, where they would be able to contribute much to the benefit of everyone, and we all would live happily together forever after. The only people who opposed the multiculturalizing of our society were violent, ignorant, White rednecks -- truly despicable people who spent their time bombing Black churches and dragging Blacks behind their pickup trucks. They overlooked the Black crime rate and the Black rioting and burning of American cities in the 1960s and accepted the media explanation of these things as justified expressions of Black anger provoked by White racism. But as White society bent over backwards further and further to give advantages to Blacks -- Affirmative Action in hiring and promotions; special quotas and lowered standards for admission to universities, and special scholarships and other aid after they were in -- and as it became clear that none of this favoritism was improving Black performance or Black behavior, thinking Whites began to wonder where it was all headed.

It took a while for the thinking minority of the White public to begin figuring things out because the mass media did everything possible to keep them confused, but gradually they began to notice things and put things together. They saw what happened to their neighborhoods when Blacks moved in. They saw what happened to their schools as the Black enrolment went up. They gradually began to see through the deceptive way in which the news media reported interracial crime, minimizing or even ignoring Black crimes against White victims while maximizing any White transgression against non-Whites.

Perceptive Whites noticed the unrelenting, hateful media pressure against White South Africa through the 1970s and 1980s and early 1990s, always painting White South Africans as evil and oppressive, always pushing for boycotts and other punitive measures against South Africa, and always pushing for the Whites who built South Africa to turn the government of their country over to the Blacks there. And they noticed the sudden loss of interest by the media in South Africa after the Whites there foolishly yielded to media pressure and gave their country to the Blacks. The perceptive Whites here found out, despite the sudden loss of media interest, about

the surge in Black crime in South Africa: about the rapes of White women, the murder of White farmers, the reign of terror over their fellow Blacks by Black witch doctors. They found out, despite the media, about the sinking of South Africa back into the jungle, into savagery. They noticed, despite minimal media coverage, the seizing of White farms by the Black dictator in neighboring Rhodesia, now called "Zimbabwe." And they remembered how the media had assured them, more than 20 years ago, that everything would be much better in Rhodesia once the Blacks were allowed to rule there.

And much more recently, perceptive Whites in America have noticed the rioting by Blacks and Asians in England, they have noticed the rise in non-White crime and the attacks on Whites by non-Whites in England and the proliferation of Black and Asian gangs there. They have noticed the similarity between non-White behavior in America and South Africa and Rhodesia and England. They have noticed how this non-White behavior always becomes worse, not better, as the non-Whites gain political and economic power. They have noticed that the media always tell the same lies about racial conflict and make the same excuses for non-White behavior, no matter in what country it occurs. And they have wondered whether, perhaps, they are seeing a pattern that tells them something important about racial differences and about the motivations of the controlled media. They are wondering whether, perhaps, there is a lesson for them about what to expect in America if the present demographic trends are permitted to continue and to give us a non-White majority here in another few decades.

And the perceptive minority of White people notice other things too. They notice President Bush's obsequious behavior in the presence of Ariel Sharon, the Butcher of Beirut, during the latter's visit to the White House this week. Sharon, remember, is the Jewish war criminal who deliberately provoked the current violence in Palestine last year in order to improve his chances of becoming Israel's prime minister. Mr. Bush pretends to be very concerned about restoring peace to the Middle East, but it is obvious that he is simply dancing to whatever tune is played by the Jews. Any government that welcomes a creature such as Sharon -- any President who hugs such a creature for the television cameras -- can elicit only disgust from decent people, and there still are a few decent people left in America.

There's one other thing I'm sure is noticed by perceptive Americans. Every time I have been interviewed by the Jewish media during the past six years -- not just by Mike Wallace, but by all of them -- and the subject of the Oklahoma City bombing has come up, the suggestion is made that the reason Timothy McVeigh blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City is that he read a novel that I wrote 25 years ago, *The Turner Diaries,* in which there is a fictional bombing of the FBI headquarters in Washington. This happened again last week: Mike Wallace implicitly blamed me for the Oklahoma City bombing because Tim McVeigh had read my book. I had to point out to him what should have been obvious to every perceptive American that what provoked the Oklahoma City bombing was not my book but the attack by the Clinton government -- by Bill Clinton and Janet Reno -- on the Branch Davidian church in Waco, Texas, exactly two years earlier.

McVeigh was outraged that the Clinton government had murdered 90 innocent people, mostly women and children, in the completely unjustified attack on the church. He had traveled to Waco during the FBI siege of the church and expressed his outrage there, he had said in court at the

time of his sentencing what his motivation was, and he had explained his motivation in detail to writers who interviewed him later in prison. But the media people, Mike Wallace and all the rest of them, always cover for the Clinton government and try to place the blame on me instead. The lemmings don't notice that, but perceptive people do.

And as perceptive people notice more and more of these things, more and more of them fall out of step with Mike Wallace and Morris Dees and the whole structure of opinion control that the Jews have erected to keep White Americans in line and in step.

And I'll tell you one thing I noticed in watching the broadcast of my *60 Minutes II* interview last week. I try to be objective when I view such things -- I try to put myself in the shoes of the average, intelligent member of the audience and see it as he would see it -- and my impression was that Mike Wallace and Morris Dees and CBS and the whole, rotten, Jewish structure of which they are part looked weak. They looked weaker and more vulnerable than I have ever seen them. When at the end of the interview Mike Wallace grinned his very Jewish grin and told me how vile my views are, he was speaking for his fellow Jews and for their liberal fellow travelers -- for the feminists and the homosexuals and the rest -- but he was speaking for fewer ordinary White Americans than ever before. And my impression was that that showed.

Fast and Furious

Last week I gave an interview to an English-language radio station in Teheran. The program was "The Islamic Voice of Iran." We talked about a number of things, including Ariel Sharon's visit to the White House, which was taking place at the time, and about President Bush's popularity ratings. The Iranian interviewer asked me whether Bush would take a more sensible, pro-American policy in the Middle East or would continue taking orders from Israel, to the detriment of American interests, the way the Clinton administration had.

Of course, I explained to him that there was really no difference between Republicans and Democrats in that regard. They both dance to whatever tune the Jews are playing at the moment, and that George Bush would no more dare to disobey the Jews than Bill Clinton would. I told the Iranian interviewer that there are minor differences between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, with the Democrats pandering a bit more to the welfare class and the Republicans paying a bit more lip service to things such as military preparedness and energy production, but that on the really essential issues -- immigration, racial policy, media control, foreign policy -- both parties do what they're told and don't give the Jews any back talk.

The Iranian had a hard time understanding this. If one party -- the Democrats, say -- were controlled by Jews and supported Jewish interests, then surely there would be another party -- presumably the Republicans -- representing the interests of the American people. He couldn't understand how the Jews, making up only 2.5 per cent of the U.S. population, could have the whole political process under their control and in particular could dictate U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East, regardless of who is in the White House or which party controls the Congress. What about the other 97.5 per cent of the population? They also have interests, and they can vote. Why aren't their interests supported by some political party?

The difficulty my Iranian interviewer had in understanding how politics works in America has two facets. One of these is the dominant influence the mass media of news and entertainment, which are largely in the hands of the country's very small Jewish minority, have on public opinion and attitudes, on the mass culture, and on the political process. In Iran tradition is much more important in determining public opinion. And Iran is a much more homogeneous country, at least in a cultural and religious sense, than is the United States. In America the media have to a large extent weaned the people away from their traditions and from their cultural and religious roots and substituted a made-in-Hollywood trash-culture with ersatz traditions in their place. The media are increasingly important in influencing public opinion everywhere in the developed countries -- even in Iran, no doubt -- but nowhere has the process been as thorough and as destructive as it has been in the United States.

A second barrier to understanding is the subtlety and indirection that is used by the media bosses in achieving their aims. They almost never make a head-on attack against the traditions or values of the host population. They look for conflict, for inconsistency, for vice or hypocrisy or weakness, and they exploit it to gain a foothold. Then they use one facet of popular belief or tradition to undermine another. For example, they will proclaim themselves champions of "fair play," and then they will persuade the public that fair play requires that no distinction be made

between Asians and Europeans in setting immigration policy. If we let Englishmen and Germans and Swedes into America, then it wouldn't be fair to keep out Vietnamese and Chinese and Pakistanis, they tell us.

Or they will play on the average American's resentment of governmental interference in his private affairs to promote the idea that homosexuality is just as normal as heterosexuality and that neither the government nor individuals should make a distinction between the two. What people do in the privacy of their bedrooms is no one else's business, therefore the government should require landlords, employers, Boy Scout troops, and everyone else to treat homosexuals just like heterosexuals: a bit of a non sequitur, but the media have been remarkably successful at using such illogical arguments to shift public opinion on a number of issues.

And because the media are able to influence public opinion so strongly, all the politicians, Republicans as well as Democrats, dance to their tune. The politicians understand that the tiny Jewish minority, only 2.5 per cent of the population, through their control of the media are the single most important influence on the public's perception of issues, of government policies, and of the politicians themselves -- and consequently are the single most important influence on the outcome of elections. And it is for this reason that everyone can safely count on George Bush's policy toward Israel being whatever the Jews want it to be.

Anyway, although I explained this as clearly as I could to my Iranian interrogator, I think he didn't really believe me. He was ready to accept the fact that the Jews are a very bad influence on American policy in the Middle East, but he couldn't accept the fact that through their control of the mass media of news and entertainment they have made irrelevant and meaningless the whole idea of mass democracy. He couldn't assimilate the idea that party politics in America has become just a shell game to keep the rubes confused about what's really happening and who's running the country. He knew that Jews are bad news, but he couldn't grasp the fact that the most powerful country in the world, economically and militarily, is so totally in their malign grip.

And really, when I try to put myself in the Iranian's shoes, it's hard for me to believe it myself: a mere 2.5 per cent of the population, a historically despised and hated group who have been kicked out of every country in Europe, and there's not a single mainstream American politician brave enough to defy them; a tiny, clannish group who have a stranglehold on the mighty American nation; a case of the tail wagging the dog. How do they do it? It doesn't seem possible.

Well, of course, it is possible, and I'll tell you how they do it: they do it with images and myths. They do it by controlling the perceptions that most people have of the world around themselves. The Jews create myths about what the world is like and then generate false images to match the myths. And they project these myths and false images of the world into the minds of their hosts.

I'll give you a specific example of this. There is a new film out by Universal Pictures. It's called *The Fast and the Furious.* It's a film directed at White teenagers, a film designed to give them a particular image of the world and instill in them a myth about the way the world works. It's a film about modern, urban teenagers -- specifically street gangs in Los Angeles -- and cars and street racing. That might seem harmless enough, but the street racing is just a gimmick on which to hang the message, and that message is that the world is multicultural, and it's good that it's

multicultural. It's good not to live in a White world, with White friends and White role models and White values and White standards and traditions. That's boring. That's not cool.

The message is that there's nothing special about being White. The message is that if one is White, then one should hang out with Blacks and Asians and mestizos. One should behave like non-Whites, talk like them, dress like them, be like them. That's what's cool. That's what's sexy. That's what everybody who's really cool is doing. And when you feel like having some sex, you just reach for whoever is nearest. It doesn't matter at all what race the other person is. If you're a White girl, it's especially cool to have sex with a Black or Asian or mestizo male.

That's the most obvious message of the film, but actually it's more than that. It's not really that the film says race doesn't matter, that we're really all the same; that culture doesn't matter, that all cultures are equivalent. The film says that Whites should become non-White, because non-White is better. The cultural milieu of the film is not raceless or a little of this and a little of that. The cultural milieu is Black. The culture is hip-hop. The music is hip-hop. The clothing style, with the baggy shorts and the rest, is hip-hop. It's Black. That is the world into which White teenagers should blend, the world to which they should subordinate themselves.

Surely, White teenagers aren't actually absorbing that message. Are they? Yes, unfortunately, many of them are. *The Fast and the Furious* is drawing bigger crowds than any other film produced by Hollywood this season. It grossed $78 million in its first ten days. White teenagers are flocking to it more than to any other movie. The attraction, of course, is the action, the street racing, the exciting car stunts. That's the gimmick that pulls them in. But that's not the message. The message -- which of course, is subliminal: that is, which is intended to change the kids' perception of the world at a subconscious level -- is exactly what I just described: it's cool to be part of the hip-hop culture; it's cool to be multicultural; it's cool not to act White, think White, or be White.

That's the message, and it's a Jewish message: Jewish in its conception, Jewish in its promotion, Jewish in its genocidal intent.

You think I'm imagining things? I'll read to you from a story about the film in last Saturday's edition of the Los Angeles *Times:*

Hollywood was stunned when the youth-oriented action film *The Fast and the Furious* streaked past the competition to become the number-one movie.... With its relatively unknown cast of Latinos, Asians, and African-Americans, heavy doses of high-speed chases, and a driving hip-hop soundtrack, the movie defied expectations.

...But the teen-oriented movie's success isn't so surprising when one glimpses the youthful crowds flocking to theaters.... With their ultra-baggy cargo shorts, doo-rags wrapped around their heads, and bodies festooned with tattoos and piercings, the look of these young moviegoers mirrors the multiethnic melange of actors on the screen....

Hollywood likes to pride itself on being ahead of the cultural curve, but with last summer's sassy white-versus-black cheerleading comedy *Bring It On* grossing $68.4 million domestically and

this winter's *Save the Last Dance*, with its once-taboo interracial dating, raking in more than $90 million in North America alone, the studios have only begun to catch up with the colorblind nature of today's MTV generation.

Rob Cohen, who directed *The Fast and the Furious*, said the film not only reflects today's "multiculti" youth culture without purposely drawing attention to it, but depicts what is really going on. When the movie opened, it drew a cross-section of races, Cohen said. Surveys taken at theaters where *The Fast and the Furious* played showed that 50 per cent of moviegoers were white, 24 per cent were Hispanic, 10 per cent were black, and 11 per cent were Asian. "I look at this and go, 'This is exactly what I'm talking about,'" Cohen said.... Attracting a young audience across the country -- a mainstay of big summer popcorn hits -- *The Fast and the Furious* has grossed an estimated $78 million in less than two weeks and is on track to make well over $100 million.

I want to emphasize a couple of things in what I just read to you, besides the fact that the director of the film is the Jew Rob Cohen and the studio is Universal Pictures, owned by the Jew Edgar Bronfman. First, note that Mr. Cohen is very much aware of the racial angle in his film. That's all he talks about, not the racing stunts. And note that he says he put the racial propaganda into his film in way that would not "draw attention to it": that is, he put it in as subliminal propaganda.

One other thing: the story in the Los Angeles *Times* implies that this film and other films like it are imitating society, not the other way around. But that's not true. These Jewish films are propaganda deliberately designed to move society in the direction the Jews want it to go. White kids didn't start wearing baggy shorts and backward baseball caps and listening to rap music and using jive talk just because that's what young Blacks were doing: it was Jewish films and Jewish television and Jewish advertising that pushed them in this direction, that persuaded them it is cool to imitate Blacks.

The *Times* story refers to the studios catching up with "today's MTV generation." But really, how did it become the "MTV generation"? That name is appropriate just because MTV has been the single largest influence on White teenagers in moving them away from their roots in their own race and making rootless cosmopolitans out of them. MTV has been the foremost promoter of the hip-hop lifestyle among young Whites. And I hardly need to remind you that it is the very Jewish Sumner Redstone, originally known as Murray Rothstein to his parents, who owns MTV. Redstone's MTV and his Paramount Pictures studio may be a little ahead of the other Hollywood studios, but they're all pushing in the same direction as hard as they can.

This is an essential point: namely, that the Jewish media are pushing our society, and not the other way around, and the Jews are understandably reluctant to admit that. Last Saturday's Los Angeles *Times* story interviewed another Jewish film producer in this regard:

Marc Abraham, one of the producers of *Bring It On*, noted: "There is a much more interracial aspect in today's culture than the way this country used to be. Any movie that reflects that -- and it doesn't mean they'll all be hits like *The Fast and the Furious* -- will ring true with the audience"

As I indicated, that is deliberate misdirection. And there's more misdirection in the *Times* story. It also interviews the Black director of Sumner Redstone's racemixing film *Save the Last Dance:*

"The movie business is certainly catching up with what's happening in society," said Thomas Carter, who directed *Save the Last Dance.* "Youth culture has been shifting a long time.... Places like MTV are right on the edge and totally involved in the change. In filmmaking we lag behind."

But of course, Redstone's MTV, which as Carter notes is "totally involved in the change," is into filmmaking too. Anyway, it's really an artificial distinction to contrast Jewish television with Jewish cinema. Redsone isn't the only Jewish media boss who is deeply involved in both media.

One of Bronfman's subordinates, the Jew Marc Shmuger, says it a little more plainly, and again I quote from last Saturday's Los Angeles *Times* story:

"I think the segregated groupings are breaking down in today's America, and I think today's movie audience is a complex mix," said Marc Shmuger, vice chairman of Universal Pictures, which released *The Fast and the Furious.* But Shmuger warned that if the movie industry starts making multiethnic movies "in a calculating and cynical fashion," the audience will sense that and stay away.

In other words, keep the propaganda subtle, keep it subliminal, so that we don't tip off the *goyim* that it's really propaganda. I'll read one more section from the Los Angeles *Times* story:

Just as *The Fast and the Furious shows* young people of all races gathered in large groups unmindful of their racial differences and not hung up on sex, Gary Scott Thompson, one of the film's writers, said today's young movie audiences also are that way. "It used to be that a boy and a girl would go on a date," he said. "Now what's happening is groups of kids who are friends -- multiracial boys and girls -- all move in date packs together. It's like a date, but they don't consider it dating. Some of them might neck; some of them might not. None of them think anything much about it. They are much more open when talking about sex.... They've broken down the cultural barriers."... Rob Friedman, vice chairman of Paramount Pictures Motion Picture Group, said the studio began noticing the colorblind nature of young audiences with its 1999 high school pigskin drama *Varsity Blues.* "It's really about their peers, regardless of race, and to a certain extent gender as well," Friedman said. "When it came to *Save the Last Dance,* it became more and more apparent young people don't care whether the relationship is interracial. The music is great, the story is great."

As I've already mentioned, Paramount Pictures belongs to Sumner Redstone, and I hardly need to tell you that his employee Rob Friedman is a Jew, like nearly all the other executives at Paramount Pictures.

This new development of White teenagers running in "date packs," as the scriptwriter put it, with Blacks, Asians, and mestizos and having very casual and very interracial sex did not evolve spontaneously, as the media bosses and their employees would have us believe. It has been promoted deliberately by Hollywood and by television and by Madison Avenue. Sumner

Redstone's MTV may be a bit bolder in this regard than the other Jewish media, but all of them have been working together for decades toward the same goal, and that goal is the annihilation of our people. They say, "Oh, we're just reflecting with our films and our TV shows and our magazine ads what your society has become all by itself," but that is a conscious, calculated lie. They know exactly what they have done and are doing, and one can easily sense them gloating over it when one reads their remarks in the Los Angeles *Times.*

I've said this a thousand times already in different words, but when we permitted the Jews to come into our society and take over our mass media of news and entertainment -- our newspapers and our radio broadcasting networks and our motion picture and advertising industries and then television broadcasting -- we handed them the weapons with which they intended from the beginning to destroy us and now are destroying us. This program of theirs to corrupt and destroy us didn't begin with the Second World War and the so-called "Holocaust." It is a consequence of their nature. The "Holocaust" was not the cause of their destructive behavior, but rather a consequence.

If you believe that I am hallucinating when I say that, see for yourself what Jews such as Edgar Bronfman and Sumner Redstone are producing for the entertainment of our children, and you try to explain it in any other way. I know that the majority of our own people, lemmings that they are, are dancing to the Jews' tune now, along with the politicians. That is a shame, but it in no way excuses us from our task. Many of those who have become blinded by the Jews and have become collaborators of the Jews will unavoidably become "collateral damage" in the struggle and the chaos that lie ahead, but we must do whatever is necessary to free our people from the spell cast over them by the Jews. To that task I have consecrated my life, and I invite each of you to do likewise.

Why We Deserve Their Contempt

I receive letters from many people who tell me about the things that concern them -- especially about the things that they believe are important and that they want me to address in one of these broadcasts. Their concerns cover a wide range. Some people tell me, "You should talk about the Freemasons. Masons are involved in every aspect of the conspiracy to destroy our civilization and impose the New World Order on us."

Well, maybe so. I really don't know much about Freemasonry. I do know some people who are Masons, though, and I'm quite sure that if the Masonic organizations to which they belong are engaged in some sort of sinister conspiracy, the fellows I know haven't been let in on it. It could be that at the higher levels -- 32nd degree and so on -- there's a lot of nasty stuff going on that they don't tell the rank and file about. Certainly many men who should have been hanged, drawn, and quartered for their crimes against our people -- mostly politicians of one stripe or another -- are or have been Masons. But I just don't know enough about Freemasonry to talk about it.

Other people who write to me are quite concerned about the Federal Reserve System. They tell me that it's illegal, that there's some sort of legal irregularity in the way the system was set up. They tell me that it's a system designed to enrich a few bankers at the expense of everyone else. They tell me that it's a Jewish system, and they point to the very Jewish chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan. And they tell me that the Federal Reserve System is at the root of our problems and that I should talk about it.

Well, the reason I don't talk about the Federal Reserve System is, first, I don't know anything about it or about banking systems in general. I've heard too many people talking about the Federal Reserve who also don't know anything about it, and I don't want to embarrass myself. Second, even if everything these Federal Reserve enthusiasts say about the Federal Reserve System being illegal and a big drain on the economy is true, I'm not convinced that it's something I need to explain in an *American Dissident Voices* broadcast. Perhaps I'm wrong. Perhaps someday I'll understand it well enough and believe that it's important enough for me to explain the problems associated with it in a clear way to everyone else.

Most of my broadcasts have been related in one way or another to the two issues that I believe are most important for us to understand and to deal with. These central issues, around which everything else revolves, are race and the Jews. We can figure out how to straighten out our banking system after we have regained control of our mass media and won the demographic battle. If we don't win that, we'll have no chance to deal with banking or anything else.

Of course, I do talk about other issues. For example, I've discussed various aspects of feminism in my broadcasts. But every time I've talked about feminism at any length I have pointed out that the principal promoters of this pathology have been Jews. Certainly the 1963 book by Jewess Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, was the *Das Kapital* of the modern feminist movement, and a great many of the other feminist writers and publicists also were Jews. More important, the feminist movement would have remained on the fringes of our society, populated mostly by

lesbians, if it had not been for the enthusiastic and continuing support of the Jewish mass media, which made feminism Politically Correct on college campuses.

And I have pointed out that the reason feminism is important is not that it has made many women neurotic and has made many men as well as many women very unhappy, but that it is race-threatening. Feminism is not important because of its effects on the economy by changing the composition of the work force. It is not important because it opens up new careers for women or because it relieves men of the need to be chivalrous or protective toward women. Feminism is important for just one reason, and that reason is racial. Feminism has drastically lowered the White birthrate: it is now well below the replacement rate, and the race will die out if the birthrate is not raised once again above the replacement level. Even more immediately threatening, the White race, which is the race on which feminism has wreaked its havoc, will be swamped by the non-White races, where feminism has not taken hold. Feminism takes women out of the home and puts them in the workplace. Feminism leads women to choose careers other than motherhood. Feminism, all by itself, will destroy us unless we stamp it out the way we would an epidemic of hoof-and-mouth disease: ruthlessly and thoroughly. To summarize: feminism is a racial threat, and it has been made into a racial threat by the Jews, who have been and still are its principal promoters.

Communism is another example. There certainly are people who manage to talk about communism without mentioning either race or the Jews. Conservatives are pretty adept at that sort of thing: at dodging the real issues. The John Birch Society, for example, will tell you that communism has nothing to do with race or with the Jews; it has only to do with freedom and with private property. Many Christians will tell you that the bad thing about communism is that it is atheistic: "godless communism," they call it, and to them that's what is really important.

When I talk about communism, the Jews and race are central to the discussion. I talk about the Jews because they are the ones who designed and spread this plague. What would communism be without the Jew Karl Marx? How could it ever have gotten the Russian people by the throat without all the Jews who constituted the majority of Lenin's accomplices during the revolutionary period?

Lenin himself was only a quarter Jewish, but most of the people who financed his revolutionary activities were full-blooded Jews, and so were the Bolshevik gangsters with whom he conspired: Radek, Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, Sverdlov, Uritsky, and the rest. Every foreign observer who visited the Soviet Union in its early days was struck by the huge preponderance of Jews among the commissars and other Soviet leaders. Without these Jews to finance, lead, and staff the revolution, the communist movement would still be meeting in cellars and back rooms in St. Petersburg trying to figure out how to seize control of the Russian government.

And without the Jewish apologists for communism in the media in the United States and elsewhere, the Soviet Union would have expired 50 years sooner than it did. It was Jewish media influence -- concealing the true nature of communism, concealing communist atrocities and portraying the Soviets in the best possible light, as heroic pioneers for social justice -- that made it politically feasible for the United States and Britain to become allies of the Soviet Union in the

Second World War in order to crush anti-communist Germany and then to turn half of Europe over to communist rule after the war.

Of course, there were many non-Jewish activists, leaders, and propagandists involved in the spread and rise of communism -- Stalin is the most outstanding example -- and most of the Jews of the world never belonged to a communist party or made a pro-communist movie or wrote an editorial for the *New York Times* favoring communism.

That is the smokescreen always raised by the Jews and their defenders when the issue of the Jewish involvement in communism comes up: there were many non-Jewish communists, and the majority of the Jews weren't participants in communism. The fact remains, however, that Jews not only formulated the essence of communism -- they made it what it is -- but they also played an absolutely essential role in its triumph. Without the Jews, communism, like feminism, never would have gotten off the ground. That is why any discussion of communism that doesn't mention the Jews is meaningless and can only be misleading.

And why was communism such a terrible thing? Was it because it demanded a redistribution of wealth? Was it because it threatened the incomes and property of the capitalists? Was it because it was atheistic?

Hardly. Communism was full of unworkable economic theories -- unworkable because they weren't in accord with human nature -- and it put forward some really nutty ideas about history and other things. But these were not what made communism such a disaster. The evil in communism was not that it took property away from those who had earned it or inherited it and gave it to those who had not; the evil was not that it discouraged individual initiative or that it eventually made an economic basket case out of every nation on which it was imposed. The evil in communism was that it preached egalitarianism. It denied the differences in human quality among individuals and among races. Worse, it inverted the natural ranking of human beings. It appealed to the worst to bring down the best. It appealed to the resentful losers to destroy those who had been successful. It preached that the first shall be last, and the last shall be first. And it used these egalitarian teachings to justify destroying the best of our people wherever it gained the ability to do so.

It was communist egalitarianism that justified the murder of 30 million Ukrainians and Russians -- the kulaks, the successful small farmers -- because they resisted being herded into collectives along with the ne'er-do-wells. It was communist egalitarianism that justified the mass murder of the Polish professional and military elites, in the Katyn forest and elsewhere, in order to "equalize" the Polish nation and also justified doing the same thing in Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania when those nations fell under Soviet rule.

Communism preached that the talented and successful people, the people with character and ability, were no better than anyone else: that anyone could become a successful composer or scientist or industrialist if he were given the same education and the same advantages as those who had been successful. So if the successful people resisted being "equalized," then nothing really was lost in killing them, because they were simply replaceable human units like everyone

else. That was the evil in communism: it killed the best of our people in order to make more room for the worst. It did an enormous amount of genetic damage to our race.

And that's the same egalitarian teaching used today to justify every sort of racially destructive policy in America, from Affirmative Action to open borders. Since Blacks are essentially the same as Whites, except that they've been held back by White racism, it does no racial harm to give jobs and promotions to Blacks that otherwise would have gone to Whites, say the egalitarians. It does no racial harm to boost Blacks up the socioeconomic ladder so that they can be more easily integrated into White society -- and can more easily intermarry with Whites. Since European Americans are essentially the same as Mexican mestizos and Haitian Negroes, why should we exclude them from our country? Sharing our land and our wealth with them can't possibly degrade us as a nation or weaken us in any way. What difference does it make if they outbreed us and eventually replace us? Everything will be the same, because we're all equal. We all have the same creative potential, the same potential for building and maintaining civilization. Right?

And I hardly need to tell you that the people who are pushing the party line of racial egalitarianism in America today are the same people who covered for the communists while they were butchering the best of our people in Europe for the sake of individual and class egalitarianism. The same people are running Hollywood and television and the *New York Times* today who were running Hollywood and radio and the *New York Times* while the communists were "equalizing" Ukraine and Russia and Poland and the Baltic states before their media allies got us into the Second World War in order to keep the Germans from stamping out communism -- and the people responsible for communism.

I'll mention one other thing in this regard. A lot of people believe that the Jews pushing racial egalitarianism in America today are a kinder, gentler bunch than the Jews who were pushing communism in Europe 50, 60, or 70 years ago -- Jews such as Leon Trotsky or Lazar Kaganovich or Ilya Ehrenburg or the unnamed secret police or *gulag* commissars, with the blood of millions of our people on their hands. It isn't so. The Jews in America today cannot order the arrest of their enemies or potential enemies by the thousands, gloat over them while they are being tortured in the basements of police headquarters around the country, and then have them disposed of with a bullet in the back of the head the way they did in Europe. But they would like to. The Jews of Hollywood hate us with the same insane hatred that the Jewish secret police commissars had for the Polish officers and intellectuals they butchered by the thousands in the Katyn forest, with the same insane hatred that was expressed in propaganda commissar Ilya Ehrenburg's exhortations to the Red Army to rape German women and murder German children. They don't yet have the power to murder us wholesale the way they did in Ukraine and Estonia, but they would if they did.

Let me illustrate that. Timothy Blake Nelson is a Hollywood film director. One would never expect someone with the name Timothy Nelson to be a Jew, but in fact he is a Jew and has identified himself as such in various film-industry publications. He is the director of a new film -- *O* as in *Othello* -- due to be released next month by Lions Gate Films, although it actually was made by Miramax, a division of Disney. Disney is headed by the Jew Michael Eisner, and Miramax is headed by the Jewish Weinstein brothers, Bob and Harvey. The original production

team at Miramax is entirely Jewish and is headed by executive producer Michael Levy. The point I am making is that everything about Nelson's new film is Jewish.

Although *O* is very loosely based on the Shakespeare play, Nelson's Othello character is not a Moor but a modern American Negro, who is incongruously named "Odin" -- and, believe me, the incongruity in naming a Negro after the chief god in the Germanic pantheon is deliberate. Everything in the film is deliberate. It is a calculated outpouring of hate against everything White, everything European, everything Aryan.

O, like so many other films coming from Hollywood recently, is aimed at promoting sex between teenaged White girls and Black males. If you believe most of the pre-release reviews, it is not an anti-White film at all, but rather a film aimed at breaking down racial barriers. It is a film against White racism, a film that will help to promote racial brotherhood and racial togetherness and all the other things so beloved of liberals and Christians.

If you read what Nelson himself has to say about his film you will get a different picture, however. It is a film calculated to rub the noses of Whites -- especially Southern Whites, especially upper-class Whites, especially racially conscious Whites -- in their wickedness and their inferiority. The setting of the film is a high-class boarding school for wealthy White kids in Charleston, South Carolina. Nelson gloats over the way in which the school has been forced to change its policies in order to comply with the "civil rights" laws his fellow Jews have imposed on the country. He gloats even more over the way in which the White students at the school have changed.

The White male characters in the film are inferior in every way to the Black hero, who takes possession of the most beautiful White girl in the school, Desi. Although Desi has surrendered herself willingly to him, the Black ultimately subjects her to a violent rape: a symbolic playing out of Jewish hatred against the White race. I'll read a a few selections from Nelson's own pre-production notes for the film, in which he expresses the feelings that he wants the film to evoke. You can read the notes for yourself from the Internet at the Lions Gate Web site. And of course, you do have to read between the lines. The Jews are never straightforward in expressing themselves, but Nelson's hatred comes through clearly enough in these pre-production notes:

First, a few words about why shooting in the South is important. Obviously, the story of *Othello,* and our modern version, deal with racial issues, and in no region in America is the history of racial oppression more apparent.

...I'm actually speaking more of the historical backdrop this region offers. Without populating the film with an assortment of crackers, we can give this story a specific and pointed setting. Place Odin on a distinctly antebellum campus, in a crisp school uniform, among the similarly dressed scions of former slave-owning families, and the rhetorical value is immeasurable.... Like the actress who'll play her, Desi is not only beautiful, she's extremely bright. She's also got poise, wisdom, and depth, which means she's not vulnerable to fads, nor is she indifferent to her past....

Odin is that terrific paradox: the one whom all at some level despise, but whom all, at some level, want to be. In this elite Southern academy, hip-hop language and culture abound, as kids

casually appropriate the argot of places they wouldn't be caught dead in day or night; of characters with whom they'd be terrified speaking. It is beautifully ironic that against the backdrop of antebellum architecture, and in a town in which the old slave market still stands ... kids speak as they do in this film. These great grandchildren of plantation owners venerate the enraged great grandchildren of slaves, whose rhetoric, at close listening, is virulently anti-white.... Odin is born of the black underclass culture fetishised by his rich white classmates, while he simultaneously gets to mingle with those classmates as one of their own. The most beautiful girl in the school is his girlfriend. He'll get the same diploma his classmates will; he'll go to Duke.... Like the ... classroom, the dining hall should feel as though students' grandparents once dined there.... We want old South, so that ... it shouldn't be hard to contemplate Odin's forebears serving the grandparents mentioned above.... With very few exceptions, these kids should seem very white, and very rich.

Well, what I quoted is just a small taste of what the Jewish director has to say about his latest anti-White propaganda film. What is clear is his obsession with race and his burning hatred for us and his contempt. And we let these people -- Jews like Nelson and Eisner and the Weinstein brothers and Redstone and all the rest, with their films and their television and their advertising agencies and the rest of their media -- shape the opinions and the fashions of young Whites. So paralyzed with fear of being called "anti-Semites" or "racists" are we that we let them do it. Perhaps we deserve the contempt they have for us.

Subverting Freedom

Today I want to talk again about a growing threat to our freedom in America. In every White society, at all times, there have been people who valued freedom over comfort and security, and there have been people who valued comfort and security over freedom. Sometimes there are more of the one, and sometimes there are more of the other.

When I've talked about this subject in the past, I've characterized the freedom-lovers as masculine and the security-lovers as feminine because under natural conditions men are a bit more willing to take chances and try new things and want to keep their options open, and they also are a bit more concerned with general principles, and women are a bit more concerned with the security of home and hearth -- which is not to say, of course, that even the most adventurous and principled man has no concern for security or comfort or that even the most home-oriented woman has no concern for principles. It's just that on the average men are more freedom oriented, and women are more security-and-comfort oriented.

As times and manners change, however, the degree to which men value freedom changes. In America 226 years ago Patrick Henry proclaimed, "Give me liberty, or give me death," and in doing so he won the general admiration of his fellows and the agreement of a majority of them. Today many Americans would question his sanity, and more would laugh or sneer at him than agree with him. Partly this change is the consequence of dysgenic immigration and breeding policies during the past century, but it is due more to permissive child-raising practices and a less masculine, less demanding social and civic environment.

And there's another reason -- a very important reason -- for the devaluing of freedom in recent times, and that's the propaganda line of the mass media. The media have worked diligently to undermine Americans' attachment to certain specific freedoms -- the freedom to keep and bear arms, for example -- and at the same time have twisted and redefined the whole meaning of freedom, while cultivating a more feminine ideological climate in America. Sixty years ago Franklin Roosevelt did much to confuse the concept of freedom in the public mind by classifying comfort and security as "freedoms" and then elevating them to the status of freedom of speech and freedom of religion. He included in his enumeration of his so-called "four freedoms" freedom from want and freedom from fear, and the media bosses loved him for it.

Ever since then they have done everything they could to further twist meanings and compound the confusion, so that today the average couch potato or soccer mom can be persuaded easily that comfort -- that is, "freedom from want" -- and security -- that is, "freedom from fear" -- are indeed freedoms in the same sense as freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, freedom of self-defense, and freedom from excessive governmental intrusion.

Really, I have had women -- and men too -- seriously defend the notion that freedom of speech needs to be balanced against comfort, in the form of freedom from feeling bad because of some "insensitive" remark by another person. These couch potato and soccer-mom types will argue, "Well, yes, we have freedom of speech, and that's important, but we can't have people saying or writing things that offend other people, things that hurt the feelings of other people."

For the most part, this is just simpleminded "feel-goodism." These soccer moms and couch potatoes just have very fuzzy notions about concepts such as freedom, and they've absorbed from TV the belief that there really is a "right" to feel good about oneself. Imagine where we'd be today if the Americans at Valley Forge in the winter of 1778 had believed that they had a "right" to be comfortable, and that "right" was as important as the right to be free from domination by a foreign government. In the last couple of centuries we have not only become softer physically and morally, but we've become a bit soft in the head as well.

But it's not just the couch potatoes: there are smarter people out there whose notions are not fuzzy at all but who also hate and fear our ideas about freedom. The radical feminists and the militant homosexuals and many of the leaders of various racial minorities understand the precariousness of their present positions. They understand that a very comfortable and confused White society that tolerates their antics now may someday lose its patience, especially if someone explains things. They understand that they could very quickly lose all of their unnatural privileges if someone explains to the public what their behavior is doing to our society.

They begin feeling very insecure and very uncomfortable when they hear me, for example, talking against government-imposed sexual and racial quotas. When I ridicule the idea that America needs more "diversity" or more female fighter pilots or more Haitian or Mexican immigrants, they would like very much to shut me up. They are afraid that other people will listen and will begin thinking. When I say in one of my broadcasts that a society is sick unto death when its citizens are taught that there's nothing wrong with men kissing and fondling each other in public, these people begin screeching about "hate speech" and demanding laws to keep me quiet.

And a lot of the couch potatoes and soccer moms are ready to go along with them, because they've been conditioned in that direction by the media and the schools -- especially if they have attended a college or university. The radical feminists and the homosexuals and the non-White militants established a beachhead in the university faculties and administrations in the 1960s, and since then they have metastasized to the point where they are the arbiters of Political Correctness in nearly every university in America.

Well, all of this is bad enough -- on the one hand the positions of influence in our schools and our government held by freaks of various sorts and by non-Whites and on the other hand the general softness and state of confusion of our population -- but what makes it much worse and much more dangerous is the campaign by well organized and well financed Jewish pressure groups to subvert legislative bodies and law-enforcement agencies at the same time that Jews in the media are continuing to soften up the public. There is a powerful effort underway now to abolish our Bill of Rights, piece by piece, both directly and indirectly, and it is succeeding.

You know, I've spoken with you before about the Jewish and liberal campaign to have more so-called "hate crime" legislation enacted, at both the state and the Federal levels. That campaign continues, with groups such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith presenting their so-called "model hate crime" bills to legislators everywhere and lobbying for their enactment. And it's not just the Anti-Defamation League. It's other Jewish organizations too, such as the Southern Poverty Law Center and all sorts of ad hoc groups. And politicians being what they are these

days, these Jewish groups are having an alarming degree of success. Legislators, who take an oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, eagerly subvert the Constitution if it will win them favor with the Jews. They will enact patently unconstitutional laws without a second thought if the Anti-Defamation League will give them a pat on the head for it.

And let me assure you, even patently unconstitutional laws that should never be able to stand up in court are dangerous. In the first place, some of them do stand up in court because the courts themselves have been corrupted. But even when they aren't enforceable they intimidate people. No person in his right mind wants to be charged even under a law that is so clearly unconstitutional that no court will uphold it, because he can be bankrupted by the legal fees involved in proving that it is unconstitutional.

At least, there are some more or less "mainstream" groups in America that are as strongly opposed as I am to the whole concept of "hate crime" laws, although for different reasons, and these groups undoubtedly have slowed down somewhat the rate at which the Constitution is being undermined. They could do much more if they weren't so terrified of being labeled "haters" or "anti-Semites" for daring to take a Politically Incorrect position.

The Jews, however, are pushing their campaign to subvert the Constitution at more than one level. While using their media to persuade the public that everyone will be safer and more comfortable with more "hate crime" laws, and lobbying the politicians to enact the laws, at the same time they have a massive effort underway to infiltrate and subvert law-enforcement agencies. And in this last effort, which in some ways is the most dangerous of all, there are no mainstream groups opposing them.

Here's the way it works: the media in a particular area -- say, in Arizona or in Michigan -- raise the public's consciousness of the threat of terrorism. The Jews persuade one of their favorite Gentile politicians in the area to speak up about the need to be prepared to deal with this new threat. The politician gives television interviews and speaks very seriously about the lack of preparedness on the part of police and other government agencies. State and local police agencies begin to worry that they will be blamed if they don't do something to show that they are taking the threat of terrorism seriously. As a matter of fact, terrorism is completely new to them. They've never thought about it much. They don't know anything about it.

Well, guess who comes to the rescue! An official of the Anti-Defamation League or another Jewish group goes to see the head of the state police, and he brings along a member of the Israeli secret-police organization Mossad. The two Jews tell the chief of the state police that they know all about terrorism and terrorists, and they want to share their information with him, because of their humanitarian concern for public safety. The police chief is happy to accept their offer, and so training seminars are set up. The Jews tell the police officials about terrorism -- and especially about terrorists, about how to spot a terrorist, about what characteristics to look for.

Usually the irony of the situation is not even realized by the Gentile policemen. The Mossad is an organization that engages in state-sponsored terrorism. It commits terrorist acts on a larger scale than any other organization, including Osama bin Laden's group. Its agents sneak into

people's hotel rooms in other countries and plant radio-detonated bombs under their beds. They put bombs in people's telephones. They put bombs in people's cars. They use exotic poisons to assassinate people. A couple of Mossad agents got caught in Jordan a couple of years ago when they tried to murder an Islamic religious leader they didn't like by squirting poison into his ear as they passed him on a sidewalk in Amman. And these professional assassins and terrorists are supposedly teaching our policemen about how to spot terrorists!

Imagine the police hiring the Mafia to teach them about organized crime and how to fight it. Do you think that perhaps the Mafia instructors might tailor their teaching to give the police only the information that wouldn't be harmful to the Mafia? Do you think that perhaps the Mafia might try to use the police for its own ends instead of being public-spirited and really helping the police fight organized crime?

It is not surprising that what our policemen learn about terrorism and terrorists from this relationship with the Jews is a bit one-sided. It is not surprising that the police learn that terrorists are likely to be Islamic extremists -- or even more likely, White racists. It is not surprising that they learn that White racists and White patriots -- in fact, any groups or individuals who are not Politically Correct -- should be watched carefully, because they might be terrorists, or they might become terrorists as demographic and social conditions in the country continue to worsen. People who are opposed to the flood of non-White immigrants pouring into the country, people who are opposed to continually increasing "diversity" in America, might become violent, might resort to terrorism, if the government doesn't do something to control immigration.

Well, that's just the beginning of this worrisome relationship between our police and the Jews. And you know, when I say "the Jews," I don't mean just the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center and the Mossad. This ongoing subversion of our Constitution -- this assault on our freedom -- is also supported by the Jewish community, by the Jewish tribe, as a whole. The Jewish bosses of the mass media support it as well as the Jewish pressure groups.

Of course, there are individual exceptions. There are a few Jews who, for one reason or another, refuse to march in lockstep with the rest of the tribe. In an earlier program I told you about Norman Finkelstein, whose book *The Holocaust Industry,* exposes the chicanery and fraud of the media Jews and other Jews who have lied about and exaggerated Jewish losses during the Second World War in order to gain economic and political advantages for their fellow Jews. Despite Finkelstein's dissent, the Holocaust fraud remains a Jewish fraud, because it is supported by nearly all Jews, not just by Simon Wiesenthal and Elie Wiesel and a few other professional Holocaust hucksters. I've discussed with you Robert Friedman's revelations of the Jewishness of so-called "Russian" organized crime in his book *Red Mafiya.* But despite Friedman's exposé, virtually all the Jews in the controlled media continue to pretend that the members of the organized crime gangs that came to America from the former Soviet Union are Russians instead of Jews.

And there are a few individual Jews who speak out against the campaign to enact "hate crime" and "speech crime" laws. They warn that this campaign threatens our most fundamental freedoms. Nat Hentoff, a Jew who works for the Jewish newspaper *Village Voice* and has a syndicated newspaper column, is one of these. Hentoff has for years spoken out against threats to

free speech, and he is speaking out now against the "speech crime" campaign being pushed by his fellow Jews.

Of course, Hentoff doesn't refer to it as a Jewish campaign, but that's exactly what it is. I'm happy that Hentoff is at least speaking out against "speech crime" laws, but it is a fact that one cannot really understand what is going on unless one sees the campaign as Jewish and sees how it meshes with long-term Jewish goals. And one cannot effectively fight against this campaign unless one is willing to fight against the Jews as a whole.

Well, I told you that the Anti-Defamation League's teaching of law-enforcement agencies about terrorism is just the beginning. Having established a cozy relationship with police departments around the country, Jewish organizations next put themselves forward as experts on "hate crime" legislation, which is as new and strange to most law enforcement people as terrorism is. "Hate crime" and "speech crime" are the coming things, the Jews persuade the policemen. If you want to stay on the right side of the media in the future, you'll be spending much less time chasing robbers and rapists and instead will be arresting "hate criminals" and "speech criminals." You'll need to know how to recognize them. Let us teach you.

And the Jews are teaching them. In Phoenix, Arizona, the police department has a special "bias crimes detail": an incipient thought police unit. Although the Phoenix cops do not yet have the authority to arrest people for expressing Politically Incorrect thoughts, they do keep official police records -- "information cards," they are called -- on people overheard saying things that might be used later as evidence against them if they ever are charged with a "hate crime." For example, a White man reports to the Phoenix police that he has just been mugged and robbed on the street by two illegal aliens from Mexico. While the police are taking his report he says, "I'd like to see all of these wetbacks rounded up and shot." An "information card" reporting that remark goes into the police files. Two years later the same White man gets in a fight with a Mexican and beats him up. Has a "hate crime" been committed? The "bias crimes detail" finds the two-year-old "information card" in its files and on that basis charges the White man with a "hate crime" carrying twice the penalty that a simple assault would carry.

And Phoenix certainly isn't the only community where the Jews have persuaded the local cops to begin collecting evidence of what people are thinking so that they can be prosecuted later. In Laguna Beach, California, Police Chief Jim Spreine encourages citizens to report to the police any "hate-style comments," to use the chief's words, that they overhear. People who make "hate-style comments" are more likely to commit acts of violence later and so bear watching, the chief told a reporter for the *Orange County Register.* And I do not need to tell you who it is that advises the chief exactly what constitutes a "hate-style comment."

This is the sort of thing that is happening all over America at a rapidly increasing rate. The whole meaning of law enforcement is being transformed. The police used to protect normal, law-abiding citizens by locking up violent predators. Nowadays in many cities the police are doing less of that from fear of being charged with "racism" or "racial profiling," because violent predators are disproportionately non-White. The police instead are spending their time watching, gathering information on, and in some cases arresting White men who are suspected of having Politically Incorrect attitudes and thinking Politically Incorrect thoughts.

As I told you earlier in this broadcast, there are two principal reasons for this transformation. One is the general feminization of America: the shift from a freedom-loving citizenry to a comfort-loving and security-loving citizenry. The other reason is deliberate subversion on a huge scale, in which the controlled mass media and Jewish pressure groups have played the largest role.

If America is to survive much longer its citizens must once again come to value freedom more than comfort and security. But before this shift in attitude can be effected, the grip of the Jews on the mass media and on the political process in America must be broken. And before that can happen, those Americans who still love freedom must find the courage to speak out and accuse those who are subverting their country.

Certainly, anger is growing. The rage is growing. But along with the rage must grow understanding and courage.

Time to Blast Our Enemies

There are some interesting things going on around the world. I want to describe a few of these things for you and then tie them together and make a few predictions.

Let's begin with Australia. Police in Sydney, Australia's largest city, are trying to cope with a new problem: rapes of young White girls by gangs of non-White immigrants. More than 70 White girls, ranging in age from 13 to 18, have been abducted from Sydney suburbs and subjected to exceptionally brutal gang rapes during the past two years. The frequency of the rapes is on the rise, and they are spreading from Sydney to other Australian cities. In an incident three weeks ago in Guildford, a residential suburb of Perth, Australia's fourth-largest city, on the other side of the continent from Sydney, as many as two dozen men seized a young girl in a school yard and raped her repeatedly, before scrawling anti-White slogans on her naked body.

All of the victims have been White, and all of the rapists have been non-White. Police refuse to be specific, saying only that the members of the rape gangs are of Middle Eastern origin. Although a number of arrests of the rapists have been made, police are pessimistic about curbing the phenomenon or even slowing it down. They say it is a "culturally institutionalized" problem, which means that gang rape of women and girls not under the protection of a strong male is traditional in the home country from which the rapists come: gang rape of unprotected women is an institution in the Middle East and among Semitic peoples generally. Police are hesitant to crack down on the rape gangs from fear of being charged with "racial profiling," the same charge that has hamstrung police in America. So in lieu of moving aggressively against the Middle Eastern immigrant groups to which the rapists belong, Australian police are planning a "social research program" to better understand the phenomenon.

South Africa is experiencing similar problems with gang rape. Rape always has been "culturally institutionalized" among Blacks throughout Africa, including South Africa. The new aspect of rape there is that now White women are increasingly being chosen as victims, whereas during the apartheid period they were exempt because Blacks feared aggressive police action and extremely severe punishment for raping a White woman. With a Black government, that is no longer true; in fact Black police officials in South Africa look with amusement on rape complaints by White women.

South Africa has become the rape capital of the world, with more reported rapes per capita than any other country, according to Interpol. South Africa also has the fastest rising per capita rate of HIV infection. The belief is widespread among Blacks in Africa that they can cure AIDS by having sex with a woman who does not have the disease. They believe that sex with an uninfected woman will "draw out" the disease from their bodies and into the bodies of the women. Therefore they seek out very young girls -- presumably virgins and therefore uninfected -- for rape. And they also seek out White women, among whom the infection rate is only a tiny fraction of the rate among Black women.

Racial hatred also plays a role in the growing incidence of the gang rape of White women in South Africa. Jean Saul lives with her husband just outside Johannesburg. Four Blacks recently

broke into their home, robbed them at gunpoint, then tied up both Mrs. Saul and her husband in their beds. They called Mrs. Saul a "White bitch" and then told her husband: "We've got AIDS, and we're going to rape your wife." Then all four took turns raping her, forcing her husband to watch. After that, according to Mrs. Saul's report:

One of the Blacks "stood on the bed, and he actually peed on us: just urinated over both of us.

France and Sweden both are experiencing a growing surge of gang rapes of young girls by non-White immigrants -- not by Blacks, but by Middle Easterners in Sweden and by North Africans in France. As in Australia the police in France and Sweden seem hesitant to crack down vigorously on the rape gangs, simply because the rapists are all non-White.

In England the immigrants causing the worst problems at the moment are Asians, most of them from the Indian subcontinent. I spoke with you two months ago about the destruction that Asian gangs were wreaking in northern England. I spoke specifically about the Asian riots in Oldham, about the Asian gang attacks on Whites there. Well the riots have continued, primarily because the police have refused to crack down on the rioters. The mass media in England have tried hard to put the blame for the riots on "White racism," and under the government of Tony Blair, who is a British version of Bill Clinton, the police in England are as afraid of "racial profiling" accusations as are the police in America.

Last month the heaviest rioting yet in England by Asian gangs hit the city of Bradford, near Leeds. White-owned stores in Bradford were looted and firebombed, two White men were stabbed, and more than 200 policemen were injured. Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of White property was destroyed or stolen.

And what about America? Earlier this year I spoke with you on several occasions about the Black riots in Seattle and in Cincinnati. I pointed out that during the Mardi Gras riot in Seattle the police stood on the sidelines and refused to interfere while gangs of Blacks rampaged through a mostly White crowd, beating, robbing, and stomping individual Whites, mostly young women, and killing one young White man who tried to help a young woman who had been knocked to the ground and was being kicked by Blacks. The police explained that they had been using "restraint" in order not to provoke even worse violence. Actually, as was revealed later, they were afraid of being charged with "racial profiling," because if they had arrested lawbreakers nearly all those arrested would have been Black. As every lemming has learned from TV, Blacks are no more likely to commit crimes of violence than Whites, so arresting more Blacks than Whites during a riot is clear proof of police racism.

The Black rioting in Cincinnati in April also saw the police looking the other way while the Blacks pulled Whites from cars and beat them, looted stores, set buildings afire, and carried on in their customary way. The Black pretext for rioting in Cincinnati was the shooting of a Black criminal with 14 outstanding arrest warrants who was fleeing from police. The media in Cincinnati made such a hullabaloo about the fact that the fleeing criminal was unarmed at the time -- the headlines read: "unarmed Black youth gunned down by White policeman" -- that the police and the city's White politicians became gun shy.

In an effort to deflect charges of "racial profiling" they arrested a young White man who had thrown a brick at a Black during the riot and charged him with a "hate crime": certainly the first "hate crime" charge to be filed as a result of the Cincinnati riot and, as far as I am aware, the only one. During the rioting angry White citizens in the Cincinnati area were calling radio talk shows and asking why the police were refusing even to arrest Black rioters who pulled a White woman from her car and beat and kicked her savagely. The television cameras caught it, but the police ignored it. The White mayor of Cincinnati, Charlie Lukens, obviously was scared to death that if the police waded into the rioters to rescue White victims other Blacks might be shot, and he would be blamed by the media. He refused to criticize the Black rioters; he attended the funeral of the Black criminal who had been shot; and his solution for preventing further rioting was:

We must address the broader issues of racism and economic inclusion in our community.

After the riot in April and the anemic response of Cincinnati police, violent crime is up astronomically in the city. Since the riot there have been 74 more shootings, compared to nine shootings in the same period last year. All but one of the gunmen in the 74 shootings since April was Black. And while violent crime is way up, arrests in Cincinnati are down more than 50 per cent. Clearly Mayor Lukens is hoping to avoid provoking another Black riot and more charges of "racial profiling" from the media. What he's doing now to try to curb violent crime in Cincinnati is recruit more Black policemen. He believes that a more "diverse" police force will lead to less crime -- or at least, to less media criticism of him.

This sort of reaction by White politicians to media charges of lack of sensitivity to Blacks or other non-Whites is not confined to Cincinnati. They are telling White cops to take it easy on Blacks everywhere. On my desk I have a Fox News story from last week -- July 27 -- headed, "Seattle Cops, Wary of Race-Profiling Accusations, Cutting Back on Minority Arrests."

I also have a similar story, which was printed in the *Seattle Times* a month earlier. That story is headed, "Wary of racism complaints, police look the other way in Black neighborhoods." Here are a few lines from the story:

The cops on the street have different names for it: de-policing, selective disengagement, tactical detachment. They even joke about it, calling themselves "tourists in blue." ... Many officers, wary of being labeled "racists" or "racial profilers," say they hold back or bypass opportunities to make traffic stops or arrests of black suspects.... "It's real. It's happening," said Eric Michl, a Seattle patrol officer for 17 years. "Parking under a shady tree to work on a crossword puzzle is a great alternative to being labeled a racist and being dragged through an inquest, a review board, an FBI and U.S. Attorney's investigation, and a lawsuit."

The same Seattle policeman described a recent incident in which he stopped a car that was being driven recklessly. The driver appeared to be high on cocaine and was carrying no driver's license and had no registration document for the car. Ordinarily, said Michl, he would have arrested the driver on the spot. But the driver was Black, and so Michl hesitated. Instead of making an immediate arrest he went back to his patrol car to run the license plate through the police computer. It turned out that the car was stolen, but by that time the Black driver had fled.

Well, I said that we would tie together all of these things and then draw some conclusions from them. What we have in each of these situations I have described for you is White men on the defensive; White men thinking and acting like women; White men so terrified of being criticized, so terrified of being called "racists," that they will not protect themselves, their women, or their communities. They have let themselves be pushed into positions that are less and less defensible.

Australia, for example, used to be a White country, in spirit as well as in fact. The government had a "White Australia" policy: immigrants from non-White parts of the world simply were not accepted. That's the way the Australians wanted it, and the government was happy to oblige. In the late 1960s, however, the Jews, the controlled media, the Christian churches, and leftist elements in the Labor Party began collaborating on a long-range "anti-racism" propaganda campaign in Australia. It was the same sort of propaganda campaign that was used to soften up South Africa prior to turning it over to Black rule. The formula was: racism is a terrible thing, and you should be ashamed if you have any racist feelings; not permitting Asians and Middle Easterners to immigrate to Australia is racist -- or in South Africa, not permitting Blacks to vote is racist; therefore, if you are in favor of keeping Australia White you are a terrible person and should be ashamed of yourself -- or, if you are a White South African and don't want the Black majority to vote, you are a terrible person and should be ashamed.

By the mid-1970s the campaign had had such an effect on Australians that they were afraid to protest when the government abandoned its "White Australia" policy and opened the floodgates to Asian and Middle Eastern immigrants. And by the early 1990s White South Africans had been so intimidated by the "anti-racism" propaganda in their country that they were ready to commit collective race suicide rather than be considered "racists." In 1991 they abandoned their system of apartheid, and in 1993 they agreed in effect to turn their country over to rule by the Black majority. They agreed to let Blacks vote, so that they wouldn't be thought "racists" by the lemmings in other countries.

As social conditions in Australia began deteriorating and the crime rate began rising under the impact of Asian immigration, the government pushed for a general disarmament of the White population. Everyone would be safer, the government and the media and the churches proclaimed, if no one had a firearm. And the feminized, brainwashed population put up only a minimal protest. Yes, yes! They wanted to feel safer! They wanted to be nicer! Let's get rid of those awful firearms! So in 1997 -- just four years ago -- all privately owned firearms in Australia were confiscated by the government. Since then there has been a 45 per cent increase in the rate of armed robberies across Australia. In the state of Victoria the rate of homicides committed with firearms has risen 300 per cent. That's because the Asian gangs still have their guns, but the Whites don't.

It's really difficult to sympathize with White Australians and White South Africans. Through their own foolishness and weakness they brought their present problems upon themselves. When men begin acting like women, that is what happens. When White men let themselves be bamboozled into feeling guilty and defensive about their natural, healthy racial feelings, that is what happens.

I remember what happened in South Africa just a few years ago. The Christian churches there organized huge anti-apartheid demonstrations. The Jews were lurking in the background and pulling the strings, of course, but it was White Christians out front campaigning for an end to apartheid. It was Christian clerics denouncing racism from their pulpits and calling for interracial brotherhood. And the White lemmings soaked it up. I remember seeing the young White women -- beautiful, empty-headed White women -- marching in these demonstrations arm in arm with Blacks. The White women were so proud of themselves for being ideologically fashionable, for being Politically Correct. And their men -- their fathers, their husbands, their brothers -- let them behave in this way rather than risk being thought racist. And so now the fashionable White women of South Africa are being raped and infected with the AIDS virus, and their spineless men are being forced to watch.

Foolishness and weakness! Foolish women and weak men. But is that not the way most of our people are everywhere, including the United States? Isn't that the way most of our people always have been? Isn't that why the Jews just love mass democracy and praise democracy to the skies in their media?

It's easy for us in the United States to shake our heads at the foolishness and weakness of the Australians and the South Africans. It's easy for us to say to the Australians: "You had a Bill Clinton/Tony Blair style government, a government catering to the welfare rabble and to the worst of the lemmings, so how can you be surprised that your government abandoned your "White Australia" policy and now welcomes a growing flood of non-White immigrants into your country? The Asian immigrants will be the new constituency for your politicians. And you certainly can't complain that now you have no weapons to protect yourselves and your women from these immigrants. You were so afraid of being Politically Incorrect that you permitted the government to confiscate your firearms without even putting up a fight. Now you're getting what you deserve."

It's easy for us to say that about the Australians and to say even harsher things about the South Africans. How could anybody be so stupid as to let a majority of the electorate in their country become non-White and expect their government to continue to protect them and to maintain civilized standards?

It's easy to say these things because the Australian and South African situations seem so different from ours. It's a little harder for us to criticize the people in England for letting the Asians there riot and tear up their cities, The situation in England is a little too close to what we have witnessed in Seattle and Cincinnati. But you know, the situation in Australia really is not so different from ours as we might want to believe. Our government is just as democratic, just as corrupt, and the attitudes and opinions of our people are just as prone to manipulation by the media. We used to have a "White America" immigration policy here too. Under pressure from the Jewish media and the Christian churches that policy was abandoned after the Second World War.

Now our government doesn't even attempt to control our borders. It is more concerned that the mestizos pouring in from Mexico might lose their way in the Arizona desert and suffer from the heat than it is about keeping them out. The U.S. Border Patrol is planning on installing special

signalling stations in the desert so that if the illegal aliens get lost on their way north they can call for help. Really! I got that news from a July 28 Associated Press report from Tucson, Arizona, which is on my desk now. With that kind of thinking in our government, our situation in just a few decades will be very similar to that of South Africa's Whites today. We will have a non-White voting majority in the country and a government staffed by a majority of non-Whites who will be just as amused by our cries for help as are the Black police officials of South Africa when White women there complain about being gang-raped by Blacks. And like the Australians we will not have weapons to defend ourselves or our women.

That's where we're headed everywhere in the White world. What is happening now in Australia and in South Africa gives us a clear warning. That warning will do us no good, however, unless we do something about our basic problem. That basic problem is the continued programming of our lemmings by mass media controlled by Jews. As long as the Jews who control America's mass media are permitted to continue teaching our women that frolicking with Blacks is fashionable, and as long as they are permitted to continue teaching our men that being thought a "racist" is a fate worse than death, we will not be able to avoid the future the media bosses have planned for us. Because, believe me, our women are just as foolish and our men just as weak as are those of Australia and South Africa. The governmental structure is in place that will annihilate our race and our civilization, and the masters of the mass media are at the controls of this structure. Whether there is a Democrat or a Republican figurehead at the top of the structure makes very little difference. We must begin dismantling that structure; we must put a monkey wrench in its gears; we must yank -- we must blast -- the controllers from their seats of power in Hollywood and New York, or we are finished.

Demonstrating for Freedom

Two weeks ago my organization, the National Alliance, held a small, peaceful demonstration at the German Embassy in Washington. On Sunday, July 29, we had about 70 men and women carrying signs in front of the embassy protesting the lack of civil liberties for dissidents in Germany. We were protesting the fact that the German government puts its citizens in prison for saying or writing anything deemed Politically Incorrect. In Germany people are locked up even for listening to Politically Incorrect music or for having Politically Incorrect ideas about what really happened during the Second World War. People are in prison in Germany now for having questioned some detail of the official "Holocaust" story, for example, or for singing forbidden songs or for being caught at an underground concert where forbidden music was being played.

There is no freedom of speech in Germany, no freedom of association, no intellectual or artistic freedom, and we want everyone to know this. We want to embarrass the German government. And we want the American people to know about this lack of freedom in Germany and about the repression of political, intellectual, and artistic dissidents. Most Americans haven't the faintest idea about these things. Americans are taught in school and by the media -- especially by Hollywood -- that in the Second World War the Americans fought the Nazis to free the German people and the rest of Europe from the tyranny imposed by Hitler. Americans are taught that under Hitler the Germans had no freedom. They are taught that the first thing Hitler did when he became chancellor of Germany in 1933 was confiscate all of the privately owned firearms in Germany. Then he burned all of the books he didn't like. After that, Americans have been told in countless Hollywood films, he had anyone who criticized him or his government arrested and thrown into a concentration camp. Americans have been taught that anyone who refused to give the Roman salute or to say "Heil Hitler!" on appropriate occasions was in danger of being shot by the Gestapo.

And we are taught that the Americans smashed the wicked Nazi government in order to restore freedom to Germany. We are taught that we gave back to the Germans freedom of speech and freedom of the press and freedom of association, that we gave them back political and intellectual and artistic freedom, and that the Germans were very grateful to us for this. We are taught that we "liberated" the Germans. And to drive the lesson home we are shown photographs and old newsreel clips of American GIs handing out candy bars to grateful German children. We are shown photographs of American soldiers opening the gates of concentration camps and freeing all of the wrongfully imprisoned dissidents, many of them badly malnourished.

Most Americans don't understand that nearly all of this is a calculated lie. They don't understand that Hollywood concocted this lie, and the U.S. government and the American educational establishment went along with it in order to deceive the American people about the true reasons for the American bombing and invasion of Germany and about what actually happened in Germany before, during, and after the war. Indeed, some GIs did give candy bars to German children, but nearly everything else we have been taught about Germany and the Second World War is a lie.

Most Americans don't understand that Hitler didn't confiscate privately owned firearms after he became chancellor. In fact, he encouraged the private ownership of firearms by Germans. It was the U.S. government that outlawed the private ownership of firearms in Germany and then confiscated all civilian weapons from the German people in 1945. After Germany's surrender the U.S. Army posted proclamations requiring all German civilians to turn in their handguns, their hunting rifles and shotguns, even their fencing swords, at Army collection stations. And American GIs were amazed at the enormous number of privately owned weapons turned in by the Germans: everything from modern sporting rifles and pocket pistols intended for self-defense to antique firearms and swords that were family heirlooms. The Americans permitted no German civilian to keep any weapon with which he might defend himself or his family. Hitler didn't take away the Germans' right to keep and bear arms; the U.S. government did.

Americans don't understand that Hitler did not make it illegal for Germans to own books critical of him or his government. Americans have been shown pictures of Germans throwing books on bonfires, and they have been told that these were books confiscated from Germans, that the Nazis were basically "book burners" who consigned to the flames anything they didn't agree with. What they have not been told is that the bonfires were merely symbolic, that the books burned were communist literature, pornographic materials, and other books the Hitler government viewed as degenerate and harmful to public morality. Germans could still own or read such books if they wanted, but the Nazis were making a public demonstration of their opposition to communism, to pornography, to Jewish fashions, to degenerate modern art, and the like.

Their symbolic bonfires served much the same purpose as public bonfires that have been organized in America by Christian church groups to burn records, tapes, and CDs of music with what the church groups consider immoral lyrics. Christian leaders understand that they cannot stop people from owning or listening to such music, but they want to send a graphic message of their disapproval. Such bonfires, whether in Germany or America, have propaganda value, but they do not have legal significance.

Americans don't understand that Germans were not thrown into concentration camps for not saying "Heil Hitler!" or for not joining the Nazi party. Indeed, there were certain limits. Hitler banned the Communist Party, and if someone were caught trying to recruit communists for underground work, he very likely would wind up in a concentration camp. If homosexuals were seen fondling each other in public in Berlin the way they do in San Francisco today, they probably would be sent to a concentration camp. If a child molester or a pimp were arrested in Germany, he might be sent to a concentration camp. He might even have his head cut off.

There were some things the Nazis simply wouldn't put up with. They were quite determined to clean up German life and to set new fashions and new standards for public behavior after a long period during which the Jews had been permitted to promote every sort of degeneracy in Germany. But the fact remains that despite the restrictions on communists and homosexuals and Jews, Germans had more intellectual and artistic freedom -- more freedom of speech -- under Hitler than they did after Germany's so-called "liberation" in 1945. And under Hitler they had more freedom of expression than they do today. But if you say that in Germany now you'll be arrested and sent to prison for it.

In the National Alliance we believe that Americans ought to understand that. It was not just for German freedom that we were demonstrating two weeks ago. It was for American freedom as well. The unfortunate fact is that our government in Washington agrees with the German government's repression of dissidents in Germany. The Bush government would like very much to be able to imprison its critics in America the way the German government imprisons its dissidents. On the very day before our demonstration Mr. Bush's government forcibly sent a young German musician, Hendrik Möbus, back to Germany so that he can be imprisoned for Politically Incorrect statements he made there before fleeing to this country and seeking political asylum here.

Our Immigration and Nationality Act specifically says that asylum is available to:

(A)ny person who is outside any country of such person's nationality ... and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

That's what the U.S. law says, and it seems clear enough that, having been convicted twice in absentia by German courts while he was seeking asylum here for things he had said in Germany before fleeing, Hendrik had a "well-founded fear of persecution on account of ... [his] political opinion." And so from the beginning the National Alliance supported Hendrik's struggle for freedom. We hired attorneys for him and paid all of his expenses in the effort to win political asylum for him.

In the final ruling against Hendrik before they turned him over to the German government to be locked up, the U.S. Board of Immigration Appeals said that they found that the German government had a "right" to enforce its laws intended to:

discourage the political activities of groups seen as sympathetic to or supportive of extremely nationalistic or Nazi-like causes.

This quote is directly from the ruling. Well, I'm no lawyer, but it seems to me that being convicted and sentenced to prison for making statements seen by the German government as "sympathetic to or supportive of extremely nationalistic or Nazi-like causes" amounts to "persecution on account of ... political opinion."

You know, I have a strong suspicion that if Hendrik were Chinese instead of German, and the Chinese government wanted to lock him up for having said things it didn't like, the U.S. Board of Immigration Appeals would have viewed his petition for asylum differently. I suspect that would be the case because opposition by a Chinaman to the Chinese government is not seen as a threat by a certain very powerful minority group in the United States, whereas opposition by a German to the German government that the U.S. Army installed after the war to keep the German people under control very definitely is seen as a threat.

Of course, the principal lie about Germany that is propagated by the media and the schools and the government here isn't the lie that Germany is a free country today. It is the lie that for no

reason at all Hitler killed six million innocent, inoffensive, blameless Jews in gas chambers during the war. This is the so-called "Holocaust" story that Germans are not permitted to investigate or question. They are required to swallow it whole, under penalty of law -- and to do penance by supporting Israel.

To be sure, Hitler did kill Jews. That was a necessary concomitant of restoring Germany to health. When communists were rounded up and thrown into concentration camps in Germany before the war, many of them were Jews. And during the fight against the Soviet Union, groups of Jews were rounded up and put into concentration camps in the east, because nearly all of them were partisans of the communists. When the Germans failed to round them up, the local citizens in Poland and Ukraine and the Baltic states often rounded them up themselves and killed them, because the Jews had collaborated with the Soviets in persecuting the non-Jewish citizens of these countries. There's a big ruckus in the Jewish media at the moment about the Poles taking revenge against the Jews of the town of Jedwabne in 1941 after the Germans drove out the Reds.

I really don't know how many Jews the Germans killed, but it certainly was less than the number of German civilians and prisoners of war killed by or at the instigation of the Jews after the war. The Americans collaborated in this genocidal campaign against the Germans, allowing gangs of armed, murderous Jews in U.S. Army uniforms to run wild through conquered Germany, raping, looting, and killing. German prisoners of war were starved to death on a massive scale after they had surrendered. Some were poisoned by being fed bread laced with arsenic. And the Americans, who supposedly had been fighting to "liberate" the Germans, turned the whole eastern half of Germany over to the communists at the end of the war. Some "liberation"! It's no wonder that American GIs began using the term so cynically. To "liberate" came to mean to steal, to loot, to despoil, to plunder and pillage.

Anyway, the Germans lost their freedom in 1945, and they still haven't regained it. The Jews who control our news and entertainment media think that's a good thing, and therefore, of course, our government does too. The National Alliance was protesting against the lack of freedom in Germany and also against the attitude of the media and the government in this country that the Germans shouldn't have freedom, nor should Americans who refuse to follow the Jewish party line. So as soon as the National Alliance people began arriving at the German Embassy, they were attacked by a shrieking gaggle of the Chosen Ones who had been bused in from New York for the purpose. The Jews, representing such groups as the International Socialist Organization, the World Workers' Party, something called Anti-Racist Action, and a coven of militant lesbians, began spitting and swinging weapons.

Most of the Jews were masked: that is, they were wearing ski masks or bandannas tied across their faces. The District of Columbia has an anti-mask law, enacted back during the 1920s as an anti-Klan measure, but the police seemed to believe that the law doesn't apply to Jews or communists, because no one was arrested for concealing his face behind a mask or a bandanna. The enemy's weapons were things they could claim weren't really weapons, but that nevertheless could do substantial damage. One of them was swinging a skateboard, and another was using a heavy lug wrench when they attacked Billy Roper, who works with me in Hillsboro, but who was leading our group of demonstrators in Washington.

I wasn't there myself, but I have studied the videotape from a news camera, and one can clearly see these Jewish champions of international brotherhood trying to kill Billy with a heavy skateboard and a lug wrench. They put a nasty gash over his right eye before our people grabbed them and held them for the police. Our people, of course, in obedience to the law, all were unarmed, neatly dressed, and prepared for a peaceful demonstration, but since we had as many people as the Jews had, the odds weren't to their liking and they didn't stick around long. We marched in front of the embassy for two hours, primarily for the benefit of the news media, so that our message would reach the American public as well as the German government. One Washington television station -- Channel 9 -- carried a reasonably good report of the demonstration and of the Jewish effort to stop it; the *Washington Post* and most of the other media gave minimal coverage.

So our member Billy Roper, a high school history teacher from Arkansas, got a gash over his eye and some bruises, the National Alliance is $20,000 in the hole for legal expenses trying to win asylum for Hendrik; and Hendrik is in a German prison, where he must spend at least the next five years of his life for having said some things that the Chosen People who control both Germany and the United States didn't like. And the American people, like most of the German people, continue watching their television screens in blissful ignorance, growing fatter, and thinking exactly what the Jewish masters of Hollywood and the networks tell them to think.

Excuse me: that's not entirely correct. The situation really isn't as static as that makes it seem. The masters of the media are not content with keeping most of the Gentile population in a stupor of ignorance and consumption. They are consumed with the same murderous hatred for our people that inspired the communists, lesbians, and other Jewish radicals to attempt to murder one of our peaceful demonstrators in Washington by beating him over the head with a lug wrench and a skateboard. The media masters and their allies in the government, in the schools, and in the pulpit are pushing hard for "speech crime" laws in the United States of the same sort that resulted in Hendrik being imprisoned in Germany.

And the other side of the situation is that not all of our people are in a brainwashed stupor. More than ever before, the perceptive and independent-minded few are rousing themselves in alarm over the danger that threatens all of us. The danger to Americans is not just that of the loss of our freedom, leaving us, like the Germans, unable to speak out against those who want to destroy us. The danger comes from a whole flood of evils accompanying the campaign against our freedom. The flood of non-White immigrants into the White world -- in America, in Australia, in Europe -- is causing some to join us. The growing corruption of our courts and our legislatures is rousing others. The all too visible examples of South Africa and Rhodesia -- visible, that is, to those not totally numbed by the Jewish poison pouring forth from their television screens -- these examples of what happens to White nations that succumb to the Jew-inspired, womanish whining of the multiculturalists and the diversity-mongers, the whining of, "Oh, why can't we all just learn to get along together? Why can't we all just love each other: Blacks and Asians and mestizos and Whites? There's plenty for all of us if we'll just share and be nice to each other" -- these examples of the descent into rape and disease and murder and squalor and savagery and degradation and racial extinction wherever Jewish propaganda has prevailed -- are moving others finally to stand with us.

What is coming to America will be terrible and bloody. What will happen even to those who have tried desperately to stay out of the fight will be far more painful that what happened to Billy Roper when he was attacked by a Jewish mob in Washington two weeks ago. But we can see now at least the possibility of light and sanity and health once again after the great bloodletting that is coming. It really is a race now between the Jews and their allies on one side, and the awakening few on our side: the few who still have time to prevail against the enemies of our people everywhere if they can find the courage and the will to act soon.

To Be, or To Be Nice

Have you been paying attention to what's happening in Rhodesia and South Africa in recent weeks? Certainly not, if your only sources of news are the controlled news media, such as CNN or the network television news programs. They've been far too busy giving you interviews with Chandra Levy's parents.

Of course, I have reported to you from time to time on the situations in Rhodesia, now officially known as "Zimbabwe," and in South Africa. It is depressing to me to talk about these things. It is depressing to me to see the predictions that I made long ago coming true. And it has been even more depressing than usual recently as the deterioration of conditions in those countries has accelerated, as the ultimate horror that I predicted has become visible.

Two weeks ago, we talked about the growing phenomenon of the gang rape of White women by Blacks in South Africa. It has been a little over a year, however, since we talked about the seizure and looting of White farms in Rhodesia and the killing of White farm families there by mobs of Blacks. President for Life Robert Mugabe wanted to enhance his popularity among his followers by taking land away from White farmers and giving it to Blacks. When he began this activity Mugabe had to use a certain degree of caution for two reasons. First, virtually all the agricultural product of Rhodesia came from the White farms; Blacks engaged only in subsistence farming, and White farms that were turned over to Blacks essentially went out of production, weakening the country's economy. Second, a substantial portion of White Rhodesians were British citizens, and the British government was protesting the dispossession and mistreatment of its citizens.

It soon became clear to Mugabe, however, that the British government of Prime Minister Tony Blair really didn't care what happened to Rhodesia's Whites and that the government's protests were merely empty words. Furthermore, as the Rhodesian economy, badly damaged by the earlier seizures of White farms, sank further toward chaos, jobless Blacks clamored for even more White land. A government of reasonable men might have salvaged the Rhodesian economy by a combination of austerity measures and strict law enforcement, but that is not the African way. The African way -- more generally, the Black way is to kill the goose and get all the golden eggs now. So Mugabe, in order to maintain his popularity, has continued to let the mobs of jobless Blacks seize White farms and despoil them.

The process is now spiraling out of control. Last week a group of White farmers fought their way through a mob of squatters who were attacking a White farm. They rescued the besieged White farmer, but they injured a number of the Black squatters while doing it. The Mugabe government in turn arrested 23 of the White farmers who had been involved in the rescue, denied them bond, and threw them into prison in chains, where they now are at the tender mercies of Black jailers.

It is mid-winter in Rhodesia, and the unheated prison cells where the White farmers are being held are freezing. When three jailers in the prison responded to a request from the Whites for blankets, Mugabe promptly had the jailers themselves arrested. The Whites are not to be "coddled," he announced, sending a clear message to the other jailers and to policemen that

Whites could be abused with impunity. Mugabe has, in effect, declared all White Rhodesians to be outlaws. Blacks may attack them and steal their property, and they may not attempt to protect themselves. In order to make things perfectly clear, last Saturday Mugabe's second-in-command, Vice President Joseph Msika, announced: "Whites are not human beings." In the past year only nine White farmers have been murdered by Blacks during the seizures of White farms, but the death toll is now certain to increase rapidly.

Also last Saturday, Mugabe steeply increased his goal for the dispossession of Whites when he revealed a new plan calling for 95 per cent of all White farmland in Rhodesia to be turned over to Blacks. That, on top of the imprisonment of the 23 White farmers, caused a mass exodus of White families from farms in the area of northern Rhodesia where mobs of Black squatters have been most active recently. Three hundred women and children were evacuated from 130 White farms over the weekend, and more than 60 of those farms already have been invaded and ransacked by squatters, who routinely slaughter all pet cats and dogs left behind, carry off everything of value, even ripping out bathtubs and other plumbing fixtures, and destroy the rest. White evacuees in the town of Chinhoyi were attacked on the streets by Blacks, and White women who attempted to take food and warm clothing to their imprisoned husbands were beaten outside the prison.

And the controlled media here are silent. The politicians are silent. The Christian ministers, who used to preach crusades against Rhodesia when it was a White country, are silent. The various bleeding-heart types, who are terribly distressed over what AIDS is doing to the Black population of Africa and always are running around organizing international conferences and lobbying the government to provide more medical assistance to AIDS-stricken Blacks, are silent.

The media bosses are silent because they are happy with the present situation. This is the way they planned it. The politicians and most of the rest are silent because they really don't care. Those who are a little uncomfortable about the stepped-up genocide being waged against Whites in Rhodesia are afraid to say anything lest they be accused of "White racism." Everyone with any sense at all of Political Correctness understands that any expression of concern or sympathy for White people engaged in a conflict with Blacks is racist. The details are irrelevant: in any racial conflict, one must support the non-White side in order to be Politically Correct. It doesn't matter what the Blacks are doing to the Whites: if you complain about it, you will be accused of racism.

I've seen this happen many times. My organization, the National Alliance, distributes leaflets and stickers with the message, "Earth's most endangered species: the White race help preserve it," and then our address. That's all: no mention of Blacks, Jews, racial conflict, or anything else, just a call for concern about preserving our own kind. And yet every time we distribute this message, the news media begin shrieking hysterically about "racism" and "hate": every time. Some of our "Earth's most endangered species" stickers show up in a school or on a university campus or posted on traffic signs in a community, and the local media people begin shrieking about "hate propaganda" and urge local citizens to call the police if they see one of our stickers.

The big Jewish media bosses have everyone who works for the media, Gentile as well as Jew, so thoroughly conditioned, so thoroughly indoctrinated with anti-White propaganda, that any expression of concern for White people is denounced immediately as "hate" and "racism." I'll

guarantee you, if the White Rhodesians were mopping up the Blacks over there, running the last of them out of the country and reclaiming their farms, there would be non-stop anti-Rhodesian coverage on every television news program in America and in Britain. There would be calls from the politicians in the Congress for our government to send in the U.S. Army to save the Blacks and punish the wicked White Rhodesians. A strict embargo on all trade with Rhodesia already would have been imposed. That idiot we have in the White House wouldn't have to study the matter the way he did before issuing a statement on stem cell research; the Jews would have him on television immediately denouncing the Rhodesians and threatening grim reprisals. And his British counterpart, Tony Blair, would be shaking his fist and foaming at the mouth as he raved against the evils of "White racism."

And do you know what the British and U.S. governments have done to discourage Mugabe in his current war against the White population of Rhodesia? The Brits are threatening not to let their cricket team play in Rhodesia when it goes on tour next year. Last week the U.S. Senate passed something called the "Zimbabwe Democracy and Recovery Act." It couples additional monetary handouts from the U.S. Treasury for various programs in Rhodesia to visa restrictions on those charged with violent repression of civil rights. Visa restrictions! That's what's supposed to make Mugabe behave himself!

Of course, there's no hint in the "Zimbabwe Democracy and Recovery Act" of the genocide being waged against White Rhodesians. Really, the whole idea of the thing is to provide money for the so-called "democratic opposition" to Mugabe's dictatorship: money to finance Black democrats, not to save White Rhodesians. Even so, the whole business is being handled very quietly, lest the media make a fuss about it and claim that it's a "racist" act because by helping Mugabe's opponents it may help the White farmers. But really, there's no danger of the media making a fuss about it because the last thing the Jewish media bosses want to do is alert the White lemmings here about what's going on in Rhodesia.

Well, as I said earlier, I don't like to talk about what's going on in Rhodesia and in South Africa, and believe me, what's happening in Rhodesia now will be happening in South Africa soon. It depresses me to talk about this. I talk about it because it is a powerful lesson for us. It was only a few years ago that both of these countries were White countries. They were good, decent places for our people to live. I knew South Africans and Rhodesians. They were better people, on the average, than White Americans: better looking, healthier, better racially, better genetically. They had a small problem with Black terrorists, but it was a ***small*** problem. Fewer Rhodesians and South Africans were killed each year by Black terrorists than were killed in traffic accidents. Many, many more died each year from smoking cigarettes than from fighting a bush war against Black communists such as Robert Mugabe. And yet both countries now are under Black rule and are sinking rapidly into savagery and chaos.

How did it happen? The short answer is that it happened because both countries were persuaded to commit collective race suicide. I knew Rhodesians more than 20 years ago, before they all decided to commit suicide. I have known South Africans both before and after their collective suicide in 1993. They had some weaknesses that I noticed from the beginning. For one thing they were far too strongly under the influence of their churches and of Christian doctrine. This was especially true of the Afrikaners, the Boers, but I also noticed it to a lesser extent among

Rhodesians and among the English portion, the Anglican portion, of the South African population. The Christian churches trained every Black terrorist leader in Rhodesia and in South Africa, but this fact seemed to make no impression on the Whites there. The churches were a part of White society. The Whites believed the churches were on their side: White, Christian civilization versus Black savagery and superstition, that sort of thing. Even after the churches betrayed them to their enemies, most of them still believed that.

Well, actually, there was more to the psychological weakness of the Whites than subversive Christian "brotherhood" teaching. In a sense, the Whites were too civilized, too genteel. I used to tell my South African visitors, "It may be that the Black terrorists are no real military threat to you, but the only viable long-range solution for you is to get rid of all the Blacks and other non-Whites in your country. Do whatever you must do: force them out, sterilize them, kill them -- otherwise you will lose your country. Of course, it was easy for me to say that and much harder for the South Africans to implement it, with their economy making such extensive use of Black labor. There would have been very tough economic, political, and diplomatic problems to solve.

But the negative reactions of my South African guests to my advice went beyond these practical difficulties, beyond their reluctance to give up their Black gardeners and cooks and cleaning women and their reluctance to face the economic problems of restructuring their economy to use White labor only. They were shocked by my advice. Most of them, I believe, regarded Blacks as fellow human beings who were merely at a lower stage of development and still needed guidance and help from Whites. "Blacks are like children," they told me. "They need our help, and most Blacks know that. They know that they are better off under our guidance than they would be without it. That's why we don't have to worry about their ever trying to take over our government and run it themselves. They know that they need us. It's only a few terrorists who are a problem, and we can deal with the terrorists."

You know, that sounds a lot like the sort of foolishness that I used to hear from my fellow Southerners back in the 1950s and even into the 1960s. None of the Southerners with whom I discussed the matter believed that Blacks were equal in intelligence to Whites or in their ability to build or to maintain a civilization, but they could not quite bring themselves to regard Blacks as vermin to be eradicated. That just wasn't Christian. And even those who were relatively free of Christian influences felt that I was going too far. "Help the Blacks along," they told me. "Make a few concessions to them, show them that we aren't interested in oppressing them, and they will behave themselves. They will see that it is in their interest not to wreck the society that has given them so much more than they could obtain on their own. We can't just exterminate them or force them all to go back to Africa. That would be barbaric. That would be stooping to their level."

Foolishness. Suicidal foolishness. We really have become too civilized and have forgotten one of Nature's most basic rules: Two different types of animal cannot permanently occupy exactly the same ecological niche. One eventually must drive the other into extinction. That is what is happening now in southern Africa. And in fact, it also is happening in America.

We accept the truth of this when other species are involved. Why is it so difficult for many of us to apply the rule to ourselves as well? Why do some of us believe that it is un-civilized or un-genteel to deal with our race problem in a rational way?

I'm sure that everyone has heard the propaganda slogan promoted by the Jewish media and their collaborators to the effect that racists are made, not born. The Politically Correct party line is that children are born without any racial feelings or predispositions at all, and that if we don't teach them to be racists, they will grow up loving everyone equally, and that will be a desirable state of affairs. That's the way to avoid racial conflict, and so we should be very careful to shield our children from any influences that might make racists of them.

Well, for one thing that propaganda is based on a lie. And for another thing the lie is calculated to weaken us and to hasten our annihilation. The fact is that children, while not born with an explicit set of opinions about racial matters, are born with a strong tendency to regard their own kind as friend and those who are not their kind as foe. To this extent, racism does not require deliberate tutelage. Children become racists, which is to say, they develop a strong preference for their own kind, through a natural process known as "imprinting" very early in life. Nature gave us this tendency because it is a survival trait. We developed the trait over millions of years of evolution, because those of us who had it were more likely to survive than those who didn't have it. And the media bosses and their allies, who are saturating us with the lie that racism is unnatural and evil, don't want us to survive.

If you want to read more about the evolutionary basis of so-called "racism," I recommend that you read some of the works of the very distinguished anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith, especially his book *A New Theory of Human Evolution.* It's a bit hard to find these days because it's Politically Incorrect and has been purged from many libraries that formerly carried it. Sir Arthur Keith was a very civilized and genteel man, but he also was a perceptive and honest student of Nature.

As for me, I make no pretensions to gentility. I tend to be crude and simple and direct. Sir Arthur Keith explains it all in very polite terms, but I say it simply this way: If we want our kind to survive on this planet longer than another generation or two, then we must clear the cobwebs of Christian superstition and Jewish propaganda from our minds and face the facts without being squeamish. One fact is that we must have exclusive possession of those portions of this planet that constitute suitable habitat for us. Another fact is that in order to obtain and maintain that exclusive possession, we must be prepared to kill, to annihilate, any and all competitors. A third fact is that racism is God's gift to any race that wants to survive. Racism is healthy and natural and essential, and we had damned well better clear of minds of the Judaeo-Christian lie that it is evil and wicked and nasty and low-brow.

To sum it up, the law of life is: kill or die. That's still the law, no matter how civilized and genteel we become. We do not invalidate the law by wearing the latest fashions, by being computer whizzes, and by attending very polite tea parties. The law does not say, of course, that we cannot cooperate with our kind, that we cannot collaborate constructively with other members of our own race. It does not say that we cannot design and build a society in which we can work and play and breed and live at peace, more or less, with other White people. Not at

peace all the time, but most of the time: enough of the time to still continue building and developing and improving our civilization, and, make no mistake about this, it is ***our*** civilization and no one else's.

But the law of life ***does*** tell us that if we believe that being nice to members of other races will persuade them to be nice to us, then we are on the way out, just like the Rhodesians. It does tell us that if we deal with Blacks and mestizos and Asians under the assumption that they are like us because they have learned to speak English and to mimic our manners, or that they have the same aspirations and ideals and standards and values and way of looking at the world that we do, then we will doom our posterity to oblivion. If we take the paternalistic attitude, as the South Africans did and as many American Southerners did, that the Blacks are like children, whom we should protect and promote and assist, and think that they will appreciate our help, then the fate of our race will be that of the dodo.

Look at what is happening in South Africa and in Rhodesia now today. Think about how the Rhodesians and South Africans got themselves into their horrible, lethal predicaments. Then ponder the question: should we strive to be nice, or should we strive to survive?

The Saga of Yahweh ben Yahweh

An Associated Press news story recently caught my attention. The story was about the release from prison this week of a Black religious leader, who calls himself Yahweh ben Yahweh. His name actually is Hulon Mitchell. He's a former Black Muslim, and, in fact, he ran a Black Muslim mosque in Atlanta for a while in the early 1970s, until he was accused of sexual improprieties with underaged Muslim girls and of dipping into the collection plate. He dropped out of the Nation of Islam, where he was known as Hulon X, and in 1978 founded his own church, the so-called Nation of Yahweh, with a religion based on Judaism. He calls his followers "Black Hebrew Israelites" and tells them that they, rather than the Jews, are the "chosen people" ordained by God to rule the world, as described in the Old Testament. He took for himself the name Yahweh ben Yahweh that's Hebrew for "God, the son of God."

So why should we be interested in yet another megalomaniac religious cult based on Judaism? Well, the thing of interest to us about the Nation of Yahweh is the initiation requirement Hulon Mitchell established for the elite, inner circle of his church, the so-called "Brotherhood." The requirement was the murder of a White person, and the bringing to Mitchell of some evidence of the murder, such as an ear or even the head of the victim. In fact, Mitchell preached to his whole congregation that the killing of White people, whom he calls "blue-eyed devils," is pleasing to Yahweh.

By the time the police finally wound up Mitchell's race-murder cult in November 1990 and packed Mitchell off to prison, his followers had butchered and mutilated at least 23 men, women, and children, 14 of them in Miami alone. Some of the victims were recalcitrant members of his own church, and the Associated Press story doesn't give a racial breakdown, but a figure that I've seen elsewhere puts the number of White victims at 16. Mitchell spent a little over 10 years in prison. That works out to about eight months for the murder of each "blue-eyed devil." He was released on parole earlier this week.

You didn't hear about it? You didn't see anything about it on CNN or network television? You shouldn't be surprised. It's not the sort of news that the bosses of the controlled media want you to know about. There was a story about it last Saturday in the *Washington Post,* but the entire thrust of that story is the infringement of Mitchell's civil rights by the conditions imposed on him by the parole board that released him. The *Washington Post* article is not headed "Black Cult Leader Who Ordered Ritual Murder of Whites to Be Released." Oh, no! A headline like that would be considered "racist" by the people who run the *Post;* they are afraid that it might make White readers wary of Blacks. It might even lead some readers to ask questions, such as, "Why has this nutcase Black murderer been turned loose?" although I myself am not so optimistic about the ability of White Americans to figure out who their enemies are and react appropriately.

The actual head on last Saturday's *Washington Post* story is "No Freedom of Religion for Yahweh," and the subhead is "Parole Commission Limits Contact with His Followers." There's no mention at all in the story about the initiation requirements for the "Brotherhood" or of the ritual murder of "blue-eyed devils": just one cryptic mention, at the end, of Mitchell playing with the severed ear of a White victim. The story deals almost entirely with Mitchell's contesting of

the conditions imposed on his parole by the parole board. They told him that he couldn't have any further contact with the more than 1,000 members of the Nation of Yahweh. His lawyers have gone to court to have the conditions on his parole removed.

You know, I remember the same sort of reluctance on the part of the controlled news media to report the details of Mitchell's activities 10 years ago, when he was arrested, charged, tried, and sent to prison. There was minimal publicity, as if the media bosses were embarrassed by the whole affair.

It's worth our noting that Mitchell got his idea for the initiation requirement into his so-called "Brotherhood," the inner circle of his church, from a similar operation by the Nation of Islam during the time he was a member of that group. I talked about this in a broadcast a couple of years ago, but it's worth repeating. During a six-month period in 1973 and 1974, when Mitchell was a high-ranking member of the Nation of Islam, an elite group inside the Nation of Islam called the "Death Angels" murdered several hundred White men, women, and children. The exact number will never be known because many of the victims were so-called "street people": runaway teenaged girls on drugs, hippies, and the like people who weren't missed when they disappeared.

There were many of these pitiful lost souls on the streets of San Francisco in the 1960s and the 1970s: products of the great "counterculture" revolution promoted on American university campuses by Jews like Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman. Their corpses often were hacked up and dumped in the ocean or buried. But the San Francisco police who tracked the Death Angels counted 15 very tangible victims from all walks of life, not just street people: 15 murdered White people, and eight others who were seriously injured during attempts to murder them. While they were looking for the killers, the police referred to the series of murders as the "Zebra" killings: all Black on White.

Eventually the Death Angels were broken up when San Francisco police arrested eight of them. Four of them were put on trial, and after the longest trial in California history--a year and six days--they were convicted on all counts. The transcript for the trial fills nearly 14,000 pages and fills 141 volumes. During the trial, one witness, Anthony Harris, a Death Angel himself, spent 12 days testifying to the horrifying details of Death Angel operations. The Nation of Islam taught that the killing of a "blue-eyed devil" is pleasing to Allah, just as Hulon Mitchell later taught that it is pleasing to Yahweh. Inside the Nation of Islam, there was an elite organization whose members had especially pleased Allah. That was the Death Angels. To become a Death Angel one had to murder nine White men or five White women or four White children. In 1974, the San Francisco chapter alone of the Death Angels had 15 accredited members.

Some of the White victims were taken to a loft used by the San Francisco chapter of Death Angels, where they were tied to chairs and tortured to death in ways far too gruesome to describe here. Harris testified that he was given the butchered remnants of one of these kidnapped White torture victims, all trussed up in a plastic sheet like a turkey, and told to drive the package to a bluff overlooking San Francisco Bay and throw it into the water. And the killing wasn't confined to San Francisco or even California. Other chapters of the Death Angels murdered Whites in New York, in Georgia, in Florida. The word spread among Black Muslims everywhere, and it is

very difficult to believe that Hulon Mitchell did not get the idea for his "Brotherhood" and its initiation requirement from the Death Angels.

As with the Death Angels in California, many of the ritual murder victims chosen by Mitchell's Black Hebrew Israelites were the easiest White victims: people who wouldn't be missed, including young runaways, street people, low-class Whites who lived in Black neighborhoods or who socialized with Blacks.

Well, as I said earlier, in November 1990 the police finally caught up with Hulon Mitchell, also known as Yahweh ben Yahweh, and charged him and his followers with 14 murders in the Miami area. And now he's out of prison again, and the only question is whether or not he'll be permitted to run the Nation of Yahweh again.

A couple of much more interesting questions for us are, first, why was this hate-crazed mass murderer of White people turned loose under any conditions? Ten years for sending his followers out to murder 23 people or 14, if we count only those in Miami, and then turned loose on us again!

Imagine that this murderer was a neo-Nazi leader who sent his followers out to kill Jews as initiation requirements, bringing back an ear from each victim as proof to their leader that they had done as ordered. Do you think that there's any chance the government would be turning him loose, simply imposing on him the condition that he no longer could be a neo-Nazi leader? Can you imagine the howl you would hear from the media if that did happen? There would be no end to it. There would be tearful interviews with relatives of the victims on network television every day. The media would put on an even bigger circus than the one they put on after the dragging death of a Black ex-convict in Jasper, Texas, three years ago. And we would hear from the media a non-stop chorus of "hate, hate, hate" and "hate crime, hate crime, hate crime, racism, racism, racism." You know that's the way the media would react. You've already heard it from them often enough.

Why, then, the almost total silence about the release of Hulon Mitchell, alias Yahweh ben Yahweh? Why is neither the word "hate" nor the phrase "hate crime" used even once in the *Washington Post* story about the controversy over the conditions of his release? Why is the general public almost completely ignorant of who this man is and what he did, even if it happened 11 years ago? Why is the public just as ignorant of the hundreds of "Zebra" murders committed by the Death Angels? Why do the controlled mass media never say anything about these atrocious murders of White people by Blacks? It's not that there's a shortage of facts; as I said, there are 14,000 pages of horrifying testimony from the Death Angels trial. Could it possibly be that the reason for the silence of the media is that the murderers are Black and the victims are White, and that fact contradicts the media party line the Jewish party line that Blacks are the good guys and Whites are the bad guys, and that in interracial conflict Blacks are the victims and Whites are the aggressors? Could that be it?

Before I tell you about another recent news story that may help to answer these questions, I'll mention that if you have an inquiring mind and want to dig up the facts on the horrendous "Zebra" killings that inspired Yahweh ben Yahweh, a good place for you to start is with Clark

Howard's 1979 documentary book *Zebra*. That book will lead you to other sources. Although it is out of print, you should be able to find it in a larger library, if it hasn't been purged by the minions of Political Correctness.

The other recent news story is from Denver's *Rocky Mountain News*, which is one of Colorado's major newspapers. It's about preliminary court proceedings late last month against a gang of teenagers in Colorado Springs who murdered another teenager and his grandparents in a rural area 50 miles west of Colorado Springs. There are several things about this story that make it potentially interesting at a national level, and yet it has not been touched by the news media outside of Colorado. Is it possible that the media bosses feel that they've already given enough attention to teenaged murderers in Colorado with the saturation coverage of the shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, less than a hundred miles from Colorado Springs? I really don't think that's their reason for suppressing this story outside of Colorado, but I'll let you be the judge of that.

The murders took place at the beginning of this year, and the murderers were arrested during the past few months, as the police gathered evidence. Charged with murder now are Isaac Grimes, 16; Jonathan Matheny and Glen Urban, both 18; and Simon Sue, 19. Their trials are scheduled for later this year. Grimes, Matheny, and Urban are White. Simon Sue is a non-White immigrant from Guyana, in South America, primarily of Indian ancestry. He is the local gang leader of a paramilitary, anti-racist organization with roots in Guyana. He calls his organization Operation and Reconnaissance Agents, but it usually is identified in news reports from Colorado Springs only by its initials, OARA. Sue preached to the other teenagers about the evils of White racism, and he ordered them to commit several burglaries to steal guns and money to be used for fighting racism.

One of their victims is 15-year-old Tony Dutcher, who was a schoolmate of theirs in Colorado Springs. On previous occasions, Tony had invited his classmate Isaac Grimes to the rural home of his grandparents. During one of these visits, Grimes had decided that the grandfather, 60-year-old Carl Dutcher, was a White racist, and he reported this back to Sue and the other members of OARA. Sue decided that Carl Dutcher should be killed because of his racial beliefs. During the New Year's school vacation at the beginning of this year, Grimes visited Tony at his grandparents' rural home. The two boys camped out in a lean-to behind the Dutcher home. During the night, Grimes crept up behind Tony with a knife and cut his throat as he lay in his sleeping bag. Police said that Tony's throat had been cut all the way to the spinal column, and he bled to death.

Grimes then went into the Dutchers' house and awaited the arrival of another member of the anti-racist gang, Jonathan Matheny. When Matheny arrived, he shot Carl Dutcher with a rifle. Dutcher's wife, 58-year-old JoAnna, barricaded herself in a bathroom, but Matheny shot her through the bathroom door. Grimes finished them off by slitting their throats.

Now, I don't think that it's necessary for me to explain to you why the Jewish bosses of the national news media decided that this was a story you didn't need to hear about. What's indisputable is that it was a horribly atrocious series of murders with several very newsworthy

aspects, and that if you live outside of Colorado you didn't hear a peep about it until I told you about it a moment ago.

Suppose that the murderers, instead of being members of an anti-racist gang led by a non-White, had been White racists, and suppose that their victims had been chosen because one of them favored racial mixing. Do you believe that the media bosses would have suppressed the story of the murders or decided that it just wasn't newsworthy?

Of course, stories of Black-on-White crime are suppressed by the media every day. I chose this particular story because it not only illustrates the way in which news is selectively reported by the controlled media in order to support their party line, but it also illustrates the concrete results of the anti-White brainwashing conducted by the media and the schools.

We might with good justification blame the murders of the Dutcher family on the Washington government's insane immigration policy, which permits resentful, hate-filled, non-White trash such as Simon Sue into this country.

With even better justification we can blame the murders on the racial propaganda campaign of the media, the government, the schools, and the churches. That propaganda campaign pumps into the heads of young White people the lies that all the races really are the same under the skin, that the only reason members of all races can't live happily and productively together is the divisive effect of White racism, and that Whites who don't want to live and interbreed with non-Whites are hate-filled and irrational and are the cause of all interracial strife. The propagandists don't come right out and say it, but they certainly imply that these White racists, who are holding back racial progress and making things unpleasant for everyone, ought to be done away with in some way. That certainly was the message that teenagers Isaac Grimes, Jonathan Matheny, and Glen Urban absorbed from television and from their school teachers. That was the message that led them to obey the orders of the hate-filled mongrel from Guyana and to murder the Dutcher family.

Interestingly enough, it's also the message that played a major role in the Columbine massacre in Littleton, Colorado, in April 1999. The two teenaged murderers at Columbine High School, Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, were fervent ***anti-racists*** who fantasized on their Internet Web site about torturing and murdering White racists. Where do you think they picked up those sick and poisonous ideas? Who put the idea into their heads that we live in a "racist" society and that racists ought to be killed?

If you remember, the spin put on the Columbine massacre by the Jewish media bosses right after the killings is that Harris and Klebold were neo-Nazis and racists, even though one of them, Klebold, is a Jew. It wasn't until later, when investigators began looking into the private lives and the Internet postings of the two killers that it came out that they were not racists but rather were fanatical anti-racists. But that fact never received much publicity, even though several pungent excerpts from their Web site were reported in the *New York Times.* The average American couch potato still believes that the killers were White racists who deliberately targeted Blacks in their massacre, because that was the lie propagated by the media immediately after the massacre, and it was never withdrawn.

The point of all of this is that the controlled mass media in America are consistent and deliberate in their policy of deception. Whether it was their intense anti-apartheid and anti-White propaganda against Rhodesia and South Africa back when those were both White countries, followed by their deafening silence about the horror of what's happening in those two countries today under Black rule; or their silence about the atrocious series of "Zebra" murders of "blue-eyed devils" in this country by the Death Angels and then by Yahweh ben Yahweh's Black Hebrew Israelites; or the spin that they put on their reporting of the Columbine massacre in 1999; or their suppression of the story of the butchery of the Dutcher family in Colorado this year, they consistently suppress or minimize news that might undermine their multiculti, egalitarian propaganda. They consistently suppress or minimize news of non-White aggression against Whites.

They slant the news with the deliberate intention of making White people feel apologetic or even guilty for defending themselves against non-Whites. They deliberately attempt to disarm us morally and keep us off guard. They deliberately conceal from us information that would lead us to question their policies or their motives. They deliberately deceive us with the intention of making us believe that things are rosy wherever their policies have been put into effect, such as in South Africa and Rhodesia, and that everything will be rosy here when their open-border immigration policies and their plans for more "hate crime" and "speech crime" laws have had time to take effect.

They are consistent and deliberate in their use of the media to deceive us because their aim is to weaken us and to destroy us, the way they already have weakened the White people of South Africa and destroyed the White people of Rhodesia. The Jews are our misfortune. The Jews are the eternal enemies of our people.

Self-Discipline and Moral Health

Well, the murder of White farmers and the gang-rape of White women by AIDS-infected Blacks continues apace in South Africa, as does the seizure and trashing of White farms in Rhodesia. Rhodesia's Black dictator, Robert Mugabe, is boasting openly now of his intent to run all Whites out of Rhodesia. He understands now that no other country will come to the aid of the White Rhodesians, and he can do anything he wants to them. The British government of Tony Blair talks about not letting Britain's cricket team play in Rhodesia, and the U.S. government of George Bush talks about imposing visa restrictions on Mugabe and members of his government if he doesn't behave himself, and so Mugabe is laughing at them and proceeding with his plan to ethnically cleanse Rhodesia.

I could talk more about these things happening to our kinsmen in southern Africa and about the failure of our corrupt and treasonous governments to do anything to stop what is happening. I could talk more about the way in which the Jew-controlled news media in America consistently ignore these things: the same media that spearheaded the effort to persuade Americans only a decade ago to apply economic and diplomatic pressure to White South Africans until they turned their country over to Blacks.

I also could talk about more horrible Black-on-White crimes that have been committed in America recently and about the refusal of the controlled media to report these crimes. There's certainly plenty of that happening, and it's important to publicize it, as I often have done in earlier broadcasts.

Today, however, perhaps you will bear with me while I talk about a much more prosaic matter: less blood-stirring than the murder and rape of our kinsmen in southern Africa and less provocative than crimes against our people in America. What I want to talk about today is what's happening to the character and the spirit of our people. That's important, and in a sense it's as much at the root of our other problems as is the control of our news and entertainment media by the Jews or the corruption of our political process and of our governmental and social institutions resulting from that control.

Actually, I've talked about this before, but I'll try to deal with different aspects of it today. In discussing the changing character and moral quality of our people, it's important for us to have some fixed standards to which we can refer. I don't want to sound like some old geezer complaining about how much tougher he had it as a kid than today's kids do. So I've collected input from a number of other observers: teachers, parents, employers. I've tried to get balanced and reasonably accurate views of the state of morals in America today and that of 50 years ago, and to examine the differences and to try to understand what caused the differences.

I've also examined statistics where they were available. It's difficult to quantify some moral elements numerically, but others can be quantified or at least, correlated in a reasonable way with things that can be quantified. For example, I believe that it is reasonable to correlate the level of personal debt with the ability to postpone gratification: the greater the level of personal debt--typically mortgage debt and credit card debt--the less the ability to postpone gratification.

In the last 30 years, the average personal debt in America, measured as a percentage of income, has increased 70 per cent. People are much more likely today to spend money they don't have than they were 30 years ago. And there is, of course, a penalty for that. People end up spending a great deal more for the things they want if they borrow money to buy them, and so they end up being able to buy less than the person who earns his money before he buys and therefore pays no interest.

Without beating around the bush, I'll tell you now what I have concluded about the change in the moral quality of our people during the past half century. American men and women today are softer, weaker, less reliable, less willing to accept responsibility, less patriotic, less able to endure discomfort or hardship, less willing to postpone gratification, and more willing to tolerate weakness and corruption in others than they were 50 years ago. And White American men are less masculine than they were 50 years ago.

I haven't studied the matter enough to decide whether women are less feminine than they were. Certainly, there still are many very feminine women in America, but there also are more than enough unfeminine women running around today, and these un-feminine women, these feminists, certainly have more influence and are doing much more damage than they were permitted to do in the past. Whether American women as a whole are less feminine than in the past, however, I can't say. But it definitely is the case that American men are less manly on the average than they used to be. And by "less manly" I don't mean less sexually active; I mean less dignified, less self-reliant, less dependable, less self-confident, less courageous. Today they talk more and whine more, are less inclined to keep their commitments, and are more inclined to wait for someone to tell them what to do. They aren't as tough as they used to be.

Our people are less disciplined than they used to be. More specifically, they have less self-discipline, less ability to use will power, to make themselves do what they believe they ought to do. There is in each of us a combination of infantile urges and more mature desires and needs. The infant seeks only to gratify himself and to avoid pain. The well-developed man or woman has a more inclusive concept of "self" than the infant. He is concerned not only about his own needs but also about the needs of his family, his community, his clan, his nation, and his race.

And the well-developed man or woman has longer-range needs than the infant. The infant wants instant gratification, instant relief from discomfort. That's all that is of concern to the infant; nothing else matters. The well-developed adult, on the other hand, thinks about future needs and future dangers and is able to balance these against present feelings: against present desires and fears and pain. He subordinates the present to the future. If he decides that a future need is important, he will suppress present desires, endure present discomfort, and face present dangers, in order to achieve his future goal. The ability to do this is a function of a person's degree of self-discipline. The person without self-discipline remains infantile in his behavior, and often in his attitudes as well. The person with a high degree of self-discipline is able to keep his infantile urges under firm control and to marshal all of his resources, all of his strength and intelligence, to accomplish what he believes is most important.

This undoubtedly is an over-simplification, but I believe that it is nevertheless useful to look at all of the aspects of moral decline that I mentioned earlier: the greater softness, the lesser

dependability, the lesser self-reliance, the lesser ability to postpone gratification, and the lesser degree of patriotism, as consequences of lesser self-discipline. By lumping all of these aspects of moral decline together as a decline in self-discipline, we only need to ask ourselves: what has caused our decline in self-discipline, by and large? Why does the average American man or woman today have less self-discipline than the average American of 1940 or 1950?

I believe that there's more than one answer, more than one reason for the lesser degree of self-discipline today. In the first place, self-discipline develops as a result of the application of external discipline, especially when we are young. There is, of course, a genetically determined component of self-discipline, the innate self-discipline of the race as a whole, which evolved with us over millions of years and enabled us to survive. Because our temperate-zone environment was less forgiving and imposed a harsher external discipline on us, and on other races that also evolved in the North, than the tropical-zone environment imposed on the races that evolved in the Tropics, we and the North Asian peoples, the Japanese and the Chinese, for example, have greater innate self-discipline than Blacks do. But self-discipline also is the consequence of training, of the deliberate application of external discipline, when we are young. And it is clear that there is much less of that today than 50 years ago.

The raising of children in America has been feminized, softened. Spankings and other forms of corporal punishment are out. In fact, the prevailing attitude among White parents today is that any sort of punishment or denial is a bad thing. Disobedience no longer merits a whipping or the withdrawal of an allowance. Disrespect to a parent no longer earns a hard slap across the face and being confined to one's room for a few days. Self-indulgence in children actually is encouraged today.

Daily chores, which used to be the norm for children, no longer are required. The number of children who are trained on a musical instrument or who are trained in any way at all has declined drastically. In America's feminized child-raising environment, to require a ten-year-old child to practice for two hours every day on the piano or the violin is considered cruel and unusual. To require a 12-year-old to spend four hours a day studying Latin or mathematics after school is equally abhorrent to television-bred parents.

So the lack of external discipline for children today definitely is a big part of the problem. And why is external discipline no longer imposed? Well, for one thing, we live in a less demanding world or so it seems to most Americans at the moment. We are fat and soft and spoiled. Technological advances have given the average family so many labor-saving appliances in the laundry room, in the kitchen, and in the yard that less labor is needed. The tendency today is not to repair things or to clean things and reuse them, but to throw them out and buy new ones. So chores for the kids aren't really the economic necessity they used to be. And with both parents working outside the home, with the day-care center replacing the parents, the enforcement of proper standards of behavior becomes more difficult. Most parents don't even try. They just let their kids absorb their morals from television and then run with the pack.

But there are other reasons for why external discipline no longer is imposed on children: propaganda against it. We experience propaganda that makes discipline a bad word, propaganda that makes the whole concept of discipline suspect and Politically Incorrect. Discipline is

"fascist." Disciplined is what the German Nazis were, with their heel clicking and saluting and their *"Jawohl, mein Führer!"* The disciplined Germans were evil and racist. We've seen that in a thousand Hollywood films and a thousand TV serials. Much better to be relaxed and informal and insubordinate. That's the American way. Take the Black man as a model in this regard. Discipline leads to the gas chambers and to guilt, guilt, guilt! To discipline a child is to warp him and make a little Nazi out of him. That's the party line that has been pumped into us by television and by Hollywood for the past 50 years.

For the most part, the party line that the Jews have fed us from Hollywood has been implicit rather than explicit. Implicit propaganda is generally more effective, because it's less obvious and more difficult to counter. When they launched the "counterculture revolution" on America's college and university campuses 40 years ago, however, they came out of the closet. They denounced any sort of discipline or self-restraint in quite explicit terms. The assault on discipline was just one front in a Jewish war against everything traditional. The aim was not only to turn Gentile students against authority and to get them to abandon their own standard of conduct: it was to turn the whole Gentile world upside down.

At the same time that discipline was denounced explicitly as "Nazi," there were assaults on so-called "racism" and "sexism" and traditional morality and traditional standards of civility and decorum and grooming. There were demands for more Black students to be recruited and more Black professors to be hired, regardless of qualifications; for women to be treated like men; for coed dormitories; for an end to the emphasis on Western, that is, on White civilization, which was denounced as racist and sexist. It was the beginning of Political Correctness: Whites are bad, Blacks are good; heterosexual men are suspect, women and gay men are okay; discipline and self-restraint are stuffy and old-fashioned whereas licentiousness, incontinence, and wantonness are "cool." Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, Ho Chi Minh, Eldridge Cleaver, and Malcolm X became campus heroes and role models.

The amazing thing is that the Jews were able to persuade not only homosexuals and feminists and non-Whites to go along with their crusade against traditional Gentile society; they also were able to persuade heterosexual White men and women. Clearly, there already was a good deal of softness in our society, especially at our universities.

Many groups were behind the crusade against discipline, but no one expressed its spirit better than the two Jewish youth activists, Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, leaders of the Youth International Party, or "yippies" for short. These two Jews probably got as much media publicity as all the other counterculture revolutionaries together. Rubin's book, *Do It!*, was published in 1970 by the Jewish publisher Simon and Schuster, which is owned by multibillionaire Jewish media boss Sumner Redstone, who also owns MTV and CBS, among other media. You can find Rubin's book in nearly every public and university library, and it would do you good to read it, but I'll read you just a few excerpts now, in which Rubin explains what the Jewish counterculture revolution is all about. And I apologize ahead of time for the obscene language. Part of the Jewish strategy was to break down all the traditional standards of behavior and discourse and to make civility and polite language seem old-fashioned.

Puritanism leads us to Vietnam. Sexual insecurity results in a supermasculinity trip called imperialism. Amerikan foreign policy, especially in Vietnam, makes no sense except sexually. Amerika has a frustrated penis, trying to drive itself into Vietnam's tiny slit to prove it is The Man. The revolution declares war on Original Sin, the dictatorship of parents over their kids, Christian morality, capitalism, and supermasculinity trips.…

Our tactic is to send niggers and longhair scum invading white middle-class homes, fucking on the living room floor, crashing on the chandeliers, spewing sperm on the Jesus pictures, breaking the furniture, and smashing Sunday school napalm-blood Amerika forever.

We will do whatever is forbidden. We will outrage Amerika until the bourgeoisie dies of apoplexy. We will turn Amerika's colleges into nudist camps.

Rubin says much more for example, he tells his young readers that they should kill their parents because parents are repressive and keep the kids from doing what they want to do, and he always spells "America" and "American" with a "k" instead of a "c" in order to suggest a German and therefore a Nazi flavor. He ends his book with the counterculture manifesto:

At community meetings all over the land, Bob Dylan will replace the National Anthem. There will be no more jails, courts, or police. The White House will become a crash pad for anybody without a place to stay in Washington. The world will become one big commune with free food and housing, everything shared. All watches and clocks will be destroyed. Barbers will go to rehabilitation camps, where they will grow their hair long. There will be no such crime as "stealing" because everything will be free. The Pentagon will be replaced by an LSD experimental farm. There will be no more schools or churches because the entire world will become one church and school. People will farm in the morning, make music in the afternoon, and fuck whenever they want to.

Again, I apologize for the language, but I really wanted you to get the flavor of what the Jews were pushing on our university campuses. I was there at the time, as a professor. The kids were absorbing the Jews' propaganda, and most of the parents were too busy with their own affairs to pay attention. Books such as *Do It!* were very widely read, and despite the childish phrasing and shock-effect style were taken seriously by millions of young, White Americans, just as was the Jewish singer Bob Zimmerman, who used the name Bob Dylan.

Although Rubin and Hoffman and the other Jews on our campuses went further and expressed things more brazenly and more crudely than the mainstream media, the mainstream media supported them, as witnessed, for example, by Simon and Schuster's publication and distribution of Rubin's book. All of the Jews in the media were peddling the same poison, just packaged differently for different segments of our population. And very few people who knew better were willing to speak out against what was happening, from fear of being denounced as "anti-Semitic" or "racist." The people who knew better also had become too soft and too lacking in self-discipline.

Certainly, we ourselves are to be blamed for failing to structure our society in a way to keep ourselves disciplined as our technological advances freed us from natural disciplinary pressures.

The attitude in America during the past few generations has been, "I want my children to have an easier life than I had, a softer life." The attitude instead should have been, "It is my responsibility to ensure that my children grow up to be strong, self-disciplined men and women." And we should have structured our schools and other institutions, and our child-raising practices, accordingly. But we didn't. And because we didn't, we have a generation of White Americans who are softer and flabbier mentally, morally, and physically than we had two generations ago.

In addition to this huge mistake on our part, however, we made the even bigger mistake of permitting Jews to infiltrate our society and to take over virtually all of our mass media of news and entertainment, which in the television age are able to determine what most of our people think. And the Jews have used their control of the media to exacerbate the indiscipline resulting from our own laxity. They have done everything they could to make us even softer and flabbier and therefore less willing and less able to resist their further encroachments.

Nature does not for long tolerate softness and indiscipline in man or in beast. Either we will free ourselves from Jewish influence and then restructure our society so as to make our race fit once again, or we will cease to exist as a race. This is a fact of life, and it is a fact that justifies whatever means are necessary, even the bloodiest and most radical means, to bring our people once again to moral health.

When Unreason Rules

In the 19th century, in 1865, an Englishman, using the pen name Lewis Carroll, wrote *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland,* in which he described a number of events in a fantastic dreamworld. The characters in this dreamworld behaved in erratic and irrational ways. In Wonderland, things just didn't make sense. That's the way many things are in our world today. They just don't make sense. Our society seems to be operating according to some very badly flawed logic. The behavior of public officials and private citizens alike is often irrational: far more often than it should be or than it has been in healthier times. Let me give you some examples.

The members of my organization, the National Alliance, distribute much printed material to the general public. Every day, National Alliance members are handing out leaflets at shopping malls, or posting stickers on bulletin boards or power poles or construction fences, or tossing packets of informational material on front porches in residential neighborhoods. Some of the material that we distribute contains figures on race and crime, which we obtain from the Department of Justice in Washington, or on race and HIV infection rates, which we obtain from the government's Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta. This material is designed to inform the reader on matters that we believe are important. Other material that we hand out or post in public places has only a very brief and simple message intended to put open-minded and responsible people in touch with us. An example of this material is a sticker that says simply: "Earth's most endangered species, the White race help preserve it." That's all, and then it gives a contact address for the National Alliance.

None of our material is insulting or derogatory or threatening. It's not intended to offend anyone or to generate any sort of hostility. It's intended only to inform people and to put them in contact with us. And it does put many people in touch with us. But the reaction from the mainstream news media and from people who are directly dependent on the good graces of the news media--politicians and bureaucrats, for example--the reaction is really *Alice in Wonderland* stuff. Every time they see one of our "Earth's most endangered species" stickers they become semi-hysterical and denounce it as "hate" literature. Really. To them the message "help preserve the White race" is "hate." I'm quite serious. It's not just a few unstable media people who react in this way. They all do it. They all denounce that message as "hate." And of course, so do all of the people in public office who feel that they must stay in the good graces of the mass media.

And they react similarly to our informational material on racial crime and AIDS statistics. If one of our leaflets points out that the Justice Department's crime data show that a White person is 55 times as likely to be assaulted by a Black as a Black is to be assaulted by a White, the media people go berserk and begin shrieking "hate!" "hate!" And they are echoed by the politicians and the bureaucrats, including local police officials, who already know that the data are factual. They also know that this information is never supposed to be mentioned in public. The public is not supposed to hear about them.

One of our leaflets cites data from the government's Centers for Disease Control to show that a heterosexual Black male is 14 times as likely as a heterosexual White male to be infected with HIV. Actually, that figure is several years old, and the ratio of Black to White infection rates has

been increasing. The actual figure today is more than 15: a heterosexual Black male in the United States is more than 15 times as likely as a heterosexual White male to be infected with the AIDS-causing virus. The aim of this leaflet is to make White women aware of their much, much greater risk of catching AIDS if they have sexual contact with a Black. But the mainstream news media, all of them, denounce this informational material of ours as "hateful" and "racist" every time we distribute it in a community to any significant extent. And public officials regularly join their hysterical chorus of name-calling. Local police chiefs refer to our AIDS informational material as "hate literature" and lament the fact that there is no law against it.

This is *Alice in Wonderland* behavior. I mean, the news media are supposed to keep the public informed about significant matters of public interest. They're not supposed to try to keep the public from hearing about any news, whether that news is agreeable or disagreeable. The police are supposed to protect the public from significant dangers. Does anyone really believe that racial crime data are not interesting to the public? Does anyone really believe that warning the public about the danger of being infected with AIDS by having sexual contact with high-risk groups is not protecting the public? How can trying to keep the public from learning about the danger of AIDS infection possibly be compatible with the police mission of protecting the public?

But in fact the people who control the mainstream news media do try their best to keep you from hearing a lot of news. It's not just their screaming bloody murder whenever they see one of my pamphlets or leaflets with information they don't want disseminated; it's also their management of the news: their deliberate exaggeration of every White offense against a non-White and the minimizing or suppression of every non-White offense against Whites. I've certainly given you plenty of examples of the latter in recent broadcasts: their total blackout of news on last December's Wichita massacre, the non-reporting of what is happening to White people in Rhodesia and South Africa today.

Well, we all understand their reasons for the way they distort and censor the news: the media people are totally committed to the concepts of egalitarianism and multiculturalism. They want everyone else to be totally committed to these things also. In fact, they insist on it. So whenever any evidence appears that Blacks and Whites really aren't the same, that there are profound psychological and behavioral differences, as manifested in the much higher rate of criminal activity among Blacks, for example; or that there are significant physiological differences, as manifested in a much higher susceptibility to infection by HIV, then this evidence must be concealed. If it can't be concealed, then it must be explained away.

How do you explain away the criminal behavior of Blacks? It's difficult, so you confuse the issue. Every time a White commits a crime against a Black you raise an enormous hullabaloo and drown out all of the other news. If Whites are still concerned about Black criminality after that, you start beating the drums for reparations. You begin talking fast about how much Whites owe Blacks for two centuries of slavery. You try to make Whites feel guilty for not wanting to live with Blacks or to have their children go to school with Blacks. You trot out a few Christian preachers to give racial brotherhood sermons. You persuade the White public or, at least, the softer-headed Whites that if Whites will just be nicer to Blacks and will give them lots of

reparations payments for slavery, then Blacks will stop raping, robbing, and killing Whites, and we all can live together in multicultural bliss and Whites won't have to feel guilty any longer.

What about the much greater danger of our women coming down with AIDS if we let them consort with Blacks? What about that 15-to-one ratio between heterosexual Black males and heterosexual White males? Well, you simply deny it. You say that it isn't true, that the statistics from the Centers for Disease Control are misrepresented, and you count on most of the public being too lazy or too inept to look into the matter for themselves. And of course, you scream about "hate" and "racism," and you trot out the Christian preachers again for more sermons on racial brotherhood and togetherness. And you give a big play to all of the new films coming out of Hollywood in which the White heroine beds down with a Black and doesn't catch AIDS as a consequence. You make interracial sex seem not only safe but also fashionable. And you never stop screaming that anyone who tries to persuade the public that sex with Blacks is risky is a "hater" and a "White supremacist" and a "neo-Nazi." These tactics of denial and obfuscation and name-calling and guilt mongering generally work because the people who know better--the medial researchers and the officials at the Centers for Disease Control--will keep their mouths shut rather than risk being labeled "haters" themselves.

One other thing you do, just to be sure, is try to persuade the public that it may be illegal for us to distribute crime statistics from the Justice Department or racial infection rates from the Centers for Disease Control. It may even be illegal for members of the public to receive this information from us. They may get themselves into some kind of trouble if they accept a leaflet from us in a shopping mall or find a package of informational material from us on the front porch. You don't want to come right out and say it's illegal, because you run the danger of discrediting yourself. So instead you trot out a politically ambitious chief of police to announce sternly that he is investigating the distribution of "hate material" and that he has instructed his officers to be on the lookout for whoever is distributing it.

Then you send out reporters to interview a few Nervous Nellies and self-righteous soccer moms who will say how shocked and horrified they are that "hate" has raised its ugly head in their peaceful community. You quote one of them saying she is saddened that in the 21st century there still are bigoted people who have not accepted equality and multiculturalism. And you report that a team of police officers is going door-to-door collecting the material that was distributed before it disturbs more citizens. All of this usually is enough to convince at least the dimwits in the community that there is something dangerous and threatening about anyone who tries to distribute material that calls into question the equality of the races or the desirability of more multiculturalism. If one of these more impressionable citizens sees one of us coming, he'll run for cover and dial 911.

This is nuts. It's crazy. Really, the Mad Hatter and the March Hare and the Queen of Hearts in Wonderland behaved more rationally than the media people and police officials and many members of the White public in America behave today. What sort of nightmare world are we living in, where the people who are supposed to keep us informed instead deliberately misinform us about some of the most important things happening to us and try to keep us ignorant and confused, and the people who are supposed to protect us collaborate with those who misinform us in order to keep us from being warned about some of the greatest dangers facing us? And a

great many members of the public themselves don't behave much better. I mean, really, isn't that *Alice in Wonderland* stuff?

How does a race that has sent men to the Moon get away with such wacky behavior here on Earth? Do you really want to know? The answer is rather depressing, but I'll tell you anyway.

In the first place, the general public always has been a bit wacky and inclined to irrational behavior. The average citizen always has been ready to believe in witchcraft or miracles and to go see witches burned in the town square or watch in awe as some statue is persuaded by a priest to weep "real" tears. He's always been ready to believe things that his own eyes and a little common sense should tell him are not true. I've talked to World War II veterans who were persuaded 60 years ago by the news media that Adolf Hitler was getting ready to invade America, and we had to invade Europe in order to stop him, and they still believe that if we hadn't teamed up with the Soviet Union to smash Germany and force half of Europe under the communist yoke, the German Army would have invaded the United States, and we'd all be in concentration camps now.

I spoke with other people just a couple of years ago who really believed that at midnight on December 31, 1999, airliners would fall from the sky and elevators all over the world would stop working. I laughed at their claims that there would be chaos on New Year's Day 2000 and then explained to them why they were wrong and that the whole Y2K hoax was being promoted by hucksters who had something to sell. Then they became hostile and accused me of working for the enemies of America because I encouraged people not to waste time and money preparing for what they claimed was the imminent Y2K disaster.

And I've spoken with even more people who have let themselves be persuaded that there really is no difference between the races and that anyone who does not profess such a belief is a "hater." The great mass of our people always have been like that: ready to swallow every hoax and swindle that comes along, if it is being promoted by clever enough snake-oil salesmen, and certainly the people who control America's mass media are clever. The soccer moms and the Dudley Dorights who profess themselves shocked and horrified when they see a flyer with crime statistics or HIV infection statistics suggesting that Blacks and Whites really are quite different, these people are just the 21st century version of the 19th century types who were shocked and horrified that anyone would deny the creation myth in the Book of Genesis and of the 16th century types who were shocked and horrified that anyone would assert that the Earth is not the center of the universe.

As I said, wacky attitudes and behavior are nothing new for the general public. In good times, the public was fortunate enough to have strong and benevolent leadership by individuals not subject to the general wackiness: strong enough to crack heads in order to keep the snake-oil salesmen from taking excessive advantage of the public's gullibility and benevolent enough to provide a positive example and protection for those members of the public independent-minded enough to free themselves from the reigning superstition. In bad times, the snake-oil peddlers were in the ascendancy, and witches that is, those citizens who seemed reluctant to participate in the general wackiness, were burned by the thousands.

Today the snake-oil salesmen definitely are riding high. At the moment, they do not have the power to consign heretics and skeptics to the torture chamber and then burn them at the stake, but the people who should be our leaders and who should keep the snake-oil salesmen in check, the people who are rational by nature and who hardly should be expected to have been taken in by the foolish notions that the races are equal in capability and identical in nature, and that multiculturalism is a desirable state of affairs, these leaders are going along with the snake-oil salesmen.

In past centuries the leaders might be forgiven for permitting the snake-oil salesmen to operate. The snake oil, by providing behavioral and ideological guidelines for the masses, whether those guidelines were entirely rational or not, kept them out of trouble, kept them from becoming restless, and allowed the leaders to go about their more enlightened affairs without having to crack the whip over the mass of citizens. Today the foolishness of egalitarianism and multiculturalism certainly are not keeping the masses out of trouble; they are carrying the whole society, the whole race, lemmings and leaders alike, to disaster.

Why are the leaders of our society the intellectual leaders, the business leaders, the military leaders, the political leaders all collaborating with the snake-oil peddlers and behaving as irrationally as the Duchess and her household retainers behaved in Alice's nightmare world of Wonderland?

I could talk for a week about that, but the short answer is that our society today is more corrupt than it has been in centuries. The corruption has spread to every level. Greed and cowardice have infected the White leadership stratum as much as the masses. There used to be some aristocratic qualities in our leaders: a bit of pride and dignity. Today they all are very democratic and don't mind making fools of themselves and behaving like the characters in Alice's nightmare, as long as they can hang onto their wealth and privileges.

Actually, there's more to it. In past centuries the snake-oil peddlers could wave their holy water around and threaten hellfire and damnation, but that frightened only the dimwits. Today, the snake-oil salesmen can wave fists full of money and threaten to cut off credit and impose boycotts and withhold government contracts, and that frightens all too many of those who should be leaders. Furthermore, through the process of democracy, the snake-oilers have brought the government under their spell and are able to use the power of government to intimidate leaders, who as a class are more easily intimidated today than in the past.

Finally, things really are more difficult and discouraging than they used to be. If I were a university president or a general in the Army or the chairman of a big multinational corporation or a U.S. senator, I'd be very discouraged about trying to fix things by working within the system and according to the rules. And even when one contemplates breaking the rules, things don't seem very promising. If I were a top general contemplating a military coup, I'd be very discouraged by the fact that the patriotism and the sense of personal honor that used to be taken for granted among my fellow officers are mostly gone now. What other generals could I trust? The corruption has spread too far. Better, perhaps, to just continue parroting the same irrational, *Alice in Wonderland* nonsense as everyone else. When everyone is acting like a fool, then one's own foolishness is not so likely to cause embarrassment.

Well, that's one way of looking at the nonsensical nature of our society today and the irrational behavior of so many of our people. As for me, I believe that it's not half so important to make excuses for it or to explain it, as it is simply to recognize that it is terminally corrupt and is carrying us all to our destruction and then to begin dealing with it as such. It has become a bit late for the easy ways for the electoral solutions and the military coups, and so we'd better be thinking about the hard ways, the radical ways, the total ways, and we'd better be thinking about them now.

Provocation and Response

The situation in Palestine is interesting, both in terms of what is happening over there and in terms of the reflection over here. It's not just the occasional good lick the Palestinians manage to get in against the Jews over there; that's always good to see, of course, but more interesting are the reactions of the media and the government in the United States.

For example, the media Jews and their Gentile step'n'fetchits here -- *Time* magazine writer Charles Krauthammer is an example of the former, and columnist George Will is an example of the latter -- have been coming out openly in favor of government-sponsored terrorism and assassination, as long as it's Israel doing the sponsoring. And they've been doing that since well before this week's attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

It is a time-honored Western tradition that the leaders of nations at war treat one another with chivalry. In the past, when leaders actually rode into battle at the head of their men, that meant that it was all right to kill the enemy king or general in a fair fight, but it wasn't all right to send someone sneaking around his castle or his house at night to poison his well or to leap from the bushes and cut his throat. Perhaps it wasn't all chivalry. Perhaps it was in part the understanding that if you engaged in that sort of ungentlemanly behavior, your enemy might retaliate in kind.

In any event, assassination of enemy leaders, even in time of war, remained taboo until fairly recently: that is, until Western tradition gave way to Semitic tradition, which is a quite different sort of tradition. That's what happened in the Second World War. After the war the U.S. government and its allies rounded up the leaders of conquered Germany and, after a farcical show trial, hanged them. It wasn't just the generals who were hanged: it also was Germans whom the Jews hated simply because of things that they had said or written. Julius Streicher and Alfred Rosenberg are just two examples of this: neither man had any leadership role in the war, but before the war each had made unflattering remarks about the Jews and their activities and so was hanged for it.

Even with their tight grip on the media, the Jews weren't able to keep a few Westerners from expressing their dissatisfaction with this Semitic way of doing things. It did not sit well with many independent-minded Americans that German leaders and writers were hanged, while Soviet and American leaders and writers who had been far more egregious in their behavior were held up as heroes. The Jews responded with outrage to any criticism of the travesty of justice they had sponsored at Nuremberg after the war. The Germans had dared to raise their hands -- or their voices -- against God's Chosen People, and so they had to be punished, and Western tradition to the contrary be damned.

It's pretty much the same today with the few Westerners who are bold enough to criticize the Israeli government's policies of torturing Palestinian prisoners or sending disguised death squads into Palestinian territory to assassinate Palestinian leaders in their homes. To the Jews this behavior is merely "self-defense." It's the sort of thing they've always done. The Palestinians are trying to take back the land the Jews stole from them, and the Jews are merely defending themselves. How dare anyone criticize them for that!

Charles Krauthammer has a column in the August 27 issue of *Time* magazine titled "In Defense of 'Assassination,'" with the word "assassination" in quotes, meaning that when Jews do it it isn't really assassination. He concludes his column with a whining complaint about the Gentile criticism of this Jewish behavior:

The abuse Israel has suffered for this scrupulous exercise of self-defense -- in a war it did not start -- is yet another example of the outrageous double standard applied to it by a cynical, complicit world.

Did you get that?: a "scrupulous exercise of self-defense" in a war the Jews didn't start. If not the Jews, then who? And a "cynical, complicit world" is ganging up on the poor, inoffensive Jews again. *Oy, veh*, vasn't six million enough, already? The Jews really have a corner on the market in brass.

Nearly always, this sort of whining self-righteousness works for the Jews. The bought politicians and the Christian preachers and the George Will types certainly go for it every time. And George Bush isn't about to buck the Jews on anything. He's as obedient a lackey as his predecessor was. But there are signs that, as was the case with the postwar lynchings at Nuremberg, a few Western observers have had about all of this Jewishness they can stomach. And not just Westerners.

Watching the bickering at the big United Nations anti-racism conference in Durban, South Africa, has been amusing. The Jews nearly always are able to manipulate such conferences to their advantage by threats and bribery: threats of U.S. retaliation against anyone who refuses to toe the Jewish party line, and bribes from the U.S. Treasury for those who go along. This time, however, so many delegates at the conference were incensed at the recent Jewish treatment of Palestinians that things didn't go so smoothly for the Jews and their U.S. bully boy.

There are even a few signs of unrest among the Jews' front-line troops in the Western media. Do you remember the 12-year-old Palestinian boy, Mohammed al-Durrah, who was shot to death deliberately by Jewish gunmen in Jerusalem nearly a year ago as he huddled against a wall with his father and begged for his life? The Jews pumped four rifle bullets into him. They also shot the boy's father, and then they killed a Palestinian ambulance driver who arrived to give aid. It all would have been just a bit of amusing target practice for the Jewish gunmen, except that a French cameraman caught it all on film. Before the Jews could squelch it, shocked television viewers around the world had seen it.

A British journalist, Sam Kiley, who worked for *The Times* of London, recently decided to follow up that story. His editors at the newspaper were not enthusiastic about the project, to say the least. In Kiley's own words:

When I pulled off a little scoop by tracking, interviewing, and photographing the unit in the Israeli army which killed Mohammed al-Durrah, the 12-year-old boy whose death was captured on film and became the iconic image of the conflict, I was asked to file the piece "without mentioning the dead kid."

Well, Kiley is a thoroughly "wet" liberal who normally dotes on Jews and thinks they're just wonderful. But when told that he would have to write his story about the Israeli gunmen who murdered the 12-year-old Palestinian boy last September "without mentioning the dead kid," lest it offend the Jews, Kiley resigned from the staff of *The Times* and began speaking out about the way journalists are constrained to report news of the conflict in Palestine only in a way that is favorable to the Jews.

We shouldn't jump to any conclusions from Kiley's rebellion or the refusal of the delegates at the U.N. anti-racism conference to knuckle under, but it is something. It is a number of similar happenings recently that has Krauthammer whining in *Time* magazine that the world is ganging up on the poor Jews again. I wish it were so, but there hardly can be much complicity between the people who take an uncompromising stand against the Jews as Jews, on the one hand, and on the other hand the miscellaneous anti-racists, such as Kiley and the delegates in Durban, who at the moment are miffed by the Jews' atrocious treatment of the Palestinians.

It is the Jews, of course, who have built the anti-racism movement and have pumped all of the Gentile journalistic lackeys who work for them full of anti-racist sentiment. The Jews used this anti-racist sentiment to destroy Rhodesia and White South Africa, just as they're using it to destroy America, and it would be ironic if it is turning even slightly against them now as a consequence of their atrocious behavior in Palestine. I welcome that, but I don't hold out much hope for it in the near future: the Jews' grip on the mass media remains too strong, and it is that grip which controls the behavior of politicians and of governments. Remember, we saw the same sort of disgust with Jewish bloodlust and self-righteousness after the Second World War, but the Jewish media kept it under cover, and it never affected the lemmings or governmental policies.

What's necessary for combating the Jews effectively is a recognition of what they are -- not just what they happen to be doing at the moment. It's good when their hypocrisy and their self-righteousness work against them, as when their innate racism shows through their mask of anti-racism and disillusions a few of those whom they have duped. But the Jews' racism is not something we can count on using against them in a decisive way. After all, every healthy individual and every healthy nation is racist. It is in the Jews' nature to deny that fact and to attempt to weaken the racial feelings of others while secretly nurturing their own. That is the way they fight against the non-Jewish world. The motto of Mossad, Israel's principal agency for state-sponsored terror and assassination, is, "By way of deception shalt thou do war," but in fact that is the principle which governs the relations of Jews as a whole with the non-Jewish world. That is a consequence of what they are.

There are times when we too find it expedient to be deceptive. We do whatever we must to survive. But we do not make deception the cornerstone of our existence. And we must never think in terms of alliances with people like Sam Kiley or the delegates at the U.N. anti-racism conference. Cheer them on whenever they are refusing to take orders from the Jews. Even provide them with ammunition when we can. But never count on them. They are people who despite their occasional flashes of independence have been terribly flawed by their acceptance of an ideology manufactured by the Jews to serve Jewish purposes.

Among ourselves, at least, we must be honest. We must see things as they really are. We must try to understand the fundamentals and then govern ourselves accordingly. One fundamental is that people do not change their nature, any more than the leopard changes his spots. The Jews will not reform themselves. They will not voluntarily stop meddling in the affairs of non-Jews or attempting to use non-Jews for their own purposes. Until they are stopped by a superior opposing force they will behave as they always have behaved. They always will be hostile to non-Jews, and as long as we permit them, they will attempt to deceive non-Jews, just as the great bulk of our people always will be gullible and will be susceptible to Jewish deception if they are not provided with proper guidance.

Another fundamental is that we cannot counter the Jewish deception of the great bulk of our people as long as the Jews retain their control of the mass media of news and entertainment and we have no equivalent media. At this time we can only influence the thinking and behavior of the hardheaded, independent-minded minority of our people, but we always must have as our ultimate goal the guidance of all of our people, the shielding of all of our people from deception.

A third fundamental is that we must not foolishly imagine that we can achieve some quick and easy victory by building alliances with people whose goals or interests are essentially different from ours -- Middle Easterners or other non-Whites, for example -- or even with people who believe that their goals and interests are different from ours, as is the case with any of our people who still are under the influence of Jewish ideology: Sam Kiley, for example. We must count only on ourselves: on those whose most essential interests are the same as ours and who understand and accept that fact.

Our task is difficult, and at this time our progress is slow -- but there is progress. The number of people listening to these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts increases week by week. The number of people who seek out one of our Web sites on the Internet increases day by day. At natvan.com they are averaging 19,000 a day now, which is up 50 percent from a year ago. Every Saturday, when a new broadcast goes on the net, the number of visitors to natvan.com jumps to nearly 30,000. That's not much compared to the number of viewers of any of the popular Jewish television propaganda programs: a fraction of one percent. We don't have television yet -- but we will within the next month. We've just finished making our first music video with a message in both the music and the images, and you'll be able to see it in a couple of weeks. Look for it at resistance.com. By the end of this year we'll be producing video documentaries with a message, and some of those will be on cable TV.

Of course we know that we won't have anywhere near as large an audience as Mike Wallace or Oprah. But our viewers will not be the slack-jawed, beer-bellied couch potatoes and multi-culti-trendies who make up most of Mike Wallace's and Oprah's audiences. They still can outvote us by a wide margin, but the time is approaching when numbers will not be all that counts. Nor will money be the only thing that counts in determining how large an audience one can reach or how much influence one can have on the people one reaches.

The whole world is entering a new era now, where all their money and the hundreds of millions of mindless lemmings in their television audiences and being able to manipulate the political system and the government of what is still the world's most powerful country -- at least, in a

material sense -- no longer are enough to guarantee the Jews' continued hegemony. What happened in New York and in Washington this week is just one small manifestation of this new era. George Bush and the other politicians under the Jews' control can order the bombing of every pharmaceutical factory in the Middle East in response to recent events here, but that will only take us further into this new era.

I've said this before, and I'll say it again now. Not everyone in the world is willing to be dominated by the Jews. What happened this week is a direct consequence of the American people permitting the Jews to control their government and to use American strength to advance the Jews' interests at the expense of everyone else's interests. When people are driven into a corner -- as the non-Jewish people of the Middle East have been -- sometimes they will fight back. That is happening now, and it will happen even more in the future. The Jews will scream for the blood of their enemies, as Diane Feinstein and other Jews are now. Their lackeys in Washington will strike at their enemies for them, just as Bill Clinton and others before him did. And the consequence will be that the number of the Jews' enemies will grow without limit -- and not just in the Middle East.

Even here in the United States there are many people -- including many people who never have listened to one of my broadcasts and who probably would disagree with me on many fundamental issues -- who understand exactly why the United States was attacked this week. Not everyone in this country is a soccer mom or a baseball fan or an Oprah viewer. Some people can still think for themselves -- actually millions of them can. And at least some of these millions know that it was no gratuitous attack out of the blue by Middle Eastern terrorists that is responsible for all of those deaths in New York and Washington. They understand that when a nation no longer has leaders whose primary concern is the security and welfare of the nation, then bad things are likely to begin happening.

They understand that the people who flew those planes into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon did it because they had been pushed into a corner by the U.S. government acting on behalf of the Jews instead of on behalf of the American people. Certainly the soccer moms and the baseball fans will have their anger directed toward Arabs and Muslims, but there will be plenty of people who will understand that as long as we continue to let the Jews control our country one calamity after another will be inflicted on us. I certainly intend to do everything I can to help even more people understand that.

Four million subscribers to *Time* magazine had a chance to read Charles Krauthammer's explanation that terrorism and assassination are all right when it's the Jews assassinating their enemies. And those four million *Time* subscribers will read in the weeks ahead why terrorism and assassination are reprehensible and must be punished severely when it's the Jews' enemies striking back in desperation. But you know, not everyone will swallow that line.

After the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City, which clearly was a reprisal against the government for the government's mass murder of innocent civilians in Waco two years earlier, the mass media largely ignored this linkage and tried to place the blame for the bombing on "right-wing extremists." Some of them still refer to me as the architect of that bombing. Now they will try to keep the public from tracing the blame for the attacks this week back to the long-

standing subservience of the U.S. government to Israel. Every media spokesman and every politician is referring to this week's attacks as "cowardly" and "unprovoked." You read that right. The Jewish party line, and therefore the party line of every media spokesman and every politician, is that the attacks were "unprovoked." I've been listening to them all week, and not one of them will even hint at the possibility that maybe there was a reason for these attacks, that they were provoked by our own behavior. It's a "no, no" even to consider that.

But that sort of deception is not going to work as well as it has in the past. A lot of people are going to figure it out. And I'm going to help them -- and you should too, because the reprisals against America are just beginning. Many, many more innocent people will be killed because of what the U.S. government has done at the behest of the Jews. We already have killed close to a million people in Iraq alone because the Jews demanded it. The Jews, from Madeleine Albright on down demanded that we maintain the blockade that is starving Iraqi children. That is a provocation, and it is only one among many. More and more people need to think about that when looking for those ultimately responsible for this week's attacks.

And as I said, this week's attacks are just the beginning of what's in store for America. Of course, I don't know exactly what will be next, but certainly biological terrorism is coming. When it does come the death toll will dwarf anything we've seen so far. And again most of the television viewers will believe whatever the Jews tell them to believe, and Mr. Bush will declare the biological attack "unprovoked," and he will order the bombing of still more aspirin factories in Iraq and Iran and Afghanistan and Sudan in order to show the lemmings that he's a strong leader and is doing something. But among the people who can think for themselves, the number who will understand where to place the blame will continue to grow. And the demand for a real solution, a final solution, will grow too. In this new era I won't be the only one pointing the finger of blame in the right direction and talking about final solutions to our problem.

Who Is Guilty?

Observing the responses to last week's attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center has been interesting, to say the least. It has been 11 days now, and nearly every spokesman for the controlled media and for the government has been avoiding the obvious question: "Why was the United States attacked?"

Nearly all of them are afraid of that question; they are pretending that there is no answer to that question, that there was no reason for the attack, that it was an unprovoked attack -- because the answer to the question, "Why was America attacked?" also is obvious. We were attacked because we have been letting ourselves be used to do all of Israel's dirty work in the Middle East. We were attacked because we have supported -- militarily or diplomatically or financially -- every bit of aggression and every atrocity Israel has committed against its neighbors for the past half-century. Everyone in the world with even half a brain understands that, even if talking about it is considered Politically Incorrect.

I've been warning about reprisals against the United States for many years. Seven years ago, on February 25, 1994, an American Jew, Baruch Goldstein, walked into a mosque in Hebron and machine-gunned Palestinians at prayer, killing 29 of them before running out of ammunition and being beaten to death by the Palestinian survivors. This act of mass murder immediately made Goldstein a saint for religious Jews everywhere. They built a shrine to him near Hebron, and Jews from the United States and other countries still make pilgrimages to this shrine.

There were no reprisals from the Palestinians at the time, and the mass media in the United States barely mentioned the massacre, even though the murderer, Goldstein, was an American. But the Palestinians -- and Muslims everywhere -- remember such things. They blame not just the Jews, but also the people who finance and arm and shelter the Jews: that is, they blame America. And right after the massacre, I warned my fellow Americans in an article that I wrote for my magazine *National Vanguard.* The article was titled "Stay Out of Tall Buildings," and it reported the massacre and the minimal response of the media here, and then it warned:

New Yorkers who work in tall office buildings -- anything close to the size of the World Trade Center -- might consider wearing hardhats to work for the next few months.

Well, of course, it took the Muslims more than a few months, and there were many more American provocations meanwhile. But last week the response eventually came. Of course there had been lesser responses earlier -- the bombing of a couple of American embassies in Africa and of the U.S. Navy destroyer, the USS *Cole,* for example -- but those events were a long way from here, and to most Americans they weren't real: hardly enough to distract them from the latest ball game on TV. What happened last week finally caught the attention of the American people. It's about time that Americans began to pay attention to such things.

Unfortunately, the great majority of Americans still get all of their opinions and attitudes from TV, and so they will not learn what they should learn from last week's attacks. What they're learning from TV is that the attacks were "unprovoked," that the attackers were "cowards," and

that "we'll smoke them out of their holes, by golly." They're also taking to heart a lot of slogans along the lines of: "We're the greatest country on earth, and these attacks will only unite us and help us all pull together." When real lemmings hear slogans like that they become misty-eyed, put their right hands over their hearts, and begin singing "The Star-Spangled Banner." And they begin looking for enemies, so they can demonstrate their patriotism, a sentiment which will be in fashion again for a few months.

One lemming was arrested in Washington trying to ram his car into the Saudi Arabian Embassy. Others around the country have been throwing bricks through the windows of mosques. All of them have been flying American flags. But among all of them there is hardly a grain of understanding. The dimwit who tried to ram the Saudi Arabian Embassy doesn't understand that the Saudi government is more afraid of Muslim fundamentalists than anyone in the West is. If Muslim fundamentalism experiences a surge of growth as a consequence of the success of the attacks last week, it will be either the government of Saudi Arabia or that of Egypt that will fall first, followed quickly by every other Middle Eastern government that has collaborated with the Jews -- or, what is the same thing, with America.

And the chests of all the dimwits swell with pride when their government in Washington rattles its sabers and issues demands to the government of Pakistan and other governments in the Middle East. Washington has demanded cooperation with its effort to catch the people who attacked New York and Washington last week. The rulers and top politicians in these countries are pledging their cooperation, for their own reasons, but this sort of thing doesn't sit well with their countrymen. Patriotic Pakistanis, both among the educated classes and among the religious elements, can only hate America even more as a result of these humiliating demands and the ignominious response of their own leaders.

Of course, I don't know who organized the attacks on Washington and New York last week. Neither does Mr. Bush, and I doubt that he will know with any degree of certainty even when he begins ordering missile attacks against various Middle Eastern targets, more for proving his "leadership" to the flag-waving lemmings here than for actually punishing the people who organized the events of last week.

Aside from these domestic political considerations, the principal determinant of the American response will be whatever the Jews think is best for Israel. Former Israeli Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu set the tone last week while the fire was still burning in the Pentagon and in some of the buildings of the World Trade Center complex. He said that it will not be enough to kill Osama bin Laden and his followers; the United States must destroy all of the governments of those countries where terrorist groups might arise in the future. We must do it now, Netanyahu demanded, while there is popular support among the American people for such a pre-emptive war. If you wait, Netanyahu said, you will lose your chance. New and stronger terrorist organizations will spring up to take the place of Osama bin Laden's group. So strike now! And other Jewish leaders, both in Israel and in the United States, were pushing similarly for a full-scale pre-emptive war.

There's no doubt that the U.S. military forces could depopulate the entire Middle East with ease. With minimal loss to ourselves, we could make a huge, self-illuminated, glass parking lot out of

Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, and all of the other countries bordering the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the eastern Mediterranean -- except Israel, of course. Actually, that's not the solution the Jews prefer. Instead they want us to send in ground troops, whip their armies, take over their countries, and install puppet governments that will follow the Jews' orders. Then they can control and milk the whole area. That grinning idiot we have in the White House, George Bush, is perfectly willing to go along with such a scheme if that's what they tell him to do. The media are sampling public opinion now and reporting that most of the lemmings will go along too.

Whether or not that is the way the Bush government goes remains to be seen. There are serious liabilities and risks if the United States undertakes such a major, protracted war. Occupation armies will be required to keep the area pacified. And even though the lemmings are feeling all warm and fuzzy and patriotic and morally indignant now in the wake of last week's attacks, they may become restless during a protracted war intended to bring the whole Middle East under Jewish hegemony, especially when our casualties begin mounting. Presumably all of these considerations will be taken into account before the Bush government is told what to do. Mr. Bush's advisers also should take into account what happened to the Soviet Union during its attempt to conquer Afghanistan. The Soviet Union spent more than eight years trying to whip Afghanistan's Muslim guerrillas and had 15,000 of its own soldiers killed in the attempt before finally giving up in 1989. And during this attempt the Soviets already had a pro-Soviet government in Kabul: a government whose leaders were condemned as traitors and infidels and butchered by the Muslims as soon as the Red Army pulled out. Any government of Afghanistan that might otherwise be inclined to make a deal with the United States certainly will remember that.

Of course, just because the Soviet Union was unable to whip Afghanistan doesn't mean that the United States can't do it -- if the U.S. government is willing to make a big enough effort and to sacrifice the lives of enough Americans. We certainly have more than enough firepower, more than enough high-tech weaponry, to do the job. We are a bit short in some departments, to be sure: intelligence, for example. I am astounded that as complex an operation as that against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon last week could have been planned and carried out without the Bush government having any hint of what was going on.

Was this another Pearl Harbor scenario, where our government knew of an impending attack but pretended it knew nothing and waited for the attack to come so as to have an excuse for becoming involved in a war? The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, of which the Roosevelt government had plenty of forewarning, transformed the sentiment of the American public from anti-war to pro-war overnight and allowed the Roosevelt government to become fully involved in the war against Germany, which was Japan's ally. Roosevelt was itching for a war because all the Jews around him were pushing for it. Did the Bush government know about last week's attack ahead of time but pretended not to so as to have an excuse for launching a war against the Jews' enemies in the Middle East? I really don't know. I think it much more likely that the government of Israel had some intelligence about the attack ahead of time and deliberately withheld that intelligence from the United States. That's the sort of thing the Israelis often have done in the past, and they certainly welcomed last week's attack.

Well, that's a minor question. The big question is: Why should we start another war now? What advantage do we gain, even if we pulverize Afghanistan and kill its entire population? Do we thereby prevent any further attacks against America by people in the Middle East who object to our government's support of Israel? I think not. Afghanistan is not the only country in the Middle East capable of supporting guerrilla fighters, and guerrillas who are willing to sacrifice their own lives by flying into their targets will not be easily intimidated. We may be able to install puppet governments and occupation armies to support those governments everywhere in the Middle East, and we may be able to introduce all sorts of new security programs in the United States intended to make the job of an attacker more difficult, but the ultimate cost of all this will be very, very high. And again, the question is, why should we do these things? Why should we continue making ourselves a target for terrorists so that these things even bear consideration?

You know, there are Americans who have a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude. They don't want to hear that we should stop letting Israel wag America like its tail. They don't want to hear that we should stop doing the things in the Middle East that make the people of the Middle East retaliate against us. Their attitude is, "By God, nobody's going to tell us what to do. We'll continue supporting Israel with money, weapons, and diplomacy if we want to, whether it's in America's interests or not, and if any of those towel-heads in the Middle East don't like it we'll kick their asses. We're bigger and tougher than anybody else, and we'll push anybody around we want to, and they'd better not complain about it." This swaggering, bully-boy attitude is what we're hearing from some American politicians now who're courting Jewish support -- and also from some military leaders with political ambitions, unfortunately.

I think that's really stupid. Let's let the attacks on New York and Washington last week serve as a wake-up call for every thinking American: a wake-up call for us to begin paying attention to our government's policies and to begin insisting that our government act only to protect and promote the interests of the American people, and nothing else. For far too long we have watched cynically from the sidelines as our government became more and more corrupt, more and more irresponsible, more and more negligent of America's interests. We watched the Jews corrupt our political system with their money and their media and then use America's power and wealth for their own purposes. Most Americans, because of the Jewish control of their mass media, are not aware of this, but thinking people in most of the rest of the world certainly are aware of the way we're being used. This has earned America the contempt of the whole world, including not only Israel's enemies, but Israel itself. The deliberate Israeli attempt to sink our ship the USS *Liberty* in 1967 was just one indicator of that contempt, which has grown more profound since.

You know, there are two reasons why the people of the Middle East hate America. One reason is that to the Muslims America is the Great Satan, the corrupter of the world. They don't want us meddling in their affairs and trying to change the ideas and attitudes of their people. They don't want our Hollywood films and our Madison Avenue fashions and our immorality and our lust for money to corrupt their people. They don't want to be contaminated by us. They want us to take all of our Jewish fashions and our Jewish television and our Jewish attitudes and ideas and get out of their lives, go home, leave them alone. For many Muslims the view of America as the Great Satan, the great corrupter, as an actual source of corruption in the Middle East, is enough reason to attack us.

But if we were not meddling in their affairs, if we were not supporting puppet governments in their part of the world, if we were not supporting Israel, if we were not bringing our corruption to them, if we would in fact go home and leave them alone, their contempt for our lack of character and morality would not be a sufficient motive for them to attack us over here. The reason for their attack last week is our support for Israel's aggression against them. Our lying media and our lying politicians in Washington will deny that, but it is crystal clear to anyone with eyes to see; it is obvious to thinking people everywhere. The attack last week was not "unprovoked." We were attacked because we support Israel financially, diplomatically, and militarily. As long as we continue to support Israel we will remain a target for the patriots and the religious fundamentalists of every other country in the Middle East. Is that really what we want to do? Does that really serve America's interests?

I think not. Let's emphasize just two things in connection with last week's attack. First, anybody in the media or in the government, any politician or other public figure, who tells us that the attack was "unprovoked" is lying to us: consciously and deliberately lying, because although the lemmings may not know any better, every government official and every media boss does know better. And anyone who deliberately lies to the American people on such an important matter is thereby declaring himself an enemy of America, an enemy of the American people, whether the liar is George Bush or a top media Jew or a general in the Pentagon. Anyone who tries to steer us away from the truth that this attack was a retaliation for the American support of Israel's atrocious behavior in the Middle East is an enemy of America.

Second, when we hear media spokesmen or government spokesmen tell us sternly, their voices quivering with phony indignation, that we need to hunt down and punish the evil men responsible for last week's attack, we can only agree with them. Yes, the people responsible for the attack are evil and should be hunted down and punished. But we don't have to go to the Middle East to find the responsible people and punish them. They're a lot closer than the Middle East. They're evil, but not because a lot of Jewish real estate in New York was destroyed; yes, that's right, the owner of the World Trade Center -- that is, the owner of a 99-year lease on the property -- is a Jew, Larry Silverstein. They're evil, but not because a great many Jewish lawyers and Jewish financial consultants and Jewish middlemen had offices in the World Trade Center. They're evil because thousands of young White women who worked as receptionists and secretaries and file clerks in both the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were killed, along with hundreds of airline passengers and crewmembers. That is what calls for punishment.

And who are the evil men who should be punished, these men responsible for the death of so many of our people? Mr. Bush assures us that he's got the FBI and the CIA on their tails, and that he'll find them pretty soon. Hey! Mr. Bush! Call off the FBI and the CIA. If you want to know who's responsible, just walk into your bathroom and look in the mirror. Of course, it's not really fair to put all of the blame on Mr. Bush. His last ten or so predecessors in the White House also are responsible. Republican and Democrat alike, they've all danced to whatever tune Israel was playing. By ignoring America's interests and letting themselves be used by Israel against Israel's neighbors for the past half century, they all helped to incur the debt that was only partly repaid last week.

And indeed, we can cast the net of blame much wider. We have a system of government in the United States that the Jews have learned to manipulate. With their money and their media they are able to swing elections, buy politicians, and control public policy to suit themselves, without regard for the interests of the American people. After the Second World War they were determined to change American immigration policy in a way that would dilute the White majority with a flood of non-White immigrants, and they found a multitude of White politicians and White clerics and White businessmen willing to collaborate with them and push through the immigration changes they wanted. And when the Jews launched the so-called "civil rights" revolution in the 1960s, again they found many thousands of White politicians and clerics and businessmen and lawyers to help them strike down the laws against miscegenation and push through new legislation requiring the racial integration of schools and workplaces and neighborhoods.

And the same pattern can be seen in the entire history of America's policy in the Middle East. From the beginning it has been a policy intended to promote Jewish interests and to sacrifice American interests, but the Jews could not have pushed these policies through by themselves. They had a multitude of Gentile collaborators willing to sacrifice the interests of the American people in order to curry favor with the Jews. And these people, these traitors to their country and to their race, who put their own selfish interests above those of their people, certainly have been aware all along of the debt that was being built up. Sally Soccer Mom and Joe Six Pack may not have figured out why everyone in the Muslim world hates America's guts and why a few Muslims are willing to die in order to punish America for what America has done to them on behalf of Israel, but the traitors understand it perfectly well. They understand who is responsible for last week's tragedy, and that's why they all try to keep the public confused by always referring to last week's attack as "unprovoked." And I'll guarantee you this: America will continue to have tragedy after tragedy, not because we don't have strict enough security measures at our airports, and not because of Osama bin Laden, but because we don't have a government which represents the interests of the American people. Until we regain control of our own news and entertainment media and have leaders whose sole concern is what's good for America -- not what will win them Jewish support in the next election -- we'll remain a nation adrift, hated by all, respected by none, and fair game for anyone who has a grievance against us.

Regaining Control

As I noted in my broadcast of September 15, and as various politicians also have noted in a somewhat different sense, on September 11 America entered a new era. For the first time in a long time American civilians have had to pay a price in blood for abdicating their responsibility to control their government. Excepting some entirely inconsequential Japanese efforts against the Pacific Northwest during the early days of the Second World War, the U.S. mainland suffered its first attack from the air this month. In the past we dished it out -- the terror bombing of German cities throughout the Second World War, the bombing of Baghdad a decade ago, and the bombing of Belgrade in 1999, not to mention selective air strikes against an aspirin factory in Sudan and against the home of Libyan leader Muammar al-Qaddafi -- but until this month the American people hadn't been on the receiving end.

The psychological shock has been profound. The attitude used to be that our government could do whatever it wanted to do against the people of other countries, and Americans could enjoy the spectacle on TV from the comfort of their living rooms, watching the bombs falling and buildings burning while sipping their beer and munching potato chips. Americans felt invulnerable, and the feeling of invulnerability led to a diminished sense of responsibility. We could kick other people in the teeth all day long, kill other people's wives and children, burn other people's homes, and they couldn't do a thing about it. We didn't have to worry about the consequences of our behavior.

Even Americans who disapproved strongly of the bombing of Belgrade by Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton two years ago didn't disapprove as strongly as they would have if it had seemed more real to them, instead of just a spectacle on TV. What happened in New York and Washington this month seemed very real indeed. What people saw on their television screens -- and still are seeing as the wreckage continues to be cleared and the corpses hauled away in body bags -- was a stark reminder of the truth in the ancient adage: as ye sow, so shall ye reap.

That adage, of course, is about the last thing of which the media bosses and their lackeys in the government wanted to be reminded. Mr. Bush declared that what happened on September 11 was "an attack against freedom and democracy," rather than retribution for anything we had done. The people who seized the airliners and flew them into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center are described as "cowards" and characterized as hate-crazed loonies who hate America because America stands for "freedom and democracy." Really: that's what the media bosses and the politicians want us to believe.

And that's the excuse the Bush government is using for pressuring other governments into collaborating in his new Persian Gulf War. This is not a war to serve Israel or help the United States get revenge for the September 11 attack, the Bush line goes; this is a war against the enemies of freedom and democracy, wherever they may be. If you believe in freedom and democracy then you must stand with us; those who are not with us are with the terrorists.

No head of state anywhere believes Bush's baloney about the September 11 attack having been against "freedom and democracy." They all understand with perfect clarity that it was a very

specific retaliation for the U.S. government's support of Israel's aggression in the Middle East. The responses of other countries to Bush's efforts to build a coalition reveal the worldwide spread of Jewish corruption. Some European countries are nearly as much under Jewish media influence as the United States and have governments nearly as corrupt. This is the case in the United Kingdom and France, for example.

The situation is mixed in Islamic countries such as Pakistan and Turkey, with corrupt governments but with populations relatively free of Jewish media brainwashing. What we might hope for in Pakistan is an overthrow of the present government; or, barring that, the large-scale sabotage of any U.S. military effort mounted from Pakistan. Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran are almost the only countries showing any real character in resisting the Bush government's efforts to build a pro-Israel coalition in the Persian Gulf area under the pretext of waging war against the enemies of freedom and democracy.

The most worrisome aspect of the present situation is the talk from Bush administration officials about a full-scale war to take out Iran and Iraq as well as Afghanistan, so that Israel will have a free hand in the Middle East. That is the course that has been urged by Benyamin Netanyahu, Ariel Sharon, and every other Jewish spokesman, both in Israel and the United States, and the Bush administration is obediently parroting that line. The banners on all of the TV news programs are proclaiming a state of war. They don't report the news any longer; they report the latest developments in "America's New War." That is a deliberate effort to get the lemmings into a war mood. Of course, Israel is never mentioned by those pushing for a full-scale war. The purpose of the war has nothing to do with Israel, they would have us believe; the war is to save freedom and democracy, and so we should wage war not just against the people who attacked the United States on September 11, but against all enemies of freedom and democracy. That's the sort of lie that worked for two world wars in the past century, and so the lemmings ought to go along with it again, they figure.

And if we believe the public opinion polls, they are right. The intellectually challenged George Bush, who always has a sly little smirk just about ready to break out whenever he's reciting his lines for the TV cameras, has been portrayed by the media ever since September 11 as the bold, determined, resolute leader of the nation, and he has the approval of 90 percent of the public. Furthermore, approximately 80 percent of the public will back him in a war against Afghanistan, and 70 percent or so would like to see him take out Iraq while he's at it, even though there's no indication Iraq had anything to do with the September 11 attack. It really seems that the yahoo flag-wavers among the lemmings have been absorbing the war-mongering propaganda of Netanyahu and Sharon and the other Jews.

We ought to remind ourselves that this is the same American public that gave Bill Clinton an overwhelming approval rating after he admitted lying about his Oval Office affair with Monica Lewinsky. We also ought always to be cautious in accepting the results of public opinion polls. The Jews continuously sample public opinion on dozens of key issues, so that the media can adjust their propaganda in order to keep opinion moving in the way the Jews want it to move. If anything were to cause public opinion to swing against Israel, however, they not only would adjust their propaganda accordingly, they also would keep the negative results strictly to themselves. They would tell Mr. Bush, "George, the latest polls show public opinion solidly in

favor of Israel, and the people will support a U.S. war against Israel's enemies." Actually, in the present case, I have no reason to believe that the opinion polls are not correct. The Jews are calling for a war, the collaborators in our government are calling for a war, and the lemmings are responding as they always have responded.

There are a couple of things that might derail the Jews' war plans. One is the failure of the Bush government to build or to maintain its coalition of collaborator governments in the Middle East. A popular uprising in Pakistan might stiffen the spines of governments in several other countries and cause them to reject collaboration as well. Without land access to the countries the Jews want conquered, the Bush forces will be restricted to aerial bombardment. They can kill a lot of people and damage a lot of infrastructure that way, but they are not likely to win a war.

Another thing which might put a monkey wrench in the war plans would be more and larger strikes against the United States: that is, a large-scale follow-up to the September 11 attack. Whether such a follow-up has been prepared by the people who launched the September 11 attack -- or by others -- remains unknown at this time. The propaganda of the media and of the Bush government is that the September 11 attack helped to unify America, rouse our fighting spirit, and so forth. And indeed, many people did run out and buy American flags. But there also can be no doubt that many Americans have been unnerved by the September 11 attack.

As I mentioned at the beginning, what happened was a profound psychological shock to many Americans who previously had felt invulnerable. The collapse in the price of airline stocks is not due to the loss of four aircraft or the expense of collecting fingernail clippers and pocket knives from passengers; it is due to the fact that many Americans are now afraid to fly.

If there is a large-scale follow-up to September 11 -- especially if it comes in the form of a biological or chemical attack, with as many or more casualties than the World Trade Center attack -- many Americans who now are blindly following the party line on television may be ready to break ranks and start thinking about why America is being attacked. They'll want a better answer than the one they're getting from TV now: namely, that the attack is because Osama bin Laden hates freedom and democracy. A few of them will even begin to understand that the real reason we are being attacked is because of our government's support for Israel's atrocious behavior against its neighbors in the Middle East.

Well, I suppose that's a bit optimistic. Expecting Americans to begin thinking is expecting too much. A large-scale follow-up to September 11 may cause panic, but probably not much understanding. It may make some elements of the public more open to new ideas, but independent thinking and understanding are fundamentally foreign to most of the public.

Today Sally Soccer-Mom and Joe Six-Pack don't have a clue about what's really happening in their world, what the real issues are, and what's really at stake. Sally and Joe always have been clueless, throughout all of history. They are herd animals, and they know only what the herd knows, care always and only about the things the herd cares about, cheer always and only for whatever the herd is cheering for at the moment.

Let me give you one of those little capsule oversimplifications I'm fond of. Although it is an oversimplification and is, therefore, not an exact model of the real world, I find it very helpful in making sense out of what's happening in the real world.

There are four basic types of people -- White people -- in the world: First there are the Sally Soccer-Moms and the Joe Six-Packs. They constitute about 95 percent of the White population. Some are rich, and some are poor; some are factory workers, and some are lawyers; some are barely literate couch potatoes on welfare, and some are academics with pretensions to intellectualism. What characterizes all of them is an inability to think independently or to hold any opinion not held by the herd. I often call them lemmings.

Second, there are the exploiters. They are rational people, who see the world as it is and attempt to use the world -- including the rest of the population -- for their own advantage. They recognize the lemmings for what they are and manipulate them in order to use them, nearly always through deception. Prior to the 20th century most of the exploiters have been White people themselves: the leaders of the Church, the leading members of the aristocracy, and the very wealthy -- the plutocrats -- for example. Exploiters have not necessarily been malevolent, nor have they always been powerful. Aristocrats and plutocrats often have advanced the interests of the herd while advancing their own interests. What distinguishes exploiters is neither malevolence nor power, but rather the ability to think independently and the placing of their personal advantages ahead of everything else.

During roughly the past century an extremely dangerous transformation in the racial nature of the exploiters has taken place. From nearly all White, they have become substantially Jewish. The White exploiters, instead of fighting off the exploitation of the White herd by Jews, have made alliances with the Jews. They have made agreements with the Jews for sharing the spoils. All of the top Jewish media bosses are exploiters: Sumner Redstone, Michael Eisner, Gerald Levin, and the rest. And so are White men like Rupert Murdoch and Bill Gates.

Third, there are the Judases: White people who might be considered a sub-type of the exploiters, but whose behavior is more in the nature of knowingly cooperating with the exploiters or knowingly letting themselves be used by the exploiters rather than engaging in exploitation themselves. For the most part Judases are people who understand the situation, more or less, and would be happy to be exploiters but are not quite bright enough, tough enough, or energetic enough, so they settle for collaboration. Many lower- and middle-echelon Gentile media people fall into the Judas category, while other Gentile media people -- especially those in the lowest echelon -- are merely lemmings. The same can be said of politicians and bureaucrats. Bill Clinton and George Bush are outstanding examples of Judases. Though apparently in the top political echelon, neither has the qualities to be a successful exploiter without Jewish backing. Clinton lacked the self-discipline, and Bush lacks the intelligence. The ranks of the bureaucracy, of the military leadership, and of the educational establishment are filled with Judases and lemmings, with Judases predominating in the upper ranks.

Fourth, there are the independent-minded people who understand much of what is happening in the world -- that is, they are not lemmings -- and are not inclined to be either exploiters or Judases. We'll call them "observers." They make up somewhere between two and five percent of

the White population. Observers are mainly interested in looking out for themselves, but they're more concerned with the welfare of their fellows than the exploiters are. They understand that as the herd fares, so fare they. If the race goes down, everyone goes down with it. So they do feel some sense of responsibility for what is happening in the world: just not enough, in most cases.

I've always considered the observers the key element in our population: certainly, the key element in getting the Jews off our backs and regaining control of our destiny. Three of the four categories of people in my oversimplified model understand the issues involved in what the Bush government is doing now -- or at least they are capable of understanding -- but the exploiters and the Judases don't care about the things we care about. Only the observers -- two to five percent of the population -- are capable of understanding and caring. If something happens to cause them to focus their minds on the simple fact that seven thousand Americans were killed on September 11 as a direct consequence of the Jewish control of the U.S. government -- seven thousand Americans were killed because our government has for decades been used to further the interests of Israel at the expense of the interests of the American people -- if they will focus on that simple fact and also on the fact that many more Americans are likely to die in the future if the Jewish control of our government continues, perhaps some of them will put their minds to the problem of breaking that control.

And so all of my own efforts have been directed toward helping the observers to focus. I don't waste time now on the lemmings, because I can't compete effectively with Hollywood and CNN for their attention -- although part of what I'm doing is building the media that will give us the capability for competing in the future. I don't waste time on the exploiters among my own people, because they won't break their alliances with the Jews until they have been convinced that doing so will be to their advantage, and the time when they can be convinced of that is still a long way off. And I don't waste time on the Judases, because such people aren't worth any time at all. The time will come for dealing with them as they deserve, but that time isn't here quite yet.

But with the observers there is hope for doing things now, hope for persuading some of them -- perhaps many of them -- that it is immoral and irresponsible merely to sit and observe and do nothing while the Jews and the Judases continue to use America, to use our people, for their own purposes and in doing so to bring disaster after disaster down on us and to insure a future of misery and shame for our children and our grandchildren.

There is hardly anything more irresponsible than waging an unnecessary war, hardly anything more reprehensible than waging a war for any reason except to safeguard or promote the interests of one's own people. If waging war against Afghanistan and Iraq and Iran were in the interests of my people, then I would be for it.

You know, we've talked about this before, but it's worth reminding ourselves again and again: there's more to the September 11 attack and the Bush government's response to that attack than the simplistic picture being presented to us by the government and the media. It's more than a case of Osama bin Laden hit us, so now we're going to find him and kill him. It's more than a case of we have been hurt by terrorists, and so now we are going to wipe out the governments which make it possible for terrorists to operate. If the U.S. government really thought it worthwhile to wipe out the governments that sponsor terrorism or harbor terrorists, the

government of Israel should be the first one to be wiped out. Israel has sponsored terrorism and assassination from the beginning and still does. The current prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, is himself a professional terrorist who supervised the massacre of thousands of Palestinian civilians in refugee camps in Lebanon in 1982.

And it's not even a case of our excusing Israel's terrorism because Israel is our friend. Israel is no friend of ours. Have we forgotten Israel's terrorist attack on the USS *Liberty*, when the Israeli government thought it would sink our ship, machine-gun everyone in the *Liberty's* lifeboats, and then blame it on the Egyptians? The Israelis almost got away with that.

No, terrorism is a hazard inherent in what the world has become. Americans must deal with it as best they can, and that means dealing with it intelligently; that means among other things understanding why we have been attacked when we become the victims of terrorism, not stupidly accepting the claim that it is because the terrorists hate our "freedom and democracy" and then running off to start a new war on that basis.

Finally, the most important thing for observers to focus on is this: the calamity that befell America on September 11 was the consequence of our having lost control of our own government. We want to avoid future terror attacks, of course. But more important than that -- more important than anything else -- is regaining control of our government and never again permitting another country or another people to use us for their own purposes.

America's Real Enemies

Watching mainstream television news programs these days is a fascinating experience -- and an enormously educational experience for those Americans able to read between the lines. *CNN Headline News* still carries the red, white, and blue banner "America's New War" in a transparently obvious effort to build public support for a full-scale war against Israel's enemies rather than a simple punitive expedition against the group that organized the September 11 attack on New York and Washington. *Fox News*, which is heavy on interviews with bureaucrats, diplomats, generals, and the like, slants its interviewee choices and the substance of the interviews to build public support in the same direction.

There are plenty of knowledgeable Americans who are solidly against dragging America into a war to clean up the Middle East for the benefit of Israel, but they have no voice in the mainstream news media. The people whose opinions are heard by the lemmings want everyone to believe that the failure of the United States to take out Iraq and Iran now, in the wake of the September 11 attack, will reveal us to the world as spineless wimps just asking for another terrorist attack. They tell us that every patriot should be in favor of a full-scale war against every country in the Middle East that these pro-Israel hawks label as an enemy of "freedom and democracy." And there are lots of reports on public opinion polls aimed at convincing the lemmings that the public really wants a full-scale war.

To me the interesting thing about this media effort is its obviousness. It is so blatant that it should be quite clear to anyone able to observe it with detachment: the media bosses want a war; the media deliberately are pushing public opinion toward approval for a major war. Even clearer is the lesson to be drawn from the way the news media avoid the obvious questions: Why were we attacked? Did our government's policies in the Middle East provoke the attack? If so, should we re-examine these policies and perhaps change them, regardless of what we do to punish the attackers? The media people and the "experts" whom they've been interviewing shrink from such questions like a vampire shrinks from a crucifix. Any sensible person would ask such questions, but the media and the people they interview don't. Fascinating!

The most interesting people to watch giving their opinions in the media are the Gentile neo-conservatives: the Jeanne Kirkpatricks, the George Wills, the Jack Kemps, the William Buckleys, the Rush Limbaughs. These are people -- writers, editors, bureaucrats, lecture-circuit types -- who make a pretense of conservatism and patriotism, and who keep the businessman/Republican/flag-waving side of the public in line. They earn their living by keeping their noses up under the Jews' coattails at all times. They all understand that their magazines would disappear from the newsstands, that their radio sponsors would cease being sponsors, and that there would be no more lecture invitations if they failed to follow the Jewish party line. They are a rabid bunch of attack dogs for the Jews without any real patriotism or any sense of shame at all. Every one of them is now beating the war drums on behalf of Israel and calling for the annihilation of Israel's enemies.

These Gentile attack dogs for the Jews really have no opinions of their own: they simply follow the party line which is laid down by Jews, most of whom are behind the scenes. During the

Clinton administration I remarked more than once that it was the most Jewish government America ever had had: a Jewish secretary of state, a Jewish secretary of defense, a Jewish secretary of the Treasury, a Jewish secretary of agriculture, two Jewish Supreme Court justices, a Jewish national security adviser, a Jewish ambassador to the United Nations, and hundreds of other Jews appointed by Clinton to powerful government positions.

George Bush's government is different. The people out front, in the public's eye, are Gentiles -- of a sort: a mulatto secretary of state, a White Gentile secretary of defense, a Negress as a national security adviser, a White Gentile Treasury secretary -- and, except for Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, no really prominent Jews. That is, there are few Jews out front, where they can be seen. But the Jews are there, just as in the Clinton government, but working behind the scenes. There's Richard Perle, who's been gnawing at America's foundations since the Nixon days, as one of Bush's principal advisers on military policy, for example. And there's Paul Wolfowitz, nominally the deputy secretary of defense, but in reality more influential in defense policy than his nominal superior, Donald Rumsfeld. Wolfowitz and Perle both judge every policy by the single criterion, "Is it good for the Jews?" And both are relentless and outspoken advocates of the destruction of Iraq and Iran, although there is no evidence that either of those countries had anything to do with the September 11 attack. For Perle and Wolfowitz it is sufficient that those countries are enemies of Israel. In a top-level military strategy briefing for Bush on September 13, Wolfowitz urged "ending states who sponsor terrorism." That's still the position of Perle and Wolfowitz and all of their neo-conservative camp followers.

How do you "end a state"? What happens to the people?

Hey, the people of Iraq and Iran aren't Jews, so don't worry about it! What are you, some kind of bleeding-heart, liberal wimp? Don't ask questions, just do it!

And, of course, no one among all of these bloodthirsty, neo-con warmongers even hints at putting Israel on the list of "states who sponsor terrorism" and which, therefore, needs to be "ended." Have you ever heard of Mossad? That's not just some rogue group of assassins and terrorists that operates without the sanction of the Israeli government. It's an ***agency*** of the Israeli government. It's part of the government of Israel. Mossad sends out its murder squads all over the world to kill people the Israeli government doesn't like. Usually they don't get caught, or if they do the media hush it up. But they've been caught shooting a Moroccan with a silenced pistol in Norway, squirting poison in the ear of a Muslim religious leader in Jordan, putting bombs in the hotel rooms of Arab diplomats in Syria. They've shot down civilian airliners if there was someone aboard they didn't like. They send assassins dressed as Arabs into Palestinian towns to murder Palestinian leaders in their homes in the dead of night. In 1981 Israeli aircraft launched a surprise bombing raid on Baghdad to destroy a research center there.

Israel has had several prime ministers who were professional terrorists before they went into politics, including Menachem Begin, Ehud Barak, and Ariel Sharon, the current prime minister. The first leaders of the state of Israel were terrorists who carried out the terror bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem in 1946, killing 91 people. Ever hear of letter bombs? They are an Israeli invention. The Mossad has sent hundreds of letter bombs to scientists, journalists, and academics in Egypt, Syria, and other countries to kill and terrorize Israel's opponents.

Indeed, there are states in the Middle East that sponsor terrorism, in some cases because they have no other way of fighting back against their oppressors. But Israel has engaged in far more state-sponsored terrorism than any other state in the region. And yet the "experts" who speak grimly on American television about "ending states that sponsor terrorism" pretend as if they have never heard of Israeli terrorism.

As I said, all of this is painfully obvious, more obvious than Jewish television propaganda has been for a long time. After the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, the unanimous refusal of the controlled media and the government to acknowledge that bombing as the outraged response of one patriot to the Clinton government's massacre of innocents in the Branch Davidian church in Waco two years earlier, and instead to attempt to blame militias and political dissidents generally, was a pretty transparent exercise in deceitful propaganda. But the present attempt by the media and the government to deflect blame for September 11 from our country's blind support for Israel is even more obvious. It provides a wonderful education for those observers capable of being educated.

The effect on the general public of the pro-war propaganda today is somewhat less salutary but still interesting. The lemmings are responding as expected, but there is more diversity in the response of the public than the media bosses like. I have a Jewish Telegraphic Agency report on my desk showing the results of public opinion polls taken in the United States a few days ago. The September 28 JTA report is headed "Polls following terror attacks on U.S. give Israel high marks." The first part of the report gives the depressing information we expect. A poll of 1,011 Americans conducted by the Institute for Jewish and Community Research and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at the Hudson Institute found that 92 percent of those questioned endorse "full cooperation" between the United States and Israel in combating terrorism. The president of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research, Gary Tobin said:

se to unanimous as you'll ever get in a national poll. It means that the American public is almost completely behind Israel and American support for Israel and American cooperation for Israel.

Well, the support is not quite as nearly unanimous as Mr. Tobin would have us believe, but we'll get to that in a minute.

A second poll of 1,032 Americans, conducted by CNN, *USA Today,* and Gallup, found 55 percent of Americans saying they back Israel in its conflict with the Palestinians, while only seven percent back the Palestinians. The pro-Israel results are up from about 40 percent before September 11, while the pro-Palestinian results remained relatively unchanged. The JTA report quotes Tim Wuliger, president of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the huge and powerful pro-Israel lobby feared by every politician in Washington:

These polls demonstrate the solidarity between Americans and Israelis. In the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks on America, Americans understand that we should support another country which has been relentlessly attacked by terrorists and which shares our values of democracy, sanctity of human life, and tolerance for differences in personal beliefs.

Really, that's what the Jew said: Israel, where collective punishment and the torture and killing of prisoners are government policy -- Israel, the world capital of the White slave trade, where buying and selling kidnapped Gentile women as sex slaves is legal -- is a country that respects the "sanctity of human life." What Wuliger forgot to mention is that religious Jews believe that only Jews are human.

The JTA report also quotes David Makofsky, of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, another pro-Israel group. Makofsky says that the rise in sympathy for the Jewish state is a direct result of Americans experiencing firsthand the threat of terrorism that has plagued Israel. "Americans identify with Israel's plight," he said.

Could it possibly be that the way the Jewish news media present the news to the American people, always representing the efforts of Palestinians attempting to regain their country as "terrorism" and the efforts of the Israelis to repress them as "self-defense," has something to do with the way Americans view the situation in the Middle East?

Well, of course, it does. Nevertheless, a larger part of the American public than I would have guessed apparently hasn't been fooled by the spin put on the news by the controlled media. The Jewish poll I just cited, which showed 92 percent of the public agreeing that the United States should cooperate with Israel in combating terrorism, found that slightly more than 20 percent of the respondents blamed the September attack on U.S. support for Israel. The implication is that many of those who understand that U.S. support for Israel was the cause of the attack still are willing to collaborate with Israel. In any case, the 20 percent figure is encouraging. Also encouraging is the finding that those most likely to blame Israel are young people and people with relatively high incomes.

Another finding of the same poll is that 12 percent of the public believe that we now should distance ourselves from Israel, while 74 percent believe that we should not, with the pro-Israel respondents concentrated in the Bible Belt, where many primitive Christians actually accept the claim of the Jews to be God's Chosen People. Remember, these are the findings of a poll taken by a Jewish organization and reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, where the motive is to absolve Israel of blame and to show maximum U.S. support for the Jewish state.

A separate poll taken by *Time* and CNN reports that 21 percent of the respondents feel less favorable toward Israel after the attack, while only 10 percent feel more favorable. The 21 percent figure in this poll is consistent with the finding of the Jewish poll that 20 percent of the public blame the attack on U.S. support for Israel.

Polls can be tricky, with the results very much dependent on the exact wording of the questions, but certainly the polls cited in the JTA report are encouraging, indicating that a significant portion of the public is able to see the obvious. Perhaps lemmings make up only about 80 percent of the population instead of the 95 percent that I have estimated in the past.

The unfortunate fact remains, however, that although approximately one in every five Americans understands that the September 11 attack was the consequence of our government's support for Israel's aggression in the Middle East, one never would guess that from watching television

news, where the pretense is rigidly maintained that U.S. support for Israel had nothing to do with the attack: that it was an attack by people who simply hate our "freedom and democracy," as George Bush puts it. Not one of the "experts" being interviewed daily on television will give the slightest hint that anyone except a few "haters" and "extremists" believes otherwise. That must be intimidating to the enlightened 20 percent: no one wants to be labeled a "hater" or an "extremist." And, of course, it's intended to be intimidating; it's intended to keep the one in five who understands from explaining the facts to the four in five who don't.

It will, of course, be yet another tragedy for Americans if we let ourselves be lied into another war to advance the interests of the Jews at the expense of our own. There is an even greater tragedy looming than another war, however: that is the loss of our most fundamental freedoms. The same people who are using the September 11 attack as a pretext to push America into a full-scale war on behalf of Israel also are using it as a pretext to stifle dissent. They have the lemmings under control, but they're worried about that 20 percent or so of the population who aren't buying the television propaganda that the attack was "unprovoked" and that it was an attack on "freedom and democracy." They want to use the power of government to shut these people up, so that they can't influence others.

Intimidation through propaganda is a powerful weapon in the hands of the warmongers. Perhaps you remember how it was during the previous Persian Gulf War, ten years ago. Flag-waving yahoos were ready to beat up anyone who didn't seem an enthusiastic enough supporter of the war effort. Anyone who questioned America's terror-bombing of Baghdad was looked at with scorn and considered a subversive. The lemmings all tied yellow ribbons to everything in sight -- parking meters, door knobs, their car antennas, the fences around their yards, the columns on their front porches -- lest anyone suspect that they weren't gung-ho to kill as many Iraqis as possible.

The same war fever is being encouraged by the media and the government today. But that's not enough to satisfy the warmongers, because some people just aren't intimidated. The warmongers want to lock those people up. So-called "conservatives" in our government have wanted for years to have the power to silence troublemakers, dissidents, anyone who refused to march in lockstep with everyone else. Our present attorney general, John Ashcroft, is one of the worst of these. They want new laws to permit them to suppress any speech or opinion or activity that they don't like. Despite their claims of support for freedom and the Bill of Rights, these lying bastards want to take away our freedom. They are far more dangerous enemies of America's freedom than Osama bin Laden could ever hope to be.

They are disguising their fight against our freedom as a fight against terrorism. They already are ramming new laws through state legislatures, and they certainly will be pushing hard for new Federal laws as well. They want laws that not only will give the FBI and other secret police agencies additional powers to tap people's telephones and read their e-mail and scrutinize their bank records, but will broaden the definition of "terrorism" greatly. They want laws that will define as a "terrorist" anyone who speaks in favor of or helps to support a person who has been labeled by the government a "terrorist," or an organization that has been labeled a "terrorist organization." They want laws that will make such people subject to the death penalty. And who will decide which organizations are "terrorist organizations"?

Hey, you don't have to worry about that! Mr. Wolfowitz and his helpers in the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center will make a list. Attorney General Ashcroft will endorse the list. And if someone is charged under the law with being a terrorist, and you don't think he is and you give him a donation to help him hire a lawyer to defend himself, you have just given money to a terrorist and will be charged with being a terrorist yourself. Pretty slick, eh?

The people who are pushing for these new laws, ostensibly to protect Americans from terrorism, are the same people who for more than a decade have been backing "hate crime" and "speech crime" laws. All of the laws, whether ostensibly against "hate" or against "terrorism," have exactly the same purpose, and it's not really about terrorism at all: it is to silence dissenters, to silence people with Politically Incorrect ideas. The Jews and their Gentile hangers-on are afraid that the 20 percent of the public that doesn't believe the propaganda coming from television will be able to influence the other 80 percent if they aren't muzzled. The people in New York and Hollywood and Washington who truly hate America's freedom are hell-bent on using the tragedy of September 11 as an excuse to stamp out that freedom. They are America's real enemies. They are the ones against whom we should wage an all-out war, until the last of them has been annihilated.

Face Crime and Anthrax

Some novels are worth reading just because they're entertaining or exciting. Others are worth reading because we can learn something worthwhile from them. Occasionally, a novel may even be prophetic: we can learn something about the future from reading it. It is a rare novel indeed that is both entertaining and prophetic. Such is the novel *1984*, written in 1948 by the Englishman Eric Arthur Blair using the pen name George Orwell.

I first read *1984* in 1955 when I was a graduate student and found it so fascinating that I reread it at least three times in subsequent years. What fascinated me about the novel was the feeling that I had, while reading it each time, that it not only was prescient, that it not only was telling me things about the future that I felt were likely to come about, but it also was revealing to me very fundamental things about the nature of people and governments: things that I had not been taught elsewhere because they were Politically Incorrect -- although the term "Politically Incorrect" had not yet been coined.

Here's an example: Orwell talks about the ideological regimentation of the English public by the government. People were punished not only for doing or writing or saying something Politically Incorrect; they were punished for thinking Politically Incorrect thoughts: "thought crime," it was called. The Thought Police were the all-powerful enforcers of Political Correctness. In *1984*, there also was another type of crime for which people were punished: it was called "face crime," and a person committed a "face crime" if he had a Politically Incorrect expression on his face at any time. For example, if a person smiled when he should have frowned, or showed distaste or disapproval when he should have shown admiration, then he had committed a "face crime" and could be severely punished.

Well, that's only fiction, but in the real world a little over a decade ago Jewish organizations and the media began their big push to have all sorts of "hate crime" legislation enacted in America. "Hate crime," of course, is essentially "thought crime." "Hate crime" legislation punishes a person for what he supposedly was thinking at the time he committed some act. The politicians predictably put up almost no resistance. The Jews demanded it, so the politicians went along with it and began passing the laws that the Jews wanted. The Sally Soccer Moms and the Joe Sixpacks also thought "hate crime" laws were good things. Who wants to be in favor of hate? Outlaw it, get rid of it.

I've spoken often in these broadcasts about the Orwellian nature of the program to enact more "hate crime" laws. It was largely in connection with the mindless willingness of the public to go along with this trashing of their most fundamental freedoms that I began using the term "lemming" to describe people who believe whatever they are told to believe by their television screens and who then adjust their attitudes and opinions accordingly. Orwell also clearly understood this aspect of human nature. He understood that most people are susceptible to thought control by the media and by the government. He understood that no matter how repressive a government becomes, most people will never think of rebelling or even want to rebel, as long as they believe that most other people approve of the government.

I found this aspect of Orwell's book most interesting and also most profoundly depressing: his portrayal of the ease with which the thinking of the public can be controlled by the government and the media. Prior to absorbing the message of Orwell's *1984*, I'd had a rather idealistic view of people -- that is, of my people, my fellow White men and women. I had thought of the White public as being comprised of a mass of individuals, each able to think for himself and make his own decisions about the world around him. I had thought that if it were clear to me that the government is corrupt and is not serving the interests of our people, then all I had to do to persuade other people that the government does not deserve their support is show them the evidence. I thought that most other people could reach rational decisions about such matters. But when I read *1984*, I had the nagging conviction that Orwell was right about the nature of most people, and I was wrong. Orwell's portrayal of people had the ring of truth.

For a long time, however, I resisted accepting Orwell's view of the nature of the public because I didn't want to accept it. I wanted to keep my idealistic view of my fellow men. But eventually my own observations and my reason convinced me that Orwell was right, and that most people are, in fact, not individuals at all, but are lemmings.

I thought about the implications of that quite a bit, and I finally decided that it wasn't necessarily a bad thing. If the race had evolved that way, then it must have been for a reason. It must have survival value. And, of course, it does. We are able to have stable societies only because most people are lemmings: only because most people think and act only as members of the mass, not as individuals. In a time of war, for example, it is essential for a community or a nation to be united in its thinking. That's one of the reasons that multiculturalism weakens a nation. That's one of the reasons I've condemned as traitors the people trying to keep America's borders open to the Third World, trying to bring more "diversity" to America. They are weakening America, damaging America.

Anyway, lemminglike behavior was one thing before the age of television; it's something with quite different consequences when the powerful tool of television is in the hands of an alien minority with its own agenda, with its own interests, which in many cases are diametrically opposed to the interests of our people. My own concern, all of my work, has not been to change the nature or the behavior of our people; it has been to liberate them from the destructive influences that take advantage of our people and that manipulate them in ways opposed to their own interests. That's why I've focused so much on the all-important fact of Jewish media control.

Let me go back to Orwell's *1984* and to its all too prophetic descriptions of a government enforcing laws against "thought crime," and the people going along with this sort of ideological regimentation without complaint. Remember Orwell's description of "face crime"? I have on my desk a news report from the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* last week. It's about an 11-year-old fifth grader at a St. Louis-area school who was suspended from school last week for smiling inappropriately. The news story is headed, "School suspends boy who drew picture of attack, then grinned while showing it."

The boy's class had been given the assignment of writing about the September 11 attack. The boy drew a sketch of the twin towers of the World Trade Center with flames and smoke coming from the upper floors. The principal of the boy's school asked to see the drawing. The boy, Paul Volz,

showed it to the principal and smiled. The principal, Jeff Boyer, suspended Paul form school and sent him home with a note. The principal's note to Paul's father read:

When I asked him why he did this, he just looked at me and smiled. This is totally inappropriate, and Paul's behavior has to change.

Paul's father complained to the newspaper, and a reporter tried to contact the principal, but the principal refused to return his call. The reporter then contacted a spokesman for the school district, Ben Heit. Heit told the reporter that it was Paul's smile, not the drawing itself, that brought the suspension. All of this is in the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* of October 4.

Think about this story for a minute. I believe that most of us think of the attack on the World Trade Center as a very serious matter. Certainly, 6,000 people being killed is not a laughing matter for most of us. Paul Volz's smiling about the picture he drew may very well have indicated that the 11-year-old boy didn't take the attack seriously. But you know, in America, we used to be free to make up our own minds about what we would take seriously and what we wouldn't. When a neighbor -- or an 11-year-old kid -- didn't agree with us about what should be smiled at and what shouldn't, that was nobody's business but his. We couldn't sic the FBI on him -- or suspend him from school. It's clear that Paul's principal believes that that view of things is old-fashioned. He believes that the time has come when it is appropriate to punish people for "face crimes."

My concern is that many Sally Soccer Moms and Joe Sixpacks feel the same way about it that Principal Jeff Boyer does. In this case, I suspect that the war hysteria being drummed up by the media emboldened the principal to act as he did. I'm concerned that before this war is over, people like Principal Boyer, with an Orwellian Thought Police mentality, will use the war to justify many more *1984*-style curtailments of our freedom. The media bosses have been preaching for years that the First Amendment was never meant to protect "offensive speech" or speech that hurts other people's feelings: "hate speech" they call it. And there are literally millions of American voters who have let themselves be persuaded to go along with that view. Who needs "hate speech"? they think. It just hurts people's feelings and stirs them up against other people. Who wants to be in favor of speech that hurts people's feelings? Outlaw it, get rid of it. And what better time for the media bosses and their political lackeys in the government to push for new "speech crime" laws than when America is at war? Americans need to be united now, they say. We need to pull together. We must not have people saying things that divide us. That only serves the purpose of the enemy. So let's outlaw "hate speech" now. And simultaneously with this campaign to destroy our most basic freedoms, they tell us that we need to wage war against the enemies of our "freedom and democracy" in the Middle East. I'll bet they're really laughing up their sleeves about that.

And really, don't they have a right to laugh at us, to feel contempt for us? They use our democracy -- that is, our electoral system, in which the lemmings, whose opinions they control through their television, are used to put their approved politicians into public office -- to take away our freedom, and they use our people to help them do it. And they facilitate the whole process by getting us to fight a war against their enemies in the Middle East, telling us that it's a war to safeguard our "freedom and democracy." Wise men, such as George Orwell, warned us

about this sort of thing more than 50 years ago, but if we judge by people like Principal Jeff Boyer and school board official Ben Heit, the warnings haven't helped much.

Clear indications of the contempt they feel for us and of their confidence in their ability to continue manipulating us for their own purposes are visible in many places, but probably nowhere more than in Israel itself. There's been a lot of discussion among the Israeli politicians in the Knesset during recent weeks about how to take the best advantage of the September 11 attack on New York and Washington. The Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, is all in favor of carrying out a massive program of ethnic cleansing against the Palestinians while the Americans are preoccupied with annihilating the Jews' other enemies in the Middle East. Simon Perez, a former prime minister and currently Israel's foreign minister, favors a more cautious policy -- at least, in public he favors caution.

The discussion between Sharon and Perez is almost like a bad cop, good cop routine. Sharon is a certified war criminal, a professional terrorist with a record much longer than that of Osama bin Laden, and a mass murderer, who is currently defying the efforts of an international war crimes tribunal in Brussels to put him on trial for organizing the butchery of Palestinian women and children in the Sabra and Chatila refugee camps in Lebanon in 1982. His principal constituency among Israeli Jews is the raving-mad Orthodox element and the Jewish settlers in the so-called "occupied territories." Perez, a member of the Labor Party, appeals more to the rootless, cosmopolitan, pseudo-liberal Jewish element and pretends to be in favor of the badly misnamed "peace process."

Deception characterizes nearly everything that the Israelis do publicly. Privately, the Jews in both the Sharon and the Perez camps are enormously pleased by the September 11 attack on New York and Washington and by the Bush government's declaration of war against Israel's enemies in the Middle East. Sharon, however, pretends to be angry about the American efforts to build a coalition of so-called "moderate" Arab states to help in the war against Afghanistan and Iraq. Sharon blusters that the Bush government is trying to "sell Israel out" by making agreements with Arab states. These agreements may later turn out to be disadvantageous to Israel, Sharon complains.

Sharon is a master of what the Jews proudly call "chutzpah," which is a combination of incredible arrogance and spectacular brazenness mixed with a breathtaking degree of bald-faced deceit. American long-term support for Israel's aggression led to the attack of September 11 in which 6,000 Americans were killed; America then launched a war to destroy Israel's enemies in the Middle East under the guise of "fighting terrorism" and protecting America's "freedom and democracy," and Sharon complains that we're doing it at Israel's expense! It's the old Jewish trick of never being satisfied, no matter how much is given to them: of always complaining that they don't have enough and demanding more, as if we owe it to them! If we remind them of how much we already have done for them, of how many sacrifices we already have made for them, the response is an expression of injured innocence and, "Yes, but vot haff you done for us today?"

Really, one hardly can blame them. I don't know who coined the saying, "Never give a sucker an even break," but the Jews certainly have taken it to heart. That is quite evident to anyone

monitoring these Knesset discussions. Most of the discussions can be found in Jewish Telegraphic Agency or Reuters news reports, but some of the most lurid discussions are not reported in print. The week before last, the Hebrew-language Jerusalem radio station Kol Yisrael -- that's Hebrew for "all Israel" -- reported one debate that I have not found in print anywhere. According to Kol Yisrael, Sharon and Perez were discussing the Israeli government's actions against the Palestinians. Perez was arguing that the Israelis should at least maintain the pretense of seeking an end to the violence in order to keep the Americans happy. Sharon turned angrily to Perez and shouted:

Every time we do something, you warn me that America will do this or America will do that. I will tell you something very clearly: don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We, the Jewish people, control America, and the Americans know it.

This outburst from Sharon was followed by another warning from Perez that Sharon should be careful not to say such things. Clearly, when Sharon said that the Americans know that the Jews control their country, he wasn't talking about the Sally Soccer Moms and the Joe Sixpacks, who don't know anything they aren't told by television. He was talking about the politicians and the bureaucrats: about George Bush and Bill Clinton and the rest of the crowd that always has done Israel's bidding.

I'm reminded of something that happened 25 years ago, when General George Brown was the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He was showing an Israeli delegation some new, high-tech American weapons. The Israelis said they wanted them. General Brown told them that they weren't available for export, that the Congress hadn't approved them for use by anyone except the United States. The Israelis replied arrogantly, "Don't you worry about the Congress. We'll take care of the Congress." And, of course, they did. They got the weapons they wanted. And General Brown got in a lot of trouble and was even accused of "anti-Semitism" for telling others about this incident.

You know, we have a big, big problem here in America. The problem is not that people all over the world hate our guts and are willing to sacrifice their own lives in order to inflict damage on us. The problem is not that we are subjected to terrorist attacks with hijacked airliners or with deadly biological warfare agents such as anthrax. We could lose a lot of people to terrorist attacks and still survive as a nation.

The problem is not terrorism. The problem is that we have lost control of our own government. Our government no longer responds to our needs; instead it responds to the demands of an alien minority and has done this for a long time. It's even worse than that. The Jews' control of our mass media of news and entertainment, which has enabled them to gain control of the politicians and the government, has weakened -- really sickened -- our whole people. In order to gain control of the government they first had to subvert our people. They had to change our beliefs and our attitudes. They had to distract our attention from the important things and get us preoccupied with unimportant things. They had to make us forget our values and traditions. They had to break down our pride and independence. They had to change the way we raise our children. They had to subvert our educational system and our churches and other institutions, one at a time. They had to confuse us and make us feel guilty for being what we were. They had to

make us ashamed of our forefathers. They had to make us afraid to say in public what we felt about our own people and about others. They had to corrupt our political system, the way we chose our leaders. And then they were able to take control of our government and use us for their own purposes.

I've been preaching about this for more than 30 years -- about the effects of Jewish television on our people. I've been writing about it in books and in pamphlets and in leaflets. It was more than 25 years ago when I wrote my book *The Turner Diaries*, warning about what would happen to America. I've been warning about it on the Internet. I've been talking about it every week in the *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts. Many people listened. Many people agreed with me. But they thought that they didn't have to do anything. They thought that they could sit it out. But nobody can sit out what is happening to America now. We are beginning to pay the price for allowing ourselves to be subverted, for giving up control of our government, of our destiny. We are beginning to pay the price for letting ourselves, our nation, be used by an alien minority to advance their own interests at the expense of ours.

We are beginning to pay the price, and before we have finished paying the price we will discover that it is a heavy price indeed. Bombing the whole Middle East flat will not solve our problem. Our problem is here, not in Afghanistan or in Iraq. What Osama bin Laden gave us on September 11 was just a wakeup call. What the people mailing out anthrax-infected letters are giving us is just a reminder that we can have no real security -- in fact, no real future for our children and our grandchildren -- until we regain control of our own government. You must not believe the generals and the politicians who tell you confidently from your television screens that, if we just use enough cruise missiles and smart bombs and kill enough of the Jews' enemies in the Middle East, we'll be safe again. Americans will never again have real security or real peace of mind until they have regained control of their government and their media.

Let's get started!

Advice for Patriots

Today, let's talk about some of the things that have changed in America since September 11. I'm not thinking about all of the new rigmarole at airports or about how Mr. Bush's campaign of cruise-missile diplomacy in the Middle East is going, or even about how opening the mail each morning in media offices around the country and in politicians' offices in Washington has become a much more exciting operation than it used to be when Ted Kaczynski was the only person putting dangerous things into letters.

I'm more interested in the changes in the Politically Correct party line laid down for the lemmings by the media. I'm interested in changes in the way Americans view the world. And I'm interested in the changed prospects for the future of America.

The most interesting thing about the new party line is its stupidity. The Jews were caught by surprise last month, and they had to whip up something in a hurry in order to deflect blame from Israel and from the U.S. government's support for Israel. Apparently the best they could do on a moment's notice is the explanation that Osama bin Laden attacked us simply because he hates our freedom and democracy. Since they first cooked up that explanation they've refined it quite a bit. Both the Foreign Ministry in Israel and the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Israel's enormously powerful lobby in Washington, have been circulating "talking papers" to their own people, to politicians, and to everyone else who is likely to be making a public statement about America's new war or about Washington's past policy in the Middle East.

These "talking papers" tell people how to counter what the Jews call Osama bin Laden's "lies" and also how to respond to anyone who suggests that our government's support of Israel might have had something to do with the September 11 attack. The papers warn people never to raise this subject, but if someone else insists on talking about it, it is to be countered with the explanation that support for Israel had nothing at all to do with the attack, that we would have been attacked even if we weren't supporting Israel, and that the only reason for the attack is Osama bin Laden's irrational hatred of America's freedom and democracy.

I believe that it's clear that many people actually believe this nonsense, judging by the number of cars with red, white, and blue ribbons tied to their antennas. But these are the people who believe everything Tom Brokaw or their beloved Big Brother in the White House tells them. If George Bush came on TV and told them with that mock-solemn expression of his that a Martian invasion force had just landed, that the Martians were demanding one million sacrificial virgins as their price for not destroying Hollywood and Washington, and that U.S. Army troops would be going door to door to collect virgins, the folks with the ribbons on their antennas would believe it, and they would prepare to hand over any virgins in their households. They would consider it to be their patriotic duty. The party line may change from time to time, but lemmings never change.

Well, the lemmings may believe that U.S. support for Israel had nothing to do with the September 11 attack or with the anthrax-laced letters now going around, but no one else believes it. Last week the media bosses were kicking themselves because they had let the text of a statement Osama bin Laden had made be published in the United States. They said that they had

made a mistake in putting this statement before the American public. They wouldn't publish any further Osama bin Laden statements, they said, because the statements might contain secret instructions for his operatives.

Everyone I've spoken with laughed at that excuse. In his last statement Osama bin Laden said that Americans would not be secure and would have no peace of mind as long as Palestinians were not secure in their own land. That's the sort of powerful and simple message that even Sally Soccer Mom and Joe Sixpack might understand, and that's what the Jewish media bosses don't want the public to hear. They're not worried about secret instructions; they're worried about the lemmings figuring out what's going on.

Actually, I think there's very little danger of that. And really, the changes I'm more interested in are in the outlook of the minority of the population able to think for itself: the minority that doesn't believe whatever Tom Brokaw says. You know, I've been talking to this minority for years -- decades, actually -- warning them about the consequences of letting their government get out of control, warning them of the consequences of permitting the Jews of Hollywood and New York to run our country through their control of our mass media, warning them of the consequences of continuing to sit on their hands and keep their mouths shut from fear of being denounced by the media as "anti-Semites" or "racists."

And I wasn't having as much success as I wanted at getting them to pay attention and change their ways. Many of those who listened wouldn't do anything because what I was warning them about didn't seem quite real. Despite all the changes they could see around them -- the deterioration of our cities and our schools, the darkening of the racial complexion of America, the trashing of our culture by the mass media, the increasingly obvious efforts of the Jewish media bosses to persuade our young women that they should bed down with non-Whites -- despite everything, they themselves managed to remain comfortable and economically secure, so the things I was warning them about didn't seem quite real. They had convinced themselves that they were above it all, that they could continue to watch the destruction of their country and their people all around them, and it would never affect them personally: that they could remain secure and comfortable while everything around them went to hell.

Osama bin Laden jolted some of them awake on September 11: some of those whose attention I hadn't been able to catch with my own warnings. He convinced some of them that what they had been observing going on around them for years was in fact real: that continuing to ignore the degenerative processes promoted by the media and the government and hoping for the best really wasn't a good strategy for personal survival. In particular, he convinced many members of the thinking minority that losing control of our government really is a serious matter, that permitting our government to be used by the Jews against their neighbors in the Middle East -- and also against the genuine interests of the American people -- could have real consequences at home.

I have the feeling that many of these thinking people are paying at least a little more attention now to the things we've been talking about here every week. The fact that the number of people who download my weekly *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts has nearly doubled since September 11 is a pretty good indication of this. Just as I'm getting more hate mail from the red-white-and-blue-ribbon types, I'm also getting more thoughtful responses from the people who

understand and care. Which is to say, I think that I now have an audience that not only is bigger but also is more attentive and responsive. That is really important.

I'm not discouraged by the fact that the attentive and responsive people still constitute only a minority of a minority. I'm encouraged by the fact that the attentive people now make up a larger minority of the thinking portion of the population than they did before September 11. Important things always are done by minorities. Majorities don't make decisions; individuals do; small minorities do. History is made by active minorities. Sometimes an active minority may use the passive majority as a tool or as a weapon, but the minority always acts in accord with its own will.

What's important is which minority is making the decisions, which minority is active at any particular moment. For at least the past 60 years it's been the wrong minority, an alien minority that is implacably hostile to our people. If we are to survive, that must change. Our minority must become active instead. Our minority must grow to include more of the thinking portion of our population. And that is happening now. That's been happening since September 11.

The people who understand and care have been forced to begin paying attention. I have a very strong premonition that there will be other things in the reasonably near future that will make them pay even closer attention. The Bush government, just like the Clinton government before it, thinks that it can stop terrorism with cruise missiles and smart bombs. But just think for a moment: whether Osama bin Laden survives the Bush government's current war against Israel's enemies in the Middle East or not, he already has become immortal. In the eyes of Muslims he has been elevated to a status in heaven alongside Mohammed. His name will be praised, and stories will be told about him around campfires throughout the Muslim world for countless generations to come, long after the Bush government has gone and been forgotten. Cruise missiles can't take Osama bin Laden's immortality away from him. There's nothing the Bush government can do to diminish his glory in the Muslim world. In fact, the more cruise missiles and smart bombs the United States unleashes on the Muslim world, the higher will Osama bin Laden's esteem rise; the more will his strike against the United States seem justified to his fellow Muslims.

Don't be fooled by the tame "house Muslims" the media bosses have been trotting out to explain to the lemmings that violence is abhorrent to "real Muslims." The real Muslims are the ones rioting against the government in Pakistan now. The real Muslims are the ones singing Osama bin Laden's praises now. And there will be no shortage of other young Muslims lusting for a share in his glory, lusting to have their praises sung around campfires too. Cruise missiles don't frighten them. There are enough of them already in this country to keep things jumping, thanks to the government's insane immigration policy of recent decades. The anthrax-laced letters that have been going around all were mailed from inside this country. And anthrax is by no means the nastiest thing that can be mailed in an envelope. The media won't even mention the biological warfare agents the government is really afraid of, because they don't want to give anyone ideas.

The fact is, terrorism has been made much more fashionable since September 11, and the stakes have been raised. Simple truck bombs won't get much respect in the future, but I have a suspicion that we'll see a few more of them anyway. And I suspect that we'll also see people

trying to outdo Osama bin Laden's September 11 televised extravaganza. The government and the media suspect the same thing, and they're frightened. That's why they're trying so desperately to stifle dissent and keep everyone pledging allegiance to the flag.

At the University of California in Los Angeles a library worker, 53-year-old Jonnie Hargis, has been suspended without pay because he sent out an e-mail letter criticizing U.S. support for Israel's aggression. The university administration explained that it has a policy against using university computers for political messages, but Hargis, who has worked at the UCLA library for 22 years, pointed out that no one who has been sending out pro-Israel and pro-war messages has been punished.

There are similar situations at other universities around the country. Jews and neo-conservatives post belligerent, bloodthirsty messages calling for the annihilation of all of the Jews' enemies in the Middle East, including Iraq and Iran as well as Afghanistan. Anyone who calls instead for eliminating the cause of the September 11 attack -- that is, for stopping the blind support by the U.S. government of Israel's aggression -- is censured and threatened with expulsion or with being fired.

There are still people around who can remember how it was at our universities during the Vietnam War. That was when treason ruled on campuses. Students burned their draft cards and put up Viet Cong flags and posters of Ho Chi Minh in their dormitories. Jewish activists in groups such as Students for a Democratic Society organized pro-Viet Cong rallies on campuses. Professors encouraged this activity, and administrators didn't interfere, citing free speech.

The switch to red, white, and blue ribbons and saluting the flag came rather suddenly last month, and a lot of thinking people understand why it came. They understand that it is when America is involved in a war to promote Jewish interests that pledging allegiance to the flag suddenly is declared fashionable. When Israel's welfare is threatened, Jews, ordinarily noted for their cynicism and irreverence, suddenly put their hands over their hearts and begin singing *The Star-Spangled Banner,* and they glare at anyone who isn't singing loudly enough. And people who make the mistake of asking why get fired or suspended. But you know, firing people or suspending people who have dissenting opinions doesn't go down well with the independent thinkers. And I'll guarantee you: there will be a lot more dissent before this war is over. And the Jewish media won't be able to hide it all.

What we are beginning to see now is a sharpening division between the Jews, their bought politicians, and the "I pledge allegiance," authoritarian types on one side, and everyone else on the other side. We also saw a division, along different lines, during the Vietnam War, with the authoritarians and the Jews on opposite sides instead of the same side. I believe that the division this time will develop faster and become sharper.

I don't know how the war itself will develop. It was clear before it began that the U.S. military machine is quite capable of flattening Afghanistan or any other Third World country without suffering any significant losses to its own personnel, simply because we can hit them from a distance with a great deal of destructive power, and they don't have the means to hit back --

except through what we call "terrorism." It is certain that there will be more terrorism, although, of course, I cannot predict the form it will take or its magnitude.

I can predict, however, that the media and the politicians will denounce it as "cowardly" and will act as if America has been wronged: that whatever form the next blow against America takes and wherever it comes from, it will be declared "unprovoked." And I can predict that the polls published by the media will continue to show nearly every American wildly enthusiastic about the war, even as the opposition to the war grows.

One interesting thing about the opposition this time is that it is growing both among the Gentile Left and among genuine patriots. During the Vietnam War the members of the Gentile Left all were on the Jewish side. Despite the current agreement between leftists and patriots on the single issue of ending support for Israel and limiting the war in the Middle East, I don't see much chance of real collaboration between these two elements. The Gentile Left is still hopelessly confused on such essential issues as race and feminism and homosexuality and permissiveness. But the war is indeed driving a wedge between Jews and Gentile leftists -- a deeper wedge than that driven by the development of Jewish neo-conservatism after the Vietnam War, and for that we should be thankful.

There may be other hopeful developments as well. The assassination in Jerusalem this week of one of Israel's most bloodthirsty Jewish militants by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine certainly was a welcome move. Until now all of the assassins have been Jews, and all of the victims have been Palestinians. It's too soon to know whether or not this one act of retribution against the Israeli leadership will be followed by other successful blows, but it may be that the events of recent weeks have emboldened the Palestinians to act with more imagination and enterprise than before.

Looking ahead a bit, there are several signs of hope here on our own home front. The heightened sense of reality among non-lemmings, the lessening of their sense of detachment, the stronger realization that they cannot survive by continuing to sit on their hands and watch the Jews destroy the world around them -- this is the single most important consequence of recent events. This, together with the growing alienation between Gentile leftists and Jews, leaves the Jews in a weaker position than they have been in a long time. They will crack their whips more frantically than before, trying to keep everyone in line, but the principal effect of that will be to generate even more resentment against them.

Things are a bit brittle now. A few dozen more anthrax cases, another truck bomb in a well chosen location, and substantial changes could take place in a hurry: a stock market panic, martial law measures by the Bush government, and a sharpening of the debate as to how we got ourselves get into this mess in the first place. As the debate sharpens, the Jews and their collaborators will pull out all of the stops in an effort to stifle it, but I don't think that even a declaration of martial law can stifle it now. Too many people already smell the stink in Washington. Too many people already understand on whose hands is the blood of 6,000 innocent Americans who died last month. Too many people understand the true motivation behind the current war against Israel's enemies in the Middle East. The genie is out of the bottle now, and

not even Mr. Bush's new anti-terrorism agency -- what does he call it? -- the Office of Homeland Security? -- can put it back in the bottle.

It's a strange thing: in a novel I wrote more than 12 years ago -- the title is *Hunter* -- I talked about the formation of a new anti-terrorism agency, separate from the FBI. And I pointed out that the principal aim of the new agency would not be to protect the public from terrorism, but to protect the government from an increasingly restless and disillusioned public: a sort of modern Praetorian Guard. I think that we'll be seeing more developments in that direction in the next few months, with the timing depending upon when the next surprise comes and its magnitude.

Of course, I don't know what will happen next to shatter already jangled nerves, but it is likely that something will happen. My advice to responsible patriots now is this: Expect a surprise, and remain calm when it comes. But don't wait for it to come to raise your voice. Speak out now. Don't be intimidated by the mindless yahoos waving their flags or by the government or by the media. If you point out calmly and in a reasoned way who is responsible for what happened to America last month you will have more people agreeing with you than you might imagine. If you call for your fellow Americans to join you in regaining control of their government, the response will be greater than at any time in recent years.

Send Them All Back

A friend in New York has sent me a collection of New York newspapers with stories about the September 11 attack on the World Trade Center. I've scanned at least 20 issues of the *New York Times,* the *New York Post,* and the *Daily News* from the past six weeks. I wasn't paying much attention to the repetitious stories about how many thousands of tons of rubble had been removed or how many bodies had been recovered. Instead, I was trying just to capture the flavor of the party line being fed to the public by the media in New York, which is pretty much the same flavor as that being fed to the rest of the country, except perhaps a little stronger.

There are several components of this flavor, but the strongest is the intense, almost maniacal hostility directed against anyone who questions the assertion by the media and the government that the September 11 attack was based solely on the hatred that fundamentalist Muslims -- especially Osama bin Laden and his followers -- supposedly have for America's "freedom and democracy." Fundamentalist Muslims, according to the Bush government's party line, believe in a theocratic society, of the sort established in Afghanistan by the Taliban. Since America doesn't have such a society, they hate us, and that's why they attacked us. And it's the only reason, and don't you even dare to think that there might be some other reason for the attack. If you even hint at another reason, then you're a dirty, lying, criminal anti-Semite, and you're probably in league with the terrorists.

Really, the response of the media to a suggestion by anyone that the U.S. government's support of Israel's aggression against its neighbors might have been even partly responsible for the attack is a hysterical outpouring of scorn and hatred against the heretic. I have never been to Afghanistan and don't know how the Taliban responds to critics, but the government over there hardly could be more intolerant toward dissenters than the media here are in this matter of questioning the reason for the September 11 attack.

Here's an example: The whole front page of the October 12 issue of New York's *Daily News* is taken up by a photograph of Saudi Arabia's Prince Alwaleed bin Talal viewing the wreckage of the World Trade Center just after he has given a personal check for $10 million to New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani to be used in the recovery effort. Under the prince's photo, in a huge headline, are the words, "Shove It!" Not a very nice way to thank someone who has just donated $10 million to the city. Not even a nice thing to say in polite society. Why the newspaper's hatred for the prince, who is one of the world's wealthiest men? Is it because he is an Arab, and the newspaper's editor believes he may have some link to Osama bin Laden? No, it hardly could be that: the editor understands that the fundamentalist Muslims hate people like the Saudi prince, whom they consider a traitor.

What caused the nasty headline was a comment the prince made as he was touring the wreckage of the World Trade Center. After denouncing Osama bin Laden and calling the attack "a tremendous crime," the prince said:

I came here to show my allegiance to New York. We are here to tell America and to tell New York that Saudi Arabia is with the United States wholeheartedly.

That sounds kosher enough to please any media boss, doesn't it? But then a minute later the prince said:

At times like this one we must address some of the issues that led to such a criminal attack. I believe the government of the United States of America should reexamine its policies in the Middle East and adopt a more balanced stance toward the Palestinian cause. Our Palestinian brethren continue to be slaughtered at the hands of Israelis while the world turns the other cheek.

Oh, boy, that really blew it! After all of his public groveling and after his gift of $10 million to the city, the prince dared to suggest that U.S. support for Israel's aggressive behavior in the Middle East might have had something to do with the attack. He had violated the taboo. He had deviated from the party line. He had spoken the unspeakable. Thus the scornful and insulting headline telling the prince to take his $10 million gift and "shove it" on the front page of the *Daily News.* And Mayor Giuliani, as soon as he was told of the prince's words, angrily ordered an aide to return the prince's $10 million check and announced that the city would not accept the prince's "tainted" money. Commentary about the prince in other New York newspapers was just as nasty as that in the *Daily News.* Columnists and editorial writers expressed not just disapproval of the prince's statement; they were hysterical with hatred and rage.

Well, that's New York. Rudolph Giuliani always has kept his nose well up under the Jews' coattails. That's how he became mayor. And I suppose that one shouldn't be surprised by the headline on the front page of the *Daily News,* which is owned by New York Jewish real estate developer Mortimer Zuckerman. What's really interesting is that virtually all of the other mainstream media around the country -- and all the other politicians as well -- echo the same party line. And the Gentile editors and columnists and politicians are, with a few exceptions, as vicious and hateful as the Jews themselves in attacking anyone who questions the party line that U.S. support for Israel had nothing at all to do with the events of September 11.

Two journalists in Oneida, New York, in an essentially Gentile area of the state more than 250 miles from Giuliani's turf, didn't toe the party line closely enough and learned to their sorrow what happens to those naïve enough to believe in freedom of the press. Last Wednesday Jean Ryan, managing editor of the *Oneida Daily Dispatch,* and Dale Seth, the paper's city editor, were fired by the paper's publisher because they ran an editorial that quoted a Pakistani who pointed out that the state of Israel was founded on terrorism and that throughout the Middle East Israelis were looked on as the region's preeminent terrorists. Furious Jews demanded the heads of the two editors, and the publisher, in order to avoid an advertising boycott, gave them up.

It is not too much to say that the Jews and their camp followers in the media and the government become hysterical whenever the question of responsibility for the September 11 attack is raised. They refuse to discuss or debate the matter; they just begin shrieking and spitting. On the part of Jews I guess that is understandable. It is crystal clear that the principal reason for the attack was the U.S. government's support for Israel's atrocious behavior in the Middle East, against the Palestinians and others. No rational person doubts that, and Osama bin Laden himself acknowledged it in public statements. The Jews are terrified that if they permit the matter to be debated in public, then even the lemmings -- which is to say, the voters -- may begin to see the light. And if the voters ever figure out what is going on, then many politicians may rebel against

Jewish control and cut off U.S. support for Israel. And that would mean a quick demise for the Jewish state; without U.S. weapons and U.S. money Israel cannot survive. Thus the hysterical shrieking and name-calling whenever anyone links U.S. foreign policy to the September 11 attack. The aim is to keep a lid on the subject by keeping everyone intimidated, keeping everyone afraid of being denounced as an "anti-Semite" or a "sympathizer with terrorism" if he fails to toe the party line.

You know, terrorism is real. It's not just an invention by the media. It's something that we actually must learn to cope with in the sort of world that our government has made for us with its criminally irresponsible policies. But both the media and the government are badly misusing the term, much in the way they misuse such terms as "racism." For example, when one of Ariel Sharon's cabinet thugs, Rehavam Ze'evi, was assassinated last week by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, George Bush referred to it as an "act of terrorism," a term he would not have dreamed of using to refer to any of Israel's numerous assassinations of Palestinian leaders.

Ze'evi, by the way, was a close associate of Jewish mobsters involved in Israel's international trade in White slaves. His friends and political allies operated the sex-slave rings which kidnap young Russian and Ukrainian women in the lands pauperized by Jewish communism and bring them to Israel, where they are forced to work as sex slaves for the enrichment of their Jewish pimps. Killing Ze'evi was more like flushing a toilet than an "act of terrorism."

The Jews have even called me a "terrorist," and the corrupt government in Washington has gone along with this name-calling. The fact is that I have never been involved in any criminal activity whatsoever, much less terrorism, nor have I ever urged others to engage in terrorism, and yet listen to what this government report, published by the government's Centers for Disease Control, says about me. Under the general heading "Emerging Infectious Diseases" on the CDC's Web site is a report written by a Jewess, Jessica Stern, identified in her own report as a member of the notorious Council on Foreign Relations. In her report, titled "The Prospect of Domestic Bioterrorism," she writes:

Politically motivated terrorists who desire to change societies rather than destroy them might avoid killing very large numbers of people because the political costs would exceed the benefits. Some terrorists, however, want to annihilate their enemies or demolish the societal order. William Pierce, leader of the neo-Nazi organization National Alliance, aims to initiate a worldwide race war and establish an Aryan state.

She certainly makes it sound like I'm one of those "some terrorists" she mentions in the sentence just before the one in which she names me. That Centers for Disease Control report is currently on the CDC's Web site at cdc.gov.

Now, one expects this sort of name-calling and deception from the Jews, and one expects it from the news media under their control. But it becomes a more worrisome matter when the Jews are able to use the government as a willing tool to propagate their lies and to help them in their deception of the American public. Just as George Bush will knowingly repeat any lie they tell him to repeat, the Jews are able to use a government agency such as the Centers for Disease

Control, an agency charged with protecting the public health, to discredit as a "terrorist" any law-abiding citizen who exposes their lies or who otherwise displeases them.

If they can do it to me, they can do it to you or to anyone else who annoys them. And if you believe that there's anyone in the terminally corrupt government in Washington who even cares about the way in which the Jews misuse the U.S. government for their own purposes, you are sadly mistaken. Tell them about it and they will just smirk at you and lie the way George Bush smirks and lies. The civil servants who cared were weeded out of the bureaucracy long ago. The last honest elected official threw in the towel at about the same time. And if you suggest that I sue the Jewess who wrote the report calling me a terrorist or the Council on Foreign Relations, to which she belongs, or the Centers for Disease Control, which published the report, for libel, then you don't understand how the legal system in this country has been subverted.

Well, back to the party line in all of those New York newspapers I've been reading: One cornerstone of the party line is to prevent any public discussion of the real reason for the September 11 attack; another cornerstone is to whip the lemmings up into a war hysteria, so that they will go along with a prolonged war in the Middle East on behalf of Israel. To this end the newspapers are full of stories and pictures designed to warm the hearts and stir the blood of the Joe Sixpacks and the Sally Soccermoms of the nation: pictures of schoolchildren waving flags and singing "The Star Spangled Banner"; speeches about "unity" and about all Americans pulling together, regardless of race or creed, to "fight terrorism." And the photos of the "proud to be an American" types, displaying their flags and holding their hands over their hearts, are all appropriately multicultural, with Blacks, mestizos, and Asians mixed in with the Whites.

The columnists and the cartoonists in all of the New York papers are singing in tune with the editors and reporters. The columns were full of folksy anecdotes designed to get everyone into a flag-waving mood. A column in the September 24 *New York Post* quoted a woman at a rally against terrorism in Yankee Stadium: "They sought to divide us," she said. "But instead they united us as never before."

I quote columnist Steve Dunleavy:

Throughout Yankee Stadium on a Sunday blessed with sunshine you almost felt like you could touch the emotion in the air with your finger. Every color, every creed, every race, every religion together.

And Dunleavy talks about the tears on people's faces as they sing the old songs designed to build patriotism during the First and Second World Wars. And let me tell you, for most Americans this is powerful stuff. People who have been alienated by the unnaturalness of multiculturalism and modern urban life long for a feeling of togetherness, of solidarity, of purpose and mission. They want to feel strong and proud again, instead of impotent and empty and guilty for being White. Even people who ought to know better get swept up in this feeling.

And after they've got the lemmings feeling strong and proud again, the media tell them whom to hate, whom to direct their righteous wrath against. First there are the internal enemies to be hated, and then there are the external enemies. The internal enemies are those who aren't

marching in lockstep with everyone else, those who aren't singing loudly enough, those who question the wisdom of rushing off to a major war against all of the Jews' enemies in the Middle East, those who seek to damage our wonderful feeling of unity -- to divide us -- by asking about the causes of the September 11 attack. Special scorn is directed at the dissenters on America's university campuses and at citizens who express concern about the Bill of Rights being trampled by those eager to wage war and to keep everyone else in line. The neo-conservative Jew William Kristol has a newspaper filled with such scorn. It's called *The Weekly Standard*, and its columns and editorials are prominently reproduced in the New York papers that I scanned.

As for the external enemies, well, of course, there's Osama bin Laden, but the hatred and wrath of the aroused lemmings are being directed far wider than that. A cartoon in the same issue of the *New York Post* that I cited a minute ago features a garbage barrel with rats being dropped into it. The barrel is labeled "Barrel of Vermin." One of the rats is labeled "Taliban," another is labeled "Iraq," and a third is labeled "Iran." Not "Iraqi terrorists" or "Iranian terrorists"; just "Iraq" and "Iran," the whole countries, the two Middle Eastern nations most feared by Israel, but which, so far as we know, had nothing to do with the September 11 attack. The cartoon appears right above a William Kristol column beating the drums for a general war and disparaging pacifists. The message of the cartoon is clear: they all wear towels on their heads; they're all vermin; let's kill 'em all.

That message doesn't exactly jibe with the Bush government's campaign to build a coalition of so-called "moderate" Muslim states, but the general tenor of the propaganda in the New York papers is that we shouldn't be splitting hairs now. We should hug the nearest non-White who doesn't have a towel on his head, sing "The Star Spangled Banner" with him, and then go marching off to war together.

Just to avoid any misunderstanding, I'll say again now what I've said before. I have no real fondness for anyone in the Middle East. I do not believe that Middle Easterners, Arabs or Jews -- especially Jews -- should be permitted to live in America or in Europe. I have no sympathy for Islam or any other Semitic religion from the Middle East. But I do not believe that we need to go to war against Iraq or Iran or even Afghanistan in order to protect Americans from terrorism or to protect any other American interests. And I strenuously object to going to war against anyone to protect Israel's interests.

If we really have proof that Osama bin Laden organized the September 11 attack, then let's punish him without waging war against another country. Confiscate Osama bin Laden's assets wherever they can be found, expel all Middle Easterners from the United States so that he has no followers left here to mail anthrax-infected letters around the country, and send a team of CIA assassins into Afghanistan to find him. But quit waging war on other countries or trying to install puppet governments in other countries for the sake of Israel.

And after Osama bin Laden has been terminated, let's go after the people who are really responsible for the September 11 attacks. And you know who those people are: they are the politicians in Washington who have been putting the interests of one particular tribe of Middle Easterners ahead of American interests for the past 50 years. The members of that particular Middle Eastern tribe don't wear towels on their heads; they wear little, round caps called

yarmulkes, and they've done infinitely more damage to our people than the towel-heads ever dreamed of doing. The politicians in Washington serve this tribe because the members of the tribe have gained control of nearly all of the mass media of news and entertainment in America and through this control are able to manipulate the American political process.

This tribe was not satisfied with the wealth and power it acquired in America, however. Always remembering its Middle Eastern roots, it lusted for control of the Middle East too, and with the support of the American government that it had corrupted it began seizing land in the Middle East, killing or pushing aside the indigenous Muslim peoples. Every U.S. President, from Harry Truman through George W. Bush -- even Richard Nixon, whom they forced from office -- served them, helping them brutalize and kill their neighbors and expand their power in the Middle East. And every U.S. Congress during the past half century has taken orders from them as well. And every U.S. President and member of Congress who served them understood that in supporting this tribe -- in supporting Israel -- he was damaging the interests of the American people and generating hatred against America: hatred of which we all saw an expression on September 11.

So let's punish Osama bin Laden for killing all of those innocent Americans, but then let's go after the real criminals -- the traitors in Washington -- who really are the ones responsible for the September 11 attack. And then let's send all of the Middle Easterners, including those now controlling Hollywood and Madison Avenue and our television networks and the rest of our news and entertainment media, back to the Middle East for good.

Why Revolution Is Necessary

One of the most interesting developments that I've seen since September 11 is the public hinting by people in the Federal Bureau of Investigation that it really would be helpful to them if they were permitted to torture suspects or other people from whom they wanted information, like the police in Israel do. These hints haven't been given a big play by the news media, but there is a report on the subject in the October 21 issue of the *Washington Post* and a column by Jonathan Alter in this week's issue of
Newsweek.
These stories seem to be what the media people call "trial balloons": give a new proposal just enough exposure to get a bit of public reaction from the perceptive minority without alarming the lemmings. If the response isn't strongly negative, then push the proposal hard.

I'll read you just a few sentences from the October 21 story in the

Washington Post,

to give you the flavor of the proposal:
FBI and Justice Department investigators are increasingly frustrated by the silence of jailed suspected associates of Osama bin Laden's al Quaeda network, and some are beginning to say that traditional civil liberties may have to be cast aside if they are to extract information about the September 11 attacks and terrorist plans.… Said one experienced FBI agent involved in the investigation: "We are known for humanitarian treatment, so basically we are stuck.… Usually there is some incentive, some angle to play, what you can do for them. But it could get to that spot where we could go to pressure.… where we won't have a choice, and we are probably getting there." Among the alternative strategies under discussion are using drugs or pressure tactics, such as those employed occasionally by Israeli interrogators, to extract information

Well, the article goes on to quote other FBI officials who are "frustrated" by their inability to "extract information" from some suspects and who wish that they could use drugs or "pressure tactics" -- that's a euphemism for torture -- like the Israelis do, and more than "occasionally." Actually the story, by Walter Pincus, is pretty low key. It nowhere says that there already is a plan to use torture, just "wouldn't it be nice if we could." And he quotes a former senior FBI official who believes that the American public will go along with such a plan if there is another terror attack on the United States. And, of course, there will be. As I said, the article reads like a "trial balloon."

After the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, the Jewish media were all over my 1978 novel, *The Turner Diaries*, claiming that a fictional bombing of the FBI headquarters building in Washington that occurred in the novel was a "blueprint" for the Oklahoma City bombing. They presented this amusing nonsense over and over, nearly every time my name was mentioned anywhere on TV or in print. They really wanted to tie the Oklahoma City bombing to me and to everyone else who had criticized the Jews' monopoly control of the news and entertainment media. I won't be surprised when they discover that the last chapter of *The Turner Diaries* describes a suicide attack on the Pentagon with a bomb-carrying airplane and then begin claiming that that was a "blueprint" for the September 11 attack on the Pentagon. There's

something else in *The Turner Diaries*, however, that I'm quite certain they won't try to blame on me, and that is my description of the FBI's adoption of torture as an interrogation technique. In the book, published 23 years ago, I described quite vividly the FBI's torture of a terrorism suspect, using the services of an experienced Israeli torturer. The media bosses won't blame the current yearning in the FBI for the authorization to use torture on my book because they themselves also are solidly in favor of the use of torture. It is no mere coincidence that both the *Washington Post* story and the *Newsweek* column are written by Jews.

They also are solidly in favor of every other measure to strengthen the hand of the government in dealing with its opponents -- and not just with terrorists. They would like to put an end to all dissent, to all Politically Incorrect speech or writing or expression of opinion: an end to all opposition to them and to the government. And really, the media and the government are far too close to being one and the same these days. That's quite a different situation from the one we had 30 years ago, during the Vietnam War, and the situation is far more dangerous today than it was then. Then, when Jewish and Marxist groups were burning ROTC buildings on our university campuses, setting off bombs in banks and other businesses they claimed were supporting the White government in South Africa, and committing other acts of terrorism on a continuing basis, if the FBI had suggested that perhaps it should use torture in interrogating terrorist suspects, the media would have gone ballistic and screamed for the head of the FBI director.

Well, if the FBI begins using torture now, at least the government can claim that it is just going along with tradition. After all, it wasn't so long ago that witches were tortured to make them confess to having congress with the devil -- and also to reveal the names of other witches or sorcerers. The torture was justified on the grounds that it was essential for the safety and welfare of the public: you can't allow witches and sorcerers to run around putting spells on people; the government needs to find out who they are so that it can get them off the street. Of course, the danger from witches wasn't real, so the government wasn't justified in using torture in the 17th century, but the danger from terrorists today is real, and many people believe that it justifies the use of torture and the curtailment of other civil liberties. And my answer to that is that the danger of terrorism today is real only because the government has made it real through its own policies: policies that it could change at will, eliminating the danger of terrorism without limiting the freedom of Americans.

Unfortunately, however, the government not only refuses to admit that any of its policies are the cause of terrorism against Americans; it is moving with unseemly haste to silence anyone who dares to suggest that is the case. The ghastly new law, the badly misnamed "USA PATRIOT" law signed by George Bush last week, is a giant step in that direction. The "USA PATRIOT" title is a highly contrived acronym standing for "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism." The new law is both un-American and unpatriotic. It is also unconstitutional, although you shouldn't make any wagers that the Supreme Court will overturn it. The law specifically trashes the Fourth Amendment, and it is aimed at intimidating opponents of the government or its policies into silence by threatening to put them into the category of being suspected "supporters of terrorism," whereupon they immediately lose all of their civil liberties and become, in effect, outlaws.

The new law certainly succeeded in intimidating nearly every legislator in the Congress even before George Bush signed it on Friday of last week. The bill's sponsors rammed it through the Congress without any of the customary debate or public hearings or opportunity to modify it. The customary legislative process of "regular order" was completely short-circuited, and terrified Congressman dared not protest or vote against the bill from fear of being denounced as "unpatriotic." Denounced by whom, you ask? By the media, of course, which were solidly behind the new law. It was reminiscent of the witch trials of 400 years ago, when people who knew that the accused was innocent were afraid to speak up lest they too be accused of being in league with the devil.

If you still believe that the people elected by the voters to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are America's "leaders" and are looking out for the interests of the public, you should contemplate in detail the course of the "USA PATRIOT" bill through the Congress. Nearly 90 per cent of the members of the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, all of whom took a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, let themselves be stampeded by fear of media criticism into damaging the Constitution in a grievous way -- perhaps into striking a deathblow against the Constitution -- by voting for this bill. And George Bush was his usual smirking self as he triumphantly signed it into law last Friday.

Now Jewish billionaire Larry Ellison, the principal owner of Oracle, the country's second-largest software company, is trying to persuade the government to require all Americans to carry a national identity card that will allow the FBI to keep track of their movements. Ellison has generously offered to provide the software without charge to the FBI to operate the tracking system. In the government the biggest booster of Ellison's national identity plan is Senator Diane Feinstein, who heads the Senate subcommittee on terrorism.

Clearly, it is not Osama bin Laden who hates America's freedom; rather, it's our government, our media, and people like Larry Ellison and Diane Feinstein.

If you've been listening to many of my broadcasts, you know what I think about democracy and democrats. I think democracy is a lousy political system, and it is inherently crooked. It pretends to put power into the hands of the majority of the people -- which is a stupid idea in itself -- while it actually puts power into the hands of the tiny minority that control the opinions of the majority: namely, the media bosses. And I loathe Democrats: they are demagogues who seek power for themselves by appealing to society's resentful losers and by dispensing bread and circuses paid for by society's more productive elements.

But as much as I hate Democrats, I hate and fear Republicans even more: especially conservative Republicans: for example, Chief Supreme Court Justice William Rehnquist, Attorney General John Ashcroft, Vice President Richard Cheney, and George W. Bush. It is among the conservative politicians and bureaucrats that one finds the greatest mania for regimenting people, for making everyone march in step and sing in tune, for slapping down anyone who gets out of line, for sticking the government's nose into every aspect of people's lives. And I'll guarantee you, the mania these conservative politicians and bureaucrats have for controlling citizens and suppressing dissent is not based on either patriotism or a conviction that it's for our own good. They are crooks and liars, and the only good they're concerned about is their own.

You know, just because I have one view of an issue, and a politician has a different view, doesn't in itself mean that the politician is a crook and a liar. People -- even politicians -- are entitled to have different opinions about things. But when a politician like George Bush announces to the nation in completely unambiguous terms that the September 11 attack was unprovoked and was simply an expression of hatred by fundamentalist Muslims for America's freedom and democracy, it's not a difference of opinion; ***the man is simply lying.*** He's lying consciously and deliberately. He's lying to the whole nation on a matter of the utmost importance. This is much, much more reprehensible -- much, much more dangerous for the country -- than Bill Clinton's lies about the sexual services he was receiving in the Oval Office from a Jewish intern.

George Bush has lied us into a war for two very obvious reasons. First, just as the members of the Congress were afraid to question the new anti-terrorism bill from fear of being painted by the media as "unpatriotic," George Bush is afraid to talk about the provocation that caused the September 11 attack -- namely, the U.S. government's support of Israel's aggression against its neighbors -- because he knows that the media would then accuse him of "anti-Semitism."

And second, if he raised the subject of the provocation, he would have to explain why the government pursued such a policy. He would have to talk about the enormous power of organized Jewry over government policy, and again that would cause the controlled media to denounce him as an "anti-Semite." And he also would stand revealed as a man who had consciously followed a policy dictated by organized Jewry while knowing that it was a policy harmful to America. He would stand revealed as a man who was at least partly responsible, along with his predecessors, who knowingly followed the same policy, for the September 11 attack. He would stand revealed as a traitor, who had served a foreign power to the detriment of American security and welfare.

You know, being a traitor is a bit like grabbing a tiger by the tail. Once you embark on that course, you can't go back. It's either hang on or be hanged. So George Bush lies to the whole country about a matter of the utmost importance and continues serving his alien masters. And he smirks about it.

Such a man cannot be trusted. A government headed by such a President cannot be trusted. Any reasonable patriot must fear such a government when it is given the powerful tools for repression that are in the new "USA PATRIOT" law and when its secret police agencies begin suggesting that it would be nice if they were permitted to torture suspects in order to extract information. And such a government especially should be feared when it is in cahoots with the news media. In a free society, one force that keeps the government from getting completely out of control is a free press. Even when the media also are crooked, if they at least are hostile to the government they can keep the government in check. But when crooked media are in cahoots with a crooked government, the country is in real trouble. And that is the situation we're in now.

In America's present situation, terrorism is the least of our problems. Certainly, it is a bad thing when our government's policies have made our country so hated by much of the rest of the world that airliners are hijacked and flown into office buildings, killing thousands of Americans. Certainly, it is a bad thing when anthrax-infected letters are mailed around the country, killing innocent people and causing major disruptions in the postal service. But these things are nothing

compared to the loss of our civil liberties. They are nothing compared to the danger of a treasonous, lying government. They are nothing compared to the damage done to our society through the control of the mass media of news and entertainment by an alien minority pursuing its own agenda.

Americans made far greater sacrifices 225 years ago, to secure civil liberties that King George III was denying them, than they made in New York and Washington on September 11. When we are obliged to fight again to restore the civil liberties that are now being given up so lightly by an irresponsible and thoughtless public seeking more security, the loss of lives and property will be far greater than in the World Trade Center attack. When we take the necessary actions to regain control of our mass media and our government, the disruption and the suffering will be incomparably greater than that caused by the current anthrax terrorism.

In other words, even if the terrorism threat to Americans were a thousand times greater than we have experienced so far -- even if terrorism cost us five million lives instead of five thousand -- it would not be as harmful to us and as great a threat to our national survival as a treasonous government and alien-controlled mass media. The public, frightened of terrorism, may be willing to give up its freedom in the hope of gaining more security, but it will end up with neither. Unfortunately, the minority of us who really value our freedom will lose it too.

And you know, none of this is necessary. It is easy for us to eliminate -- or at least greatly to reduce -- the threat of terrorism without giving up any of our civil liberties. Without scrapping the Bill of Rights it is possible for the Sally Soccermoms and the Joe Sixpacks to go back to cruising the malls and watching the ball games without having to worry about being hit by a hijacked airliner or opening an anthrax-infected letter. It is possible for them to have their comfort and security and for us to have our freedom at the same time.

Regimentation is not necessary for security. The authoritarians in our government would like to regiment the people whether there is a threat of terrorism or not, but regimentation isn't necessary. The way to eliminate the threat of terrorism is to eliminate the causes of terrorism. And as far as terrorism from outside the country is concerned, the cause is the U.S. government's blind support of Israeli aggression in the Middle East. Every recent terrorist attack against Americans by foreigners has had this single cause: the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, the 1998 bombing of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, the 1996 bombing of our servicemen in Saudi Arabia, last year's bombing of the USS *Cole,* and the September 11 attack on New York and Washington. In fact, we can go back much further, even to the bombing of the Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983, which killed 241 Americans. None of these attacks would have occurred if the U.S. government had pursued a policy in the Middle East based on American interests, instead of on Jewish interests.

To eliminate or greatly to reduce domestic terrorism, more than a change in U.S. foreign policy is required. Here's an example: the Jewish media now are entertaining the theory that the anthrax letters causing so much anxiety are being mailed by neo-Nazi groups inside the United States. Even though the anthrax letters refer specifically to Israel and close with the words "Allah is great," Jews are speculating that because all of the letters were mailed inside the United States

and so many of the targets were media figures -- that is, Jews -- they could have been mailed by domestic anti-Semites rather than by Muslim backers of Osama bin Laden.

Perhaps so, but that still remains to be seen. The relevant fact is that domestic terrorism that would have been inconceivable 50 or 60 years ago is becoming increasingly common. Fifty years ago, no American would have considered launching a campaign of anthrax terrorism in this country. Today, it is at least conceivable. And it's not that the technology is new. Any reasonably resourceful graduate student in microbiology can find anthrax spores or other lethal pathogens in the natural environment, identify them, isolate them, cultivate them in a small laboratory using inexpensive equipment, and grow enough of them to inoculate hundreds of letters. And he could have done the same thing 50 years ago. The spores always have been around, and the techniques are not new. What is new is the motivation.

What is new is the enormously greater corruption and irresponsibility of our government today and the consequent distrust of the government by perceptive citizens. What is new is the enormously greater intrusion of the government into the lives of law-abiding citizens today and the consequent hatred of the government by freedom-loving Americans. What is new is the enormously greater degree of alienation on the part of most Americans -- at least on the part of those Americans who care about more than mall cruising and televised ball games. The principal cause of this alienation is, again, the government, with its destructive immigration policy and its destructive program of forced multiculturalism.

That's easy enough to understand, but to act on our understanding in order to eliminate the cause of either foreign or domestic terrorism will require the replacement not only of the present U.S. government but also of the system on which it is based. Which is to say, until we have a thoroughly cleansing revolution in America, we must endure more and more terrorism and more and more loss of freedom at the same time.

Terrorism and Hate

I love to read my hate mail. The shriller it gets, the better I feel, because shrillness is a sign of fear and lack of confidence on the part of the haters. These days my hate mail is pretty shrill. And that's understandable in view of the events of the past couple of months.

There's a lot of flag-waving and strutting and boasting by the politicians and by the media and by their hangers-on among the general public. I call the latter people "yahoos." A yahoo is a lot like a lemming, but louder and more obnoxious.

"We're really giving those towel-heads in Afghanistan a licking," the yahoos are bragging. "We've blown the bejesus out of them with our cluster bombs and our cruise missiles, and they haven't been able to hit us back with even a single missile or bomb. We've really taught them not to mess with us, because we're the greatest, we're the toughest, and if you even look sideways at us, we'll clean your clock."

That's the public stance of the politicians and the media people and the yahoos and the retired generals and other "experts" hired by the media to provide bellicose statements to keep the yahoos fired up. But behind the confident, swaggering front all is not well. For one thing, the Afghans are proving themselves a bit tougher than the Bush government thought. For five weeks, U.S. forces have carpet-bombed them, reduced a number of their villages to rubble, destroyed their air-defense system, hit every cave in which they think Osama bin Laden may be hiding with bunker-busting bombs, wrecked their power plants, supplied mercenary rebel forces inside Afghanistan with bribes and weapons, and repeatedly predicted the imminent collapse of the Taliban government. And yet the government has not collapsed, and Osama bin Laden continues to issue public statements.

On the public-relations front, the Bush government and the Jews are losing everywhere. The bought politicians in Pakistan and other places may be cheering every time the Americans send their bombers over Afghanistan, but the people in the streets are not. The Jews don't have the total control over the mass media in every country that they have in the United States, Canada, and most of Europe. The people throughout the Middle East and Asia are not happy seeing on their television screens night after night the bodies of Afghan villagers killed by American cruise missiles. They are not happy seeing images of maimed Afghan children who have lost eyes or arms or legs to American cluster bombs.

The Jews and the Bushites can't understand it. The people being killed by the bombing of Afghanistan aren't Jews, and they aren't even Americans. Why should anyone care what happens to them? Besides, the Americans are dropping food packages to make up for the bombing and killing. Doesn't that make everything all right? It is inconceivable to the fat, smug bureaucrats in Washington, who have bought, bribed, corrupted, and bullied their way around the world ever since the Second World War, that there still are people in the world with a sense of pride, people who care about more than money and free food and being comfortable, people who will fight, even against overwhelming odds, to keep their independence and their way of life.

It is interesting to note, by the way, that not all of the people in Afghanistan are black-haired, swarthy, greasy, hook-nosed, Middle Eastern types. Some of the tribes are White, with reddish-brown hair, white skin, and European features. Aryan people conquered and colonized that part of the world 35 centuries ago, and there are pockets of us remaining in some of the mountainous, isolated areas.

Of course, there is no doubt that the United States eventually can whip the Taliban and install a puppet government in Kabul, if the Bush government is willing to drop enough cluster bombs on Afghan villages and fire enough cruise missiles into Afghan cities. The U.S. military machine is vastly more powerful than anything the Afghans have, and Washington has the economic resources to wage a long war of attrition and starve Afghanistan into submission. Perhaps we should remember, however, that the Soviet Union succeeded in setting up a communist puppet government in Kabul, and then, with that puppet government already in place, rocketed and bombed Afghan villages for eight long years and still managed to lose the war -- and 15,000 Soviet soldiers in the process.

On the home front there is more reason for shrillness. The anthrax terror has killed only a handful of people so far, but it has had an enormous psychological impact on the public. Even though the likelihood of being struck by lightning is far greater than the likelihood of receiving an anthrax-infected letter in the mail, many Americans have been spooked. Housewives who never would be deliberate targets of an anthrax attack are worrying seriously about how to sterilize their incoming mail with a steam iron. And certainly every American has been impressed by how much disruption can be caused by a single terrorist.

I am assuming that just one person or a very small group of people has been preparing and mailing all of the anthrax letters, and he not only has spooked the whole country, but he also has done hundreds of millions of dollars worth of damage by causing postal centers, government offices, and business and industrial facilities to be shut down for weeks at a time for decontamination operations. And, despite an enormous effort by the FBI and other secret police agencies, he hasn't been caught. He can do it again whenever he wants. Or if not him, anyone else with a little training in microbiology.

Even though most of the public really hasn't thought carefully about the implications of all this and drawn any clear and concrete conclusions, there is a vague but growing awareness that we all are living in a world that is a bit more dangerous than most people had believed it to be. There is more awareness that the government isn't omnipotent and cannot guarantee everyone's safety or solve all his problems. And this awareness has caused some uneasiness: not a lot for most people, but enough to be perceptible, enough to steal a small amount of peace of mind from the Sally Soccermoms and the Joe Sixpacks, who just want to do their mall shopping and their TV viewing without intrusive worries about what the next unpleasant and dangerous surprise will be.

It's not the Sally Soccermoms and the Joe Sixpacks who're sending me hate mail, though. They don't care much about what happens outside their living rooms and the nearest shopping mall: not enough, anyway, to send me a hate letter. The real haters are those who have an emotional investment in the destructive trends and programs that have been wrecking our society and our civilization during the past half-century. They are the ideological egalitarians and the

multiculturalists and the diversity-mongers, who enthusiastically have promoted every sick and perverted policy put forward by the Jewish media. They have been in favor of racial hiring quotas and the lowering of academic standards in order to get more non-Whites into our universities and open borders and interracial sex and gun control and hate-crime laws and speech-crime laws.

And they have been pretty cocky most of the time, because they believed they were on a roll. They had the power of the government and the media behind them, and they didn't see how they could lose. They really believed that they could ram their filthy New World Order down everyone's throat, and we couldn't do anything about it. They believed that they were the inevitable wave of the future, and that nothing could stop the birth of the sick, new world of enforced equality and Big Brotherhood they envisioned.

Well, most of them still believe that, but they've had their cages rattled a bit by the events of the last two months. I doubt that it has occurred to any of them that when their schemes finally come unraveled, and the society they have been poisoning for so many years finally gives up the ghost, and they no longer have a treasonous government to protect them, they will be called to account for their crimes and dealt with appropriately. I doubt that any of them are afraid of that yet. They still believe that they can carry on with impunity -- but there is a glimmer of recognition among them of the fact that there may be unforeseen dangers in what they are doing. There may be obstacles for them to overcome that they hadn't counted on. There are unpredictable forces at work in the world that they don't know how to deal with. And here I am, continuing to nip at their heels and make a nuisance of myself when they have these new problems to worry about. That's what provokes them into sending me hate mail, I believe.

Many of the haters are Christians who believe that they are pleasing Jesus by pulling the White race down to the level of the world's non-Whites: the first shall be last, and the last shall be first; blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; that sort of thing. You'd be surprised at how many of the hate letters I receive quote verses from the Bible intended to prove to me that all of God's children were created equal, and that God intended for us to mix together, and that Whites, in holding themselves apart and rising above the colored races, have contravened the will of God and deserve to be punished, and that I, in opposing their sacred work of pulling the Whites down to where God intended them to be, am being especially sinful and deserve especially severe punishment.

About as numerous and as hateful as the Bible-thumpers are the oh-so-desperate-to-be-fashionable types, who really hate me for raising issues they prefer not to think about: issues that only can complicate their quest for fashionableness, acceptance, approval, and prosperity in the New World Order of equality and togetherness. Many of these announce how unpleasantly surprised and even disgusted they are that in the 21st century there still are people like me, with such old-fashioned ideas on race and nationalism and the proper roles of the sexes, and with my belief in human inequality and in the need for discipline and order and individual responsibility and for a strong sense of racial identity.

These old-fashioned ideas of mine, of course, are just as valid today as they ever were, but they are in conflict with the trends that these fashionable types feel obliged to follow if they are to

keep in step with the media and be popular and prosperous. Now, if they really believed that my old-fashioned ideas were not valid, then they could just laugh at me and ignore me. But they have this dreadful fear, deep down inside themselves, that I am right after all, and that the trends they are following can lead us only to disaster and extinction. They don't want to think about that, and when they were pretty confident in the ability of the government to keep things moving in a Jewish direction and keep people like me from rocking the boat, they didn't have to think about it. But the events of the last two months have shaken their confidence that the government has everything under control, and these awful, old-fashioned ideas of mine are still being rubbed in their faces. They wish that I would shut up.

There's one more thing that has thrown these haters off balance and provoked them into screaming at me, and that is the nagging knowledge that the sudden loss of confidence and security that they are feeling now is not the result of anything that I have said or done, but rather is the consequence of the policies that they have been promoting and against which I have been preaching for years. I certainly have never been pro-Arab or pro-Muslim, but I have said over and over again that we need have no fundamental conflict with Arabs or Muslims, because they are in their part of the world and we are in ours. They have their religion and their way of life, and we have ours. Because we are separate and both of us would like to stay that way, we need have no conflict. They have oil, of course, and we would like to have their oil, but they are only too happy to sell it to us. So really, there is no reason for us to hate each other, as long as we stay out of their affairs and they stay out of ours. Separation and non-interference make good neighbors.

The one thing that has brought about conflict between us is the Jewish lust for power and control in the Arab part of the world and our support of the Jews. The fashionable set understand that as well as I do, but they aren't permitted to talk about it, and they certainly don't like hearing about it from me. They've always supported Jewish aggression in the Middle East, just as they've always supported everything else Jewish. They admire the Jews enormously, because the Jews are so rich and so ruthless and seem to be able to get away with just about every sort of brazen chicanery. Nevertheless, what happened two months ago is a sharp reminder to them that not even those who have scrambled aboard the Jewish bandwagon are guaranteed a smooth ride.

Finally, there is the galling fact that they have pushed for open borders, while I have pushed for the exclusion of all non-Whites from America, and if my policy had prevailed instead of theirs, the attack of September 11 could not have taken place.

Anyway, what it all boils down to is that the people who had thought that America was on the right track in becoming less White and less masculine and less free and more under the thumb of the Jews are a little less confident now and therefore a little more hateful. But they are no less determined. They're not about to change their ways at this stage: it'll take a lot more hijacked airliners, collapsed office buildings, and anthrax mailings to destroy that much of their confidence. And so they have reaffirmed their allegiance to the Jewish program for a totally multiculturalized America, an Affirmative Action America, a mongrelized America, an America that looks like an MTV set.

But still, they are a little less confident than they were, and this loss of confidence -- this nagging fear that maybe their plan to profit from the destruction of their race and of the civilization built by their race may have a hitch in it after all -- this loss of confidence manifests itself not only in a little more overt hatefulness but also in an increased determination to crush all opposition. If those old-fashioned heterosexual White males like me -- and a few old-fashioned heterosexual White females as well -- refuse to go along with their plan, then they'll get the secret police to make us go along. If we insist on being divisive and stirring up opposition to the continued multiculturalization of America, then they'll have their secret police tap our telephones and intercept our mail and secretly search our homes and plant bugs while we're away. They'll classify us as "terrorists" and take away our civil rights.

That's what they think they'll do anyway. That was the real purpose of their so-called "USA PATRIOT" law. They're not really afraid of Arab hijackers. They know that the Arabs aren't capable of derailing their plans for "equalizing" America. The Arabs aren't capable of turning any substantial portion of the American public against them. Middle Eastern terrorists cannot take control of American public opinion away from Hollywood and the other Jewish media.

If they lose their grip on America, it won't be the Taliban hunting them down and stringing them up for their crimes against America and against our people. The scuttling of the Bill of Rights is being done under cover of the need to protect Americans from foreign terrorists, but the real reason is to protect them from the wrath of the still patriotic segment of the American people -- if that patriotic segment can be awakened and informed and organized and inspired to act.

That's our job, and because we're working on that job day and night and are determined to do whatever it takes to get the job done, they hate us. I don't believe that they fear us yet. After all, they have the secret police behind them -- they have all the repressive armed might of the Federal government behind them -- and all we are able to do is talk and spread facts and ideas among our people and try to get our people to think for themselves and to accept their responsibility as Americans, as White men and women. That's enough to make America's internal enemies, whether of the Bible-thumping variety or of the ideologically fashionable variety, hate us, but not enough yet to make them fear us. Nevertheless, they believe it is only prudent to begin curtailing our civil liberties, under the guise of protecting America from the threat of foreign terrorism.

Thinking about all of this, I've tried to decide what the long-term effect of the events of September 11 will be, besides a lot of bombed Afghan villages and dead Afghans. Is it good that the cages of America's internal enemies have been rattled, and their confidence has been shaken a bit, even though they have been put on their guard? Or would it have been better for them to have remained supremely confident that nothing could halt their plan for the multiculturalization of America?

Is it good that they have stepped up their suppression of Americans' civil liberties? Will legislative assaults on the Bill of Rights, such as the USA PATRIOT law, awaken real patriots to the fact that the government in Washington is far more an enemy of America's freedom than Osama bin Laden is? Or will such laws intimidate wavering patriots into silence and inaction?

I believe that it's too soon for me to be able to answer these questions with any degree of certainty. At this point I can't even say whether terrorism is helpful or harmful or doesn't make much difference. Does it hurt America in the long run by solidifying the support of the Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks behind the Federal government and America's other internal enemies? Or does it help America by eroding the faith of the public in the ability of the government to protect them?

We'll have a better understanding of such questions later, because we certainly will be gaining much more experience with both terrorism and governmental suppression of civil liberties. America is in a downward spiral now, and when we will break out of it and what roles terrorism and repression will play in breaking out of it remain to be seen.

The Value of Truth and Righteousness

Last Saturday George Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly, urging all of the member nations to join the United States in bringing pressure to bear against countries that sponsor terrorism or harbor terrorists. He did it in his standard mock-serious way, barely suppressing a smirk. Everyone applauded, including the representative of a country that from its founding until the present day has sponsored terrorism. That country, of course, is Israel.

The prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, is a war criminal, a mass murderer, with the blood of thousands of women and children on his hands. He is being sought now for trial by the same Hague Tribunal that succeeded in extraditing former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic for trial on charges of crimes against humanity in Kosovo, the same Hague Tribunal that already has tried and sentenced soldiers who raped and murdered in Bosnia and in Rwanda.

In 1982, during Israel's invasion of Lebanon, Ariel Sharon was Israel's defense minister. After the bloody terror-bombing of civilian neighborhoods in Beirut that killed thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian civilians -- terror bombing carried out by Jews flying military aircraft supplied to Israel by the United States -- Sharon arranged for the evacuation of Palestinian fighters from Lebanon. Palestinian women, children, and old people were left behind in refugee camps, with their safety guaranteed by the United States. On the night of September 16, 1982, Sharon sent murder squads into two Palestinian refugee camps, Sabra and Chatila, in West Beirut to kill the unarmed Palestinian civilians there. With Israeli tanks and troops surrounding the camps to prevent any of the Palestinians from escaping, Sharon's murder squads shot, knifed, and bludgeoned Palestinian civilians all that night and the next day and the following night, while the Israelis around the camps listened gleefully to the shots and screams coming from inside. Then Sharon sent in bulldozers to scoop out mass burial pits and cover up the corpses of more than 2,000 Palestinian women and children.

Many Palestinians remained unburied, however, and Red Cross workers found whole families in their homes with their throats cut and other families who had been lined up and machine-gunned, from small children to elderly grandparents. One infant had been stomped to death by a man wearing spiked boots.

This was Ariel Sharon's work, but only a part of his work. He is a man who believes the teaching of the Talmud that only Jews are human beings, and that all who are not Jews were put on this earth only to serve the Jews, and that anyone who opposes the Jews deserves to be killed, and he has acted in accord with this belief all his life. There are a dozen major atrocities for which he could be tried by the Hague Tribunal, but the one with which he is charged now is the mass murder he implemented, as Israel's defense minister, in West Beirut in September 1982. And the U.S. government, which clamored for Slobodan Milosevic to be turned over to the Hague Tribunal for trial, pretends that it knows nothing about Sharon's genocidal crimes against humanity.

In the 1950s Israel's Mossad, the equivalent of the CIA in the United States, sent hundreds of letter bombs to German scientists working in Egypt and Syria, killing a number of them.

In 1967, during Israel's war against Egypt, the Israeli army carried out a number of mass executions of Egyptian prisoners of war in the Sinai, forcing them to dig ditches, then lining them up and shooting them. Dozens of eyewitnesses to these mass executions have reported what they saw, but the world's politicians and media bosses pretend not to know. Also in 1967 Israel attacked the U.S. Navy ship, the U.S.S. *Liberty*, attempting to sink it and kill its crew and then blame the sinking on the Egyptians.

Israeli agents have carried out assassinations and other terrorist operations around the world. One of the most colorful of these operations -- and one of the few that received major media coverage -- was the attempt to murder a prominent Muslim cleric in Jordan in 1997. Two Israeli agents sprayed poison in the ear of Khaled Meshal as they walked past him on a sidewalk in Amman. Fortunately, Meshal's bodyguards were able to catch the two Jews as they ran away, and so the assassination attempt was publicized.

Israel has stolen nuclear materials and nuclear weapons technology from the United States to build an illegal nuclear arsenal. Israel also is known to have developed an arsenal of biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction.

None of these Israeli activities is secret. Those I've mentioned are just a few of the ones that were found out and publicized. Not publicized very much, of course. In fact, they all were dropped from the news pretty quickly. Still, everyone attending Mr. Bush's speech at the United Nations last Saturday knew about them. And yet, no one stood up and booed. No one walked out in protest. Bush's speech was covered by all of the major newspapers and television networks in the world, but no reporter for any news medium operating in the West commented on his hypocrisy. No one mentioned Israel's terrorism. Everyone knew, but everyone played along.

These people weren't lemmings. Lemmings really don't know any better. Lemmings are essentially moral creatures; in fact they are compulsively moral. To lemmings it is essential to feel and to think and to act in the way they believe they are expected to feel and think and act. That's morality. Most groups of lemmings believe that it is bad to lie, to deceive, to be hypocritical. If during George Bush's speech at the United Nations a substantial part of the audience had walked out in disgust, and at the end the remaining delegates had stood up and booed him loudly, and if the media commentators then had remarked with scorn to their television audiences that Bush is a hypocrite who talks about stopping state-sponsored terrorism while continuing to finance Israeli terrorism, then the lemmings would have booed him too.

But Bush's lies and hypocrisy were ignored by the media and by the other delegates. Instead of booing, they applauded him. And so the lemmings applauded him too. It was all an act for the benefit of the lemmings. Nearly all politics these days, nearly every speech or public appearance by a politician or a government official, is an act of showmanship. What is said has relatively little relationship to what the politician actually is thinking.

Certainly, last Saturday George Bush wasn't really thinking about waging war on countries that sponsor terrorism or harbor terrorists. He was thinking first and foremost about the importance of pleasing the Jewish media with his speech. He may have been keeping his fingers crossed and hoping that no Arab delegate would jump up during his speech and shout at him, "What about

Israel? You say that we should wage war on states that sponsor terrorism. Israel engages in state-sponsored terrorism more than Afghanistan and all the other countries in the Middle East combined. When will you send your B-52s to carpet-bomb Tel Aviv and Jerusalem?" And at the end he must have marveled to himself how smoothly the act went and how easy it is to deceive the public.

Crookedness of this sort has been going on for a long time. There are only two things that make this latest crookedness noteworthy. First, it is being used to justify yet another war that is not in the interests of the American people. It is being used to justify dropping cluster bombs on villagers whom we have no good reason to kill. And second, it is a lot more obviously crooked than usual. Osama bin Laden caught the Bush government and the media by surprise, and they didn't have time to refine and polish their lies. All they could do was pretend that they had no idea why he would attack the United States and then claim that it must be because he hates our freedom. They didn't have time to put up their usual smokescreen of obfuscation. They simply launched their denunciations of terrorism and of terrorists and of governments that tolerate terrorism and hoped that no one would say anything about Israel or Ariel Sharon or Israel's policies of assassination and torture.

Because the crookedness is more obvious now than usual, more perceptive people than usual are noticing it and saying something about it, and that's good. But these perceptive few who are unhappy enough about the crookedness to speak out have little or no voice in the mass media, and so the lemmings remain oblivious to the realities of the situation. That's the wonderful thing about democracy: you don't have to try to fool all of the people; all you have to do is fool most of the people all of the time, and that's pretty easy to do when you control the mass media. You can just ignore the few who refuse to go along with the act, and the great majority of the voters will never notice.

So why do I care that the system is crooked? Why should you care? Why not just pretend not to notice the crookedness and go along with it, like everyone else? Pretend to be a lemming, but stay alert to possibilities for profiting from the fact that, unlike the lemmings, you really are secretly aware of who's who and what's what. That's what the big shots do. That's what the people do who care only about themselves and don't give a damn what happens to their country or their race or the civilization built by their race, as long as they personally are able to turn a profit from events. That's what George Bush does. He pretends to care about all sorts of things. He pretends to be outraged by terrorism, but he shakes Ariel Sharon's hand and gives him a big hug whenever Sharon shows up in Washington. He pretends not to be aware of Sharon's record as a mass murderer, as a war criminal, as a terrorist, as a man who sends out teams of assassins and who orders the Israeli police to torture prisoners.

A lot of people think and behave as George Bush does. A lot of people believe that's the only smart way to be. We're living in a society in which a great many people are completely alienated, completely disconnected from any sense of responsibility to race or to nation or to anyone but themselves: amoral people, people willing to do anything that they believe is personally advantageous, people for whom every public expression is simply an act. And because there are so many people like that, including virtually everyone in the government and in the media, America is very, very sick.

I'll go further: individuals who think and behave that way are sick. George Bush is a very sick man. Anyone who consciously and deliberately betrays his own race or his own nation, anyone who commits treason, is a defective person, a sick person. And George Bush, by consciously following a policy he knows is not in the interests of America but only serves Israel's interests, a policy he knows is responsible for the September 11 attack against America, a policy he continues to follow despite that knowledge, is a traitor. That's George Bush I'm talking about, the President of the United States. He may look stupid, but he knows what he's doing. George Bush believes he's a smart guy, a guy who knows which side his bread is buttered on, a guy who can get away with anything as long as the Jewish media will back him up. And so far he has been getting away with it. In a democracy, hypocrisy works; lying works. As long as you have the mass media on your side you can get away with anything, because the majority of the voters never will figure it out.

What has been happening in Mazar-i-Sharif and in Kabul and in other northern cities in Afghanistan this week is a good example. The big act put on by George Bush and his British counterpart Tony Blair and all of their media supporters since the campaign to destabilize Afghanistan began last month -- the big act was that the Taliban is a bunch of tyrannical fanatics who brutalize women, sponsor terrorism, and do lots of other bad things, and the Northern Alliance, which was supplied with weapons and money by the U.S. government while we bombed the Taliban to smithereens, is a bunch of Sunday school teachers and Boy Scouts. The United States will deliver Afghanistan into the hands of the Northern Alliance, and then everything will be rosy and peaceful and democratic. The people who had been tyrannized by the Taliban will be free and happy under the Northern Alliance. The Americans will be the good guys, who have made this wonderful improvement possible.

Well, of course, it hasn't worked out that way. As soon as the Northern Alliance took over each city it began rounding up people it didn't like, people who belonged to the wrong tribe, for example, and raping and killing them. There have been dozens of mass executions and mass rapes by the Northern Alliance troops this week. There are a lot of people they don't like. And the ones who just get raped or shot are the lucky ones. Eyes are being gouged out, breasts are being cut off, prisoners are being castrated and impaled and skinned alive or burned to death. That's the way things are done in the Middle East. When the British tried to pacify the country in the 19th century, the rule was never to let yourself be taken alive. If you were wounded and left behind, you always saved your last cartridge for yourself. Rudyard Kipling wrote about that:

When you're wounded and left on Afghanistan's plains,
And the women come out to cut up what remains,
Jest roll to your rifle and blow out your brains
An' go to your Gawd like a soldier.

The Russians learned the same lesson, to their sorrow, just a little over a decade ago. And the military people around George Bush certainly were aware of the experiences of the British and the Russians. The Taliban indeed may be a rough and brutal bunch, but no more rough and brutal than the people paid and armed by the U.S. government. When the Taliban was in charge at least there was peace and stability. There were no massacres or gang rapes. The U.S. government, with its bombing campaign and its mercenary troops in the Northern Alliance, has succeeded in

destabilizing large portions of Afghanistan, and the rapes and mutilations and mass executions have started.

But the lemmings won't hear enough about that for it to sink in. George Bush will continue lying and smirking and pretending that the Northern Alliance are the good guys, and America is bringing freedom and democracy and happiness to Afghanistan. What the United States actually is trying to do is set up a government a little more corrupt than that of the Taliban: a government that we can control with bribes and threats and that will not be a danger to Israel. That's the whole purpose of our war against Afghanistan.

It's the same sort of crookedness that we saw in connection with the Second World War. The pretext that the British government used for declaring war against Germany in 1939 was the safeguarding of Poland's freedom. When the Roosevelt government in the United States finally was able to use the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor as an excuse for jumping into the war against Germany, the act by the media and the politicians here was that Americans were being the good guys and would bomb the Germans to smithereens in order to protect American freedom and the freedom of Europe. And the people to whom we shipped military supplies so they could help us were the Soviets under good old Uncle Joe Stalin, that kind and fatherly fellow who also was being threatened by the wicked Germans.

Of course, what we did, after carpet-bombing German cities and killing enough Germans to make them surrender, was turn Poland and the Baltic states and half the rest of Europe over to communist rule for half a century. It had never been the intention of either the British government or the U.S. government to free anybody. We knew what sort of people the communists were. We knew that they had butchered the cream of the Polish nation in the Katyn forest and elsewhere -- 25,000 Polish military officers and professors and physicians and engineers and writers -- but our government and media people pretended that it was the Germans who had done it and that we were "liberating" Europe from the Germans and protecting American freedom, which never was threatened by the Germans.

It was all an act. The aim was not to safeguard anybody's freedom; it was to destroy Germany because the Germans had gotten the Jews off their backs and out of their country. We made war against Germany in order to make Europe safe for the Jews and for no other reason. We are making war against Afghanistan now in order to make the Middle East safe for the Jews, and for no other reason. Everything else is an act to keep the public fooled. And the public will be fooled: just as they never figured out what World War Two was all about, they won't figure out what the war against Afghanistan is all about. They may hear rumors about the massacres being carried out now by the Northern Alliance, but the television people won't spell it out for them, won't show them gory pictures of the piles of corpses, and so the public won't get it.

So again, why should you care? Why not just go along with the act, the way the big shots do?

That's a hard question to answer, in this sense: If you're like George Bush or any of the other big shots who think they're being smart by going along with the act and collaborating with the Jews against their own people -- if you think that's the smart way to behave -- then you won't understand my answer, no matter how carefully I explain it. If you're a person who already is

totally alienated -- if you're an amoral person who already is completely disconnected from your race and its traditions and values and if you think of yourself solely as an individual scrambling to get an advantage over other individuals by any means that will work -- then you won't understand my answer.

But if you still have some sense of being a part of something larger and more permanent than yourself -- if you still have a sense of racial identity, a sense of kinship with a larger family of fellow Europeans, of fellow White men and women with whom you share traditions and values and a way of looking at the world -- if you value the civilization that your ancestors built over the last 5,000 years, if you think of it as your civilization -- then my answer is superfluous. You already know the answer. You already understand why you must not collaborate with creatures who secretly sneer at your values, who are contemptuous of the traditions and history of your people, who have been working for thousands of years to corrupt your civilization, and who are determined to annihilate your race. You already understand why men who do collaborate with these creatures must not be permitted to make laws and set policies governing your people. You understand that instead of being applauded and looked at with respect, they should be hanged as traitors and as a warning to others who might be tempted also to betray our people. You already understand that truthfulness and righteousness are their own reward.

Destroying Order

George Bush had his wife on television last Saturday drumming up public support for his war. The basic theme of her message was that the Taliban -- and fundamentalist Muslims generally -- don't treat their women the way Politically Correct Americans believe they should be treated. The Muslims make them wear head-to-toe covering in public, won't let them drive cars or hang out in shopping malls, and there's hell to pay if one of them is caught flirting with a man who isn't her husband. Worst of all, from Laura Bush's point of view, the women under Taliban control aren't permitted to work in factories or offices but instead must stay home and take care of the kids. The message was that it's our duty to make the folks in Afghanistan treat their women the way Mrs. Bush thinks that they should be treated. If they won't do things her way voluntarily, then it's our duty to use cruise missiles and B-52s to force them to do it her way.

Another theme of Mrs. Bush's message was that the aim of terrorists is to oppress women. Osama bin Laden's September 11 attack didn't have anything to do with Israel or with the U.S. government's long-term support of Israel's aggression against its Muslim neighbors; his aim was to oppress women. He hates us because American women are permitted to wear shorts and to hang around shopping malls instead of staying home with the kids. He wants to use terrorism to force us to make American women behave like Afghan women. The nutcase feminists over here may have believed that, but it sounded just as silly to me as Mr. Bush's claim that the September 11 attack was unprovoked: that we were attacked just because the fundamentalist Muslims hate our freedom and democracy.

Well, I am sure that fundamentalist Muslims do look on American behavior with disgust. I am sure that they are shocked by the way many of our women dress in public, that they are shocked by the effeminate behavior of many of our men, that they are shocked by the morally and socially destructive propaganda we permit Hollywood and New York to pour into our homes through television. But I am equally sure that their disapproval of our behavior here in America was not the reason for the September 11 attack. And I am sure that they have no intention of trying to oppress American women or to make Americans change their behavior over here. Their concern is only with what we do in their part of the world.

One other thing I'm quite sure about is that George Bush didn't put his wife on the air last Saturday to talk about the oppression of women in Afghanistan because he really cares about that or because he really believes that Osama bin Laden wants to force American women to wear *burqas.* His aim was strictly to drum up support for his ongoing war against Israel's enemies in the Middle East. Actually, the Jewish brainwashing machine in Hollywood was churning out hate propaganda against Afghanistan even before the Taliban government refused the Bush government's demand that it turn over Osama bin Laden. There was a special program about Afghanistan on CNN instead of the standard news programming; it was clearly aimed at persuading American liberals and feminists that Muslim fundamentalists -- especially those in Afghanistan -- are a bad bunch. When I saw the program, I said to myself, somebody is getting ready to wage war against Afghanistan whether the Taliban government turns over Osama bin Laden or not, and this program is designed to build up war sentiment among Americans.

I've been seeing a lot of news reports about events in Afghanistan that most Americans don't have a chance to see. For example, I have a very disturbing set of photographs from Ananova, a news agency in the United Kingdom. The photos were taken last week, just after George Bush's buddies in the Northern Alliance moved into Kabul. A Taliban soldier who had stayed behind tried to surrender. The Northern Alliance soldiers beat him up, and then they pulled down his pants and castrated him, and while he was writhing in agony on the ground they began using him for target practice. I never will forget the look of wide-eyed terror on the man's face just before he was castrated. The last photograph in the series shows two Northern Alliance soldiers with big grins on their faces pumping bullets from their AK-47s into the poor bastard while other Northern Alliance people, also grinning, stand around watching the spectacle.

I was surprised to see a few photographs of the same incident in this week's issue of *Time* magazine: surprised because *Time* magazine and its boss Gerald Levin are solidly on George Bush's team, and they want us to think well of Mr. Bush's Northern Alliance buddies. Of course, *Time* did sanitize its account of this Taliban soldier's fate by neglecting to mention the castration -- although elsewhere in this week's issue a reporter describes how he was invited to watch while a prisoner's eyes were gouged out with a knife. These people doing the castrating and eye-gouging are the nice folks Mr. Bush has been paying with our tax dollars to fight the Taliban. These are the people Laura Bush would have us believe will end the oppression of women in Afghanistan.

I doubt it. In fact, Mr. Bush's Northern Alliance buddies would about as soon gang rape women in Taliban territory and then hack off their breasts as they would castrate and murder Taliban POWs. They get a big kick out of that sort of thing, and that's what they used to do pretty regularly before the Taliban took over and forced them into their enclave in northern Afghanistan a few years ago.

I'm not saying that the Taliban's supporters are nice people, but they certainly are no worse than George Bush's buddies, and they did impose law and order on their country: law and order that no longer exist, thanks entirely to George Bush. The Taliban had forced a certain code of behavior on Afghan women -- and on Afghan men too, I should add -- out of religious conviction. The Northern Alliance people don't care as much about religion. They don't care whether women wear *burqas* or not; they just like to gang rape and mutilate them. And they've done a lot of raping and castrating in the past few days, courtesy of the U.S. government. In addition to raping and castrating and gouging out eyes, they like to impale prisoners on sharpened stakes and watch them wriggle.

Most Americans don't get to see any of this because the small portion of it reported by the media here is sanitized and minimized in order to keep the people who are doing the dirty work for the New World Order gang in Afghanistan from looking too bad. The consequence of this one-sided news coverage is that a substantial fraction of Americans believe Mrs. Bush when she announces that we are turning Afghanistan over to the Northern Alliance in order to end the oppression of women there, and they believe Mr. Bush when he assures them that we are helping the good guys in Afghanistan beat the bad guys in order to end terrorism.

As I said last week, what Mr. Bush really is trying to do is replace the Taliban with a more corrupt government that can be bribed and threatened more easily than the Taliban could. He wants a puppet government that will not be a threat to Israel.

George Bush knows how to end terrorism against America from that part of the world. He doesn't have to start a war or bomb anyone or overthrow anyone else's government. All he has to do is quit letting Israel use America, to quit helping the Israelis kill Palestinian women and children with weapons and money supplied by the United States. He knows that as well as I do, but he pretends that he doesn't, and that's one of the reasons that I know he is a crook.

And his wife is a crook too. If she were really concerned about the plight of women in that part of the world, she would speak out about what the Jews in Israel are doing to Palestinian women and children. She would protest the White slave trade that is flourishing in Israel, with tens of thousands of White women lured or kidnapped to Israel from eastern Europe and forced to work as sex slaves there in appalling conditions. She would not stand beside her husband and give a big smile and a hug to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, the Butcher of Beirut, the Jewish leader who engineered the murder of thousands of Palestinian women and children in Lebanon in 1982, whenever he comes to Washington.

The Bush family is a family of liars and traitors: corrupt people flourishing in an increasingly corrupt period for America. It is too bad that they cannot be made now to experience the things that they force men and women in Afghanistan and Palestine to experience. Perhaps the time for that will come later. Meanwhile they are riding high on the hog and are convinced that they're pretty smart for selling out our people and doing the will of the Jews, in return for Jewish political support. They believe that they can bring the whole world under Jewish rule and benefit themselves at the expense of all the rest of us. They believe that they can bring about the New World Order, as George Bush's father used to brag when he was President, by waging war after war against countries that refuse to knuckle under -- Iraq, Serbia, Afghanistan -- using our unlimited supply of cluster bombs and cruise missiles to terrify dissident countries into submission and to topple stubborn governments so that they can be replaced with compliant ones.

George Bush and his colleagues are willing to risk more foreign terrorist attacks along the way to their New World Order; in fact, in some ways foreign terrorist attacks are useful to them. They are much more concerned about domestic resistance to their New World Order scheme than they are about foreign terrorism. And when I say "domestic resistance," I'm not thinking primarily about domestic terrorism. The government-and-media crowd is not terribly concerned about domestic terrorism unless it is waged on a scale much larger than it has been in the past and is sustained long enough to have a destabilizing effect. In fact, occasional acts of domestic terrorism are useful to them, just as acts of foreign terrorism are, but in a different way.

Foreign terrorist attacks are useful in that they provide a pretext for wars needed to force unwilling countries into submission to the New World Order, as in the case of the current war against Afghanistan and the planned war against Iraq. Of course, when there is no threat of terrorism, the New World Order planners generally can use some other pretext. That was the case with the Clinton government's war against Serbia, for example. The excuse there was that

the Serbs were mistreating the Albanian minority in Serbia's Kosovo province, and so we had to bomb Belgrade in order to force the Serbs to see the error of their ways, but an excuse that flimsy often won't hold up under stress. If the Serbs had had any kind of decent air defense system and had taken out a dozen or so U.S. bombers over Belgrade, or if they had been able to sink one of our ships in the Adriatic which was firing cruise missiles into Serbia, the American public would have lost its stomach for the war in a hurry. Much better for sustaining a war of that sort is a foreign terrorist attack, so that the war can be portrayed as necessary for America's security or as retaliation for an attack against Americans.

Foreign terrorist attacks also provide a pretext for suppressing domestic resistance, which as I said is a matter of greater concern to the government anyway. A foreign attack gives the media an opportunity to whip the lemmings into a flag-waving, we-all-must-support-our-President mood, in which there is no tolerance for dissent, and it gives the government an opportunity to enact repressive legislation that can be used to stifle domestic resistance to a certain degree. We are seeing both these consequences of the September 11 attack now. The downside of the September 11 attack for the government and the media is the rise in anti-foreigner and anti-immigration sentiment among the public. It's a downside for the government and the media because keeping America's borders open is an important element of the New World Order scheme.

I also suspect that the government would prefer that the next foreign terrorist attack against the United States not be quite as damaging to the U.S. economy as the September 11 attack. A few more like that could destabilize the economy and generate a lot of public unrest.

Except when they really need a good excuse to start another war, the government and media schemers can make much better use of domestic terrorism, especially if it can be blamed on anyone who seriously opposes their schemes. The media bosses and other Jewish leaders really were reaching after the Oklahoma City bombing in an effort to blame that on me, just because I wrote a novel 25 years ago in which there is a truck-bomb attack on a U.S. government building. They're really hoping now that it will turn out that the anthrax letters are being mailed by a heterosexual White male who doesn't like Jews and is connected to an organization of similar heterosexual White males, so that the government will have an excuse for shutting down the organization and enacting even more restrictive legislation.

I'll guarantee you this: if it is a White American who eventually is charged with the anthrax letters, you'll hear a lot more about it from the media than you will if it turns out to be some Muslim immigrant from the Middle East. And of course, if it turns out to be a Jew just trying to stir up anti-Muslim sentiment by signing the letters "Allah is great," you won't hear about it at all, unless you're a news junkie like me.

People like George Bush, John Ashcroft, and all the other politicians who are committed to the Jewish New World Order really are determined to abolish our Bill of Rights. They want to bring U.S. law into line with that in Canada, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and most of the rest of Europe, where anyone who speaks out against Jewish control or Jewish influence can be imprisoned by the government. And I must tell you, this government and media program of

curtailing our civil liberties worries me much more than the prospect of more hijacked airliners or truck bombs.

At the moment the program the government and media people are pushing is military court-martials and summary executions for suspected terrorists: secret evidence, no right to confront one's accuser, no jury; just a military officer who decides whether or not to have you shot as a suspect. But don't worry, they tell us, this is only for suspected terrorists who aren't U.S. citizens. If you're a citizen, the new rule doesn't apply to you.

Well, let me tell you, I worry anyway. I worry when the media Jews and the FBI both begin talking about how convenient it would be if they could torture suspects to extract information and Attorney General John Ashcroft praises a new law which provides for summary executions for suspected terrorists who aren't citizens. I worry because I know that one thing leads to another. I know these bastards who run our government and own our mass media. I know that they regard each new encroachment on our freedom as just another step toward their ultimate goal, which is no freedom at all for us. Today a law giving them a license to shoot suspected terrorists who aren't citizens; tomorrow a law extending the shooting license to include citizens. George Bush and John Ashcroft and all the rest of the New World Order enthusiasts around them are evil men.

They are evil men, and they also are dangerous men because they have the support of the mass media. And because they have the support of the mass media, they also have the support of the great mass of Americans who don't have a thought in their heads that didn't come from their television screens. The yahoos with the little flags tied to their car antennas believe that being patriotic means not criticizing the government. It means doing what the government tells you to do. It means believing what the government tells you to believe. If the government tells you that a law permitting the shooting of suspected terrorists will make us all safer, then the flag-wavers are all for it. If another law permits the secret police to break into your house while you are away and search through your personal belongings and private papers to find evidence against you without telling you about it, then that must be a good thing too, otherwise the government wouldn't do it, right?

Laws are essential for order, and a government also is essential to administer and enforce the laws. The type of government and the system of laws suitable for one people might not be suitable at all for another people, another nation. I certainly would not want to live in a society ruled by the Taliban. But the Taliban at least gave the Afghans law and order, and my belief is that it is not a good thing for us to tell other nations how they should conduct their internal affairs or what sort of laws they should have. It is not our business to decide whether or not Afghan women should be required to wear *burqas.*

I wonder if the flag-waving Americans who are cheering what George Bush has done to Afghanistan by destroying law and order there have any idea what life would be like in America without law and order.

I often encounter really foolish people who believe that if we're tolerant and respect other people's rights, they'll respect ours; that if we share what we have with others, so that no one is

really deprived of what he needs, then we can all live together in our wonderfully diverse, multicultural society even without a government and laws. These people don't understand that without fear of the police to keep our multicultural elements in line, America quickly would devolve into savagery. Without order, the flower-child types who preach tolerance would be hunted down for meat and eaten alive on our city streets.

Even if we had an all-White society, we would need laws respected by our people. Without laws there is no order, and without order there is only savagery. Every gang boss, every religious nut with a few followers, every cult leader would be fighting with others for turf, for followers, for resources, for power. For most people life would be hell. Our people spent a long time -- thousands of years -- developing a system of laws and government to provide order for our societies so that we could live useful and productive lives. George Bush and the media bosses who are so eager now to abolish the hard-won laws that provide for our rights, our liberties, and to make new laws giving more and more control of our lives to the government undermine respect for the laws and for the government. They may retain the support of the yahoos, but it wasn't yahoos who established our rights and built our system of laws in the first place. The yahoos always just went along for the ride. The government, by becoming more repressive and more intrusive, delegitimizes itself and provides a prerequisite for its overthrow.

When that happens we'll all be in peril until something new and healthier is formed from the chaos. But I cannot help but wish that George Bush is still around during the chaos, so that he can experience some of the things the Taliban prisoners in Afghanistan are experiencing now at the hands of his Northern Alliance pals.

An Awakening

First, I want to correct a misstatement that I made two weeks ago, in my broadcast of November 17. In that broadcast I said that the prime minister of Israel, Ariel Sharon, who instigated the murder of thousands of Palestinian women and children in Lebanon in 1982, is being sought for trial by the International Court of Justice in the Hague, the same international court that succeeded in extraditing former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic for trial on charges of crimes against humanity in Kosovo. Actually, the charges against Sharon haven't made it to the Hague yet. Charges have been brought against him in Brussels by survivors of the 1982 massacre, however, and the public prosecutor in Brussels made a decision earlier this year that the evidence against Sharon is sufficient to begin court proceedings. A few days ago, a summons was issued by a Belgian court for Sharon to appear at a hearing on genocide charges. Both the Bush government in Washington and Sharon's own government are applying enormous pressure to the Belgian government to stifle the proceedings against Sharon, but to date the legal process against him is proceeding. That in itself is remarkable in an era when Jewish influence reaches nearly everywhere in the White world.

Now today's topic: For 35 years, I have devoted nearly all my waking hours to an effort to inform and inspire White Americans and other Europeans around the world. I began in 1966 by publishing and distributing leaflets and pamphlets and tabloid newspapers in Washington. My basic message then was the same as it is now. One part of that message is that the Jews are our misfortune. We made the terrible mistake of letting them infiltrate our society, in America and in Europe. They began taking over our mass media of news and entertainment as soon as they stepped off the boat. In the early years of the last century, they headed straight for Hollywood and, working together, elbowed nearly all of their non-Jewish competitors out of the movie business. In New York and Washington, they seized control of the nation's most influential newspapers and magazines.

In every country in Europe, they organized communist parties based on the political theories of their fellow Jew Marx, and they fomented wars and revolutions aimed at destabilizing Gentile societies so that they could gain more power, more control. In Russia in 1917, they finally succeeded in toppling a Gentile government and imposing their will on an entire Gentile nation. And then they selectively murdered tens of millions of Russians and Ukrainians. After the start of the Second World War, they carried their murder campaign to the Baltic states and to Poland, selectively rounding up and killing the best people, the most successful people, the most intelligent and creative and active people. They attempted to decapitate every Gentile nation that they could, to eliminate opposition to their rule.

In 1966, I began publishing information about the Jewish role in communism and about the terrible crimes they committed against our people in Europe. In 1968, I published the first edition of my documentary article on the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media in America, naming the key Jews and explaining how they use their media control. It's called "Who Rules America?" and I've updated it and republished it nearly every year since then.

I've explained over and over and over again, for more than 30 years, how Jewish media control has led to the total corruption of our political process and our government. The politician who gets the most votes wins a position at the public trough. The opinions of the majority of the voters -- and their attitudes toward political candidates -- are manipulated by the mass media. And the Jews control the mass media. I've pointed out the Jewish role in dozens of destructive governmental policies in the United States: immigration policy, for example. In the 1950s and 1960s the Jews pushed for switching the flow of immigrants into the United States from Europe to the Third World. They pushed for fewer White immigrants and more Brown and Black and Yellow immigrants. And after they succeeded in that, they pushed for keeping our borders open to the Third World, resulting in the continued racial darkening of America. And among themselves they talked about why this was important to them. They talked about the need to dilute the European majority in America in order to make America easier to control. They used their old tactic of divide and rule.

And I've talked about the Jewish role in changing the standards in American education, about the Jewish role in pushing for racial mixing in our society and for more miscegenation between Whites and non-Whites. I've talked about the Jewish role in "hate crime" and "speech crime" legislation and about the Jewish role in attempting to abolish the Second Amendment.

But Jewish media control and Jewish communism and the Jewish role in the destructive governmental policies that have afflicted America are not my whole message; they are just a part of it. I also have been talking and writing for decades about our own people's non-resistance to the Jewish evil inflicted on them. I have talked about traitors among our people who collaborated in the Jews' destruction of America and our people.

It wasn't long after I'd started writing and preaching to the public that I began to understand that most of the public is completely impervious to any message that doesn't come to them through TV. The only thoughts they permit into their heads are thoughts that they believe are in the heads of their peers. These are the lemmings, and it simply isn't worth while trying to talk to them until one can do it through a medium comparable in power to the media in the hands of the Jews.

After I realized that, I addressed my message only to that portion of our people able to think independently of the masses. And even here I was disappointed. I wrote and spoke about things of fundamental importance for the survival of our race and our civilization, and the response was minimal. That is, although many people agreed with me theoretically, very few were willing to do anything. In some cases it was fear: they were afraid of the government, even though the government was much less fearsome in those days than it is now. More often, however, it was simply a lack of interest. People understood what I was saying, more or less, but their response was, "So, what?"

They were relatively comfortable and secure, and the things that I was talking about seemed too impersonal, too remote. They didn't believe that these things would impact their personal lives severely enough to warrant their taking action along the lines that I suggested. I told them about the Jewish control of the mass media, and most of them believed me, because I gave them names and other specifics they could check for themselves. I told them that allowing the Jews to exercise such power over our people would lead to our destruction. They shrugged and figured

that I was exaggerating. They thought that they would control what their own kids watched on TV, and that would take care of the problem. No need to do anything drastic.

Well, I kept preaching, and I continued to develop new media for my message: radio, the Internet, music, video. The response to my message grew, but very slowly. I tried every way that I could to stress the importance of what I was saying. I used very emphatic language, sometimes shocking language. I didn't want to risk losing credibility by exaggerating, but I did try hard to catch people's attention and make them think about what I was saying.

And I did more than just talk and publish. One subject I had preached long and hard about from the beginning was the danger of the United States continuing to provide military, financial, and diplomatic support for the gangster state of Israel. I warned that supporting Israel was not in accord with America's interests, that it was only making the people from whom we needed to purchase petroleum hate us, and we were getting nothing in return from Israel except contempt. Indeed, I put a great deal of effort into publicizing Israel's treacherous attempt in 1967 to sink the U.S Navy ship, the USS *Liberty*, and kill the crew, so that it could be blamed on Egypt, against whom Israel was waging war at the time.

Then in 1973, when Israel was involved in another war, against both Egypt and Syria, I sued the U.S. secretary of defense in a Federal court in an effort to block the illegal shipment of U.S. tanks, aircraft, and other weapons to Israel. I invited others to join me in this lawsuit. This was a concrete thing people could do. If the United States could be made to stay out of the war, then Israel would lose, and our Jewish problem in the Middle East would be solved. But in order to be effective, my lawsuit needed much support. It needed some big names behind it, so that the media couldn't ignore it. It needed a whole army of high-profile lawyers prosecuting it, so that the courts couldn't ignore it. And lawyers meant money, of course. The suit itself was on firm legal ground. The secretary of defense could not legally send U.S. tanks and planes to Israel without a specific authorization from the Congress, which he did not have. And the Jews needed the weapons immediately in order to avoid defeat by the Egyptians and the Syrians.

Well, the big names that I wanted to associate with my lawsuit refused to come forward. They were much more concerned with not offending the Jews than with eliminating the festering sore in our side that was Israel. And neither the money nor the high-profile lawyers needed to make the Federal court pay attention to my suit came forward. And so the Jewish secretary of defense, James Schlesinger, airlifted to Israel the weapons for which the Jews were clamoring. He drew down our military stockpiles in Europe to dangerously low levels in order to give Israel the weapons needed to defeat her neighbors. All of this was in the middle of the Cold War, when the U.S. defense of Western Europe against the Soviet Union was a serious matter. The Congress later gave Schlesinger the authorization to do what he had done, after the fact, but when he began doing it he lacked that authorization, and a strongly prosecuted lawsuit could have delayed the shipment of arms to Israel.

I had put all of my own money into the effort to hold up the diversion of U.S. weapons to Israel at least long enough to give an advantage to Egypt and Syria, and no one would help me. Anyway, for my efforts I had a valuable lesson in the way the judicial system works in America: it's not about justice and right and the law; it's all about power and money. And I also had yet

another reminder of what I already had learned about the lack of any real sense of responsibility even among thinking Americans. I'm sure that many of those who refused to help me with my lawsuit in 1973 thought of themselves as patriots. They just didn't take seriously my warning about the dangerous consequences for America of continuing to permit the U.S. government to support Israel's aggression against her neighbors.

In 1975, I tried a new medium for my message. I wrote a novel, which I named *The Turner Diaries.* I looked at the trends I saw in 1975: the increasing meddling of the government in people's lives, the increasing effort by the government to control not only what people did with their own resources, but also what they said and thought; the increasing favoritism shown to non-White minorities by the government; the increasing compulsion toward mixing of the races in the schools, in the workplace, in residential neighborhoods; and the growing alienation of the White population, the growing tendency to shrug off any sense of responsibility, to withdraw into oneself and to seek only one's own pleasure and comfort while everything else went to hell. I looked at these trends, and I tried to project them ahead 20 years. I tried to imagine what life in America would be like in the 1990s. And that's what I wrote about in *The Turner Diaries.*

And the book was successful beyond my wildest dreams. No major publisher would touch the book, of course, and I had to publish it myself. After it was published bookstores wouldn't carry it, and reviewers wouldn't review it. I had to advertise it and sell it myself. And despite all the obstacles it sold like hotdogs at a ball game. I was amazed. Hundreds of thousands of people bought the book and liked it and told their friends about it. It was translated into German and French and Swedish and Polish and Romanian. Last week a Polish visitor told me that the Polish edition of the book is being sold now at newsstands in railway stations in Poland. But the governments in Germany and France and Canada and Britain went to the trouble to ban the book, and people who try to sell *The Turner Diaries* in those countries can be imprisoned.

But people still wouldn't do anything. People read my book as escapist fiction because they enjoyed the action I wrote about. But almost no one really took it seriously -- until very recently. The book was too farfetched to be taken seriously. It didn't seem real. They couldn't imagine that the projection of the future that I made back in 1975 ever could come to pass in America. After all, I wrote about an America with a much more repressive government than Americans ever had experienced. I wrote about an armed uprising against the government by White patriots. I wrote about domestic terrorism on a huge scale. I wrote about patriots using truck bombs to blow up government buildings, about patriots obtaining nuclear weapons and then putting one in an airplane and flying it into the Pentagon on a suicide mission. It just didn't seem real. Readers enjoyed it, but they didn't take it seriously.

And it wasn't just the action in *The Turner Diaries* they didn't take seriously. They thought that my message was too extreme. They thought that I was being excessively harsh in my portrayal of governmental corruption and of treason by the politicians. Things are bad, they agreed, but not as bad as I had portrayed them. They thought that the racism and the anti-Semitism of the characters in the book were too fanatical. They thought that the ethnic cleansing that was described in the book was unnecessarily bloody and cruel -- until very recently. But now I am detecting a changing attitude toward my book on the part of the most perceptive and most independent-minded readers.

The attitude of the lemmings hasn't changed at all, of course. They're not about to be seen reading the book, because their TV has told them that it's a very Politically Incorrect book, a very hateful book. But thinking people are looking at it again and reconsidering their initial judgment that it is too extreme, too unrealistic. They have seen too many of the things that I wrote about in 1975 come to pass. Or at least, they are seeing persuasive indications now that some of the farfetched things I wrote about may come to pass soon.

And it's not just my book, *The Turner Diaries*, that they're re-evaluating now. They're re-thinking everything that they had taken for granted before. They are taking things seriously now that they didn't pay much attention to before. Until very recently most Americans -- even thinking Americans -- didn't take the government's foreign policy very seriously, because it seemed too far from home. They didn't believe that what the government did overseas could have much effect on their personal comfort or security. Now they understand that it can. In September, it was brought home to them that a bad foreign policy can have disastrous consequences right here in America.

And it's not just that they understand that Americans can be bombed and hijacked and infected with anthrax by people who have been driven to desperation by our foreign policy. They have seen the U.S. government's response and the media response to what happened in September. They have heard the barefaced, brazen lies from everyone in the government and the media to the effect that the September 11 attack was unprovoked, that it had nothing to do with the government's support of Israel against her neighbors, that it was based only on an irrational hatred by fundamentalist Muslims of America's freedom and democracy -- and, as Mrs. Bush claimed recently, on their desire to oppress American women.

I have been claiming for years that the government in Washington is totally corrupt and totally under Jewish control, and nearly everyone took those claims with a grain of salt. It is true that the Jews are powerful and have much political influence, they thought, but certainly Pierce is exaggerating. Certainly there still are some patriotic politicians in the government. Certainly the Jews don't control everything in Washington the way Pierce claims they do. After all, our government often is critical of Israel's illegal occupation of Palestinian land. Our government has criticized the programs of assassination and terrorism the Jews are using against the Palestinians. Often there are public arguments between Israeli politicians and Washington politicians. So surely Pierce is exaggerating.

Now, however, these people who were sure that I have been exaggerating are noticing that, despite the public show of criticism and disagreement, U.S. money and weapons somehow keep going to Israel, year after year. They are noticing that, while there undoubtedly are a few minor agencies of the government in Washington that the Jews don't have their noses in, the Jews do seem to get their way with everything that is really important to them. The doubters are noticing that in a matter as important to America as the September 11 attacks, everyone in the government and the media continues to support Israeli interests instead of American interests. No one will condemn Washington's Israel-first policy that led to the attacks. The doubters are noticing that instead of acting to secure America's interests now, we are beginning a major war in the Middle East in order to secure Israel's interests.

Finally, thinking people who could not accept my blanket condemnation of Jewish influence on European and American society -- people who objected that not all Jews had been communists back during the rise and triumph of communism, and not all communists who participated in genocide against the people of eastern Europe were Jews; people who objected that not all Jews in America are involved in the filth coming from Hollywood now, not all Jews are working to abolish the Second Amendment, not every single Jew is pushing to keep America's borders open -- these thinking people are beginning to understand that it is the collective influence of the Jews on our society that is dragging it down. It is dawning on them that the most important of the destructive influences in the life of our race are Jewish influences, whether every Jew is involved in these influences or not. They understand that we no longer can afford the luxury of quibbling over just what the role of this Jew or that Jew has been. We must act to end the overall Jewish influence, the collective Jewish influence, and if we are to survive we must do it soon.

Perhaps I am too much of an optimist, but I do believe that, after all of these years of preaching, I am seeing the beginning of an awakening among thinking Americans now, the beginning of a new contact with reality. And perhaps this awakening to the reality of our situation will lead some thinking Americans to begin accepting some responsibility for the future of our people.

Great Masters of the Lie

Let's begin with a few simple statements of fact.

First fact: The September 11 attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon was a direct response to the U.S. government's long-term support for Israel's aggression against her neighbors in the Middle East. The attack was not irrational or cowardly or unprovoked. And we were not attacked because fundamentalist Muslims hate America's freedom and democracy or because they want to oppress American women. America was attacked simply because the U.S. government has helped Israel attack and plunder her neighbors.

Second fact: Everyone of any consequence in the U.S. government and in America's mass media understands with perfect clarity the first fact.

Third fact: Everyone of any consequence in the U.S. government and in America's mass media has lied consistently and deliberately about why America was attacked and also about why the U.S. government started a new war in the Middle East a few weeks ago.

Fourth fact: The reason for the lying by the media people and by the politicians and government officials is Jewish influence. Jews own or control most of the mass media in the United States, and they also own the politicians, for all practical purposes.

Fifth fact: If the U.S. government remains subservient to the Jews and continues its Israel-first policy in foreign affairs, as it is doing now with its war against Afghanistan and Israel's other enemies in the Middle East, Americans will continue to pay the price, and only Jews will profit.

These five facts bear repeating over and over and over again. They are simple and self-evident, but it is easy to forget them in the blizzard of lies and obfuscation coming from the news media these days. One fundamental principle that professional liars rely on is that a lie, no matter how transparent or preposterous, if repeated often enough and brazenly enough, will be believed by most people. And if repeated loudly enough it will drown out the truth, and even the more perceptive and thoughtful members of the population will forget what is truth and what is a lie. George Bush has told us so many times now that we were attacked on September 11 because fundamentalist Muslims hate America's freedom and democracy that most of the public believes it. It is important that some of us not forget that it is a brazen lie, and that no amount of repetition will make it other than a lie.

Well, it's bad enough having to listen to a not-so-bright politician like George Bush lie to us about matters of the utmost national importance, but he's really an amateur at lying. You can see that little smirk around the corners of his mouth, even when he's lying about very serious things, and that will put you on your guard. Even Bill Clinton was a better liar than George Bush. If the only liars we had to worry about were the politicians and the bureaucrats, we'd be in pretty good shape. The lemmings would stay fooled, but then, they're always fooled. At least, the perceptive minority would understand that we were being lied to.

Unfortunately, however, we also are inundated by lies from those who are real experts at lying, far cleverer at it than the politicians. I am referring, of course, to the Jews. They are such effective liars that we really must pinch ourselves every time one of them opens his mouth, lest we be taken in. It is, in fact, their absolutely astounding facility at lying that has persuaded me, more than any other difference between us, that an unbridgeable racial gulf separates us from the Jews. It is more than their perverse religion and more than their distinctive family life that is responsible for this facility, I am convinced.

I believe that it is based in their genes. From far back in prehistoric times their ancestors spent so many generations in the markets and bazaars of the Middle East changing money and buying and selling camels and goats and goods of every description, haggling over every transaction, that the ability to lie convincingly became a real asset in the struggle for survival. And it is the adverb "convincingly" that is the key here. They evolved the knack for seeming to be sincere while lying outrageously.

I'll give you a concrete example. And, really, the only way to deal with a subject like this is to study concrete examples: many concrete examples; to look at the details. My example today is a recent paper written for the Center for Immigration Studies by Dr. Stephen Steinlight. Dr. Steinlight spent more than five years as the director of national affairs for the American Jewish Committee. He's certainly no fringe Jew, but rather is a real Jew's Jew, right at the core of Jewish power. His paper, which you can find for yourself on the Internet at cis.org, is titled "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography." It is a paper written by a Jewish leader primarily for his fellow Jews, and so is perhaps a bit more revealing of Jewish attitudes than it would be if it were addressed to the general public instead.

The general theme of Steinlight's message is that U.S. immigration policy, as it stands today, is not as favorable to Jewish interests as it might be. In fact, he sees some real dangers for his fellow Jews if immigration policy isn't changed soon. The main danger he sees is the loss of the Jewish ability to control the U.S. government. Now, he indicates, the Jews have a tight grip on things; through their control of the media they are able to control public opinion. But, he frets, with so many diverse races pouring across the U.S. borders so fast, and with the new immigrants retaining their own racial loyalties instead of assimilating into the cosmopolitan mass of the general public, the Jews may lose their grip. When more than half of the U.S. population becomes non-White during the next 30 or 40 years, if the various minorities still have any sort of separate group identities, the Jews may no longer be able to control the outcome of elections.

The way around this danger, according to Steinlight, is not to halt non-White immigration. Instead it is to shift the makeup of the immigrant flow in a way so as to make it easier for the Jews to control them and to slow the flow if necessary so that the new immigrants can be integrated into the mass -- and controlled along with the mass -- rather than retaining their separate identities.

Well, that's Steinlight's message in broad outline, which is interesting in itself, but it's in the details of the way in which he says it that we can see the peculiarly Jewish knack for deception. I can't read Steinlight's whole paper to you, because it's 26 pages long, but I'll try to give you the general flavor with just a few excerpts. For example, he carries on for pages about how

wonderful democracy is -- the will of the people, equality, and all that -- and how important it is to preserve democracy. And then on page seven he says:

Is the emerging new multicultural American nation good for the Jews? Will a country in which enormous demographic and cultural change, fueled by unceasing large-scale non-European immigration, remain one in which Jewish life will continue to flourish as nowhere else in the history of the Diaspora? In an America in which people of color form the plurality, as has already happened in California, most with little or no historical experience with or knowledge of Jews, will Jewish sensitivities continue to enjoy extraordinarily high levels of deference and will Jewish interests continue to receive special protection? Does it matter that the majority of non-European immigrants have no historical experience of the Holocaust or knowledge of the persecution of Jews over the ages and see Jews only as the most privileged and powerful of White Americans?

You really need to read that statement over two or three times and let it sink in to get the full impact: to realize that Steinlight has just announced that Jewish interests get special protection because Americans want to make up for the persecutions they have been led to believe that Jews suffered more than 50 years ago during the so-called "Holocaust"; that it is dangerous to let immigrants in who haven't been indoctrinated with "Holocaust" propaganda, because they might see Jews for what they really are, namely, the most privileged and powerful group in America. But how nicely Steinlight says that: how smoothly!

Well, Steinlight goes on to complain that Jews already are losing some of their power. He mentions the Jews in the Congress who have been replaced by Asians and Hispanics, and he asks whether Jews can hope ever again to have ten Jewish senators, as they do now, if present immigration trends continue.

We should note that if the Jews were represented in the Senate in proportion to their percentage of the population there would be only two Jewish senators now instead of ten. And then Steinlight asks:

How long do we actually believe that nearly 80 per cent of the entire foreign aid budget of the United States will go to Israel?

Steinlight says:

Not that it is the case that our disproportionate political power (pound for pound the greatest of any ethnic/cultural group in America) will erode all at once, or even quickly. We will be able to hang on to it for perhaps a decade or two longer. Unless and until the triumph of campaign finance reform is complete, an extremely unlikely scenario, the great material wealth of the Jewish community will continue to give it significant advantages. We will continue to court and be courted by key figures in Congress.

Steinlight's paper is really fascinating reading. He says all of the typical, mealy-mouthed things about democracy and equality and so on, sounding like a true-blue, public-spirited, patriotic American -- and then he lets slip the real reason why Jews love democracy so much: it is because

democracy is so corruptible; it is because their wealth gives them such an advantage. And gradually one begins to understand that the Jews' whole concern about immigration and politics is Jewish power: that's all that concerns them. And Steinlight actually communicates that message to his fellow Jews, but he heaps on so much obfuscation that the average Gentile will never get it.

Here's another little gem from Steinlight's paper. After mentioning how rapidly the political power of the Hispanic segment of the U.S. population is growing and how racially self-conscious this segment is, Steinlight says:

For perhaps another generation, an optimistic forecast, the Jewish community is thus in a position where it will be able to divide and conquer and enter into selective coalitions that support our agendas.

Did you catch that bit about "divide and conquer"? Of course, that was the motive driving the Jews' campaign for the new immigration law in 1965 that brought in the flood of non-White immigrants who have so drastically darkened America in recent decades, and it is the motive behind the Jews' insistence now that our borders be kept open and that the government do virtually nothing to halt illegal immigration. The motive from the beginning was to dilute White political strength, to multiculturalize America, so that Whites couldn't gang up on the Jews: so that the 2.5 per cent of the population that is Jewish could continue to control the other 97.5 per cent that is not Jewish.

And Steinlight admits the virtual Jewish unanimity on the immigration question as well as the decisive role the Jews have had in shaping the U.S. government's immigration policy, but his admission is cloaked in all of the standard mush about sympathy for the underdog and how the Jews always have been against racism and so on.

But now, Steinlight is telling his fellow Jews -- now is the time for us to change America's immigration policy again, so that we Jews can continue to hang on to our power. We need to have fewer Muslim immigrants and others we are less likely to be able to control, and we need to slow immigration down so that the new non-White immigrants can lose their own sense of identity, shed the influences from their home countries, and become fully "Americanized" -- which means fully subject to Jewish control through the mass media.

And Steinlight comes right out and says how that control is to be exercised. He says:

It is also true that Jewish economic influence and power are disproportionately concentrated in Hollywood, television, and in the news industry....

And then, a few pages later, after saying some very unkind things about Muslims, he tells us:

I suspect that MTV, for better or for worse, will prove more powerful with young Muslim immigrants than the mullahs....

What is that if not gloating over his fellow Jews' power to capture and control the minds of non-Jews, even to wean young Muslims away from their religion, away from the influence and guidance of their own spiritual leaders, through the Jews' control of the media? He doesn't have to spell it out for his fellow Jews. They already know that MTV is owned by the billionaire Jew Sumner Redstone, born Murray Rothstein, and that the whole aim of MTV propaganda is to multiculturalize young Americans, to cut them loose from their own racial and cultural and religious roots and make rootless cosmopolitans of them, with no sense of racial identity or loyalty. The Jews know all of this, but the Gentiles listening to Steinlight will never get it. To communicate the way Steinlight does takes a special ability: a Jewish ability.

I'll say this again: Jews -- and not just Steinlight, but Jews generally -- are able to get away with making such brazen statements because they fuzz them over with lots of contradictory verbiage that keeps the Gentiles trying to figure it out. The Jews in Steinlight's audience read his message loud and clear, while the non-Jews sit there with idiotic smiles on their faces and applaud, having understood nothing at all. I chose Steinlight's recent paper to illustrate this because Steinlight is a policy-making Jew with unquestionable credentials, and because the paper is available to anyone with access to the Internet at cis.org.

For those listeners without Internet access, his core message to his fellow Jews is this: "We Jews are richer and more powerful than any other group in America. Our power is concentrated in the media. We always have pushed for more non-White immigration into America because we wanted to dilute the power of the White majority. We used the tactic of divide and rule. But now, with America becoming non-White so rapidly our open-borders policy is likely to begin working against our own Jewish interests. We are not able to control large ethnic minorities who maintain their separate identities as easily as we can control those who have given up their identities and become fully assimilated into the mass. In the future we probably can continue to use our media, such as MTV, to undermine the culture of new immigrants and integrate them into the American mass, but in order to be sure of doing this we need to slow the rate of immigration a bit, skew the immigration quotas more toward those who are not hostile to Jews, and speed up programs aimed at assimilation. And we should be especially sure that we indoctrinate new immigrants with lots of "Holocaust" propaganda, so that they will feel guilty if they don't let us have our way and keep our special privileges."

That's Steinlight's message. It's simple enough, but being delivered the way it is makes it fiendishly deceptive. And lest you think I'm exaggerating or distorting his message by paraphrasing it, I should quote exactly what he says on page 18 of his paper, where he explains how Jews are able to get away with claiming to be loyal to America while actually being loyal to Israel. He says:

We get a free pass, I suspect, largely over Christian guilt about the Holocaust....

But he pads that bald statement with a warning to his fellow Jews that they'd better be more careful not to flaunt their "free pass" and had better try harder to seem patriotic.

There's one area of Steinlight's paper that gives additional insight into the Jewish mode of deception, and that's his commentary on Muslims, whom he regards as an especially problematic

group of immigrants. I'll quote for you exactly what he says first about Muslim fundamentalists and then about Muslims generally, beginning on page 21 of his paper. Muslim fundamentalism is, he says:

[A] totalitarian political ideology with strong theocratic and fascistic elements.... Islamism is profoundly hostile to pluralism, religious tolerance, democracy, secular civil society, Jews, Zionism, [and] Israel....

He complains about Muslim fundamentalism's:

intolerant religiosity, irrational atavistic values, [and] misogyny.

Gee! What other Semitic religion does that description remind me of? Except for the bit about hostility toward Jews, Zionism, and Israel, what he says about Islam describes Orthodox Judaism perfectly. And there's much more. Steinlight complains about the multiplicity of Islamic social and religious organizations in the United States and how they all stick up for each other. And -- get this -- he actually complains that Muslims, when criticized or questioned, raise the "red herring of Islamophobia." How noble and honest it is of the Jews that they never raise the red herring of anti-Semitism to deflect criticism from themselves!

But that is only the beginning of Steinlight's arrogance and deception. The traditional Islamic faith, he says:

...is itself not unproblematic in its attitudes toward Jews, Christians, and other non-Muslims. The religious education of traditional, non-Islamist Muslims -- literalism in Koranic exegesis, theological straightjackets imposed on scriptural interpretation, the study of text without context, and the virtual absence of intellectual self-critique -- is filled with anti-Jewish teaching as well as a theology of contempt for the followers of other faiths.... Powerful strains of religious triumphalism and religious supercessionism are central tenets of Islam. Such dangerous spiritual arrogance has been abandoned by many Christian denominations, largely as a product of Vatican II and years of interfaith dialogue and soul-searching encounter. Christian believers, from Roman Catholics to members of such liberal Protestant denominations as the Congregationalists and the United Church of Christ, have, for example, adopted the view that God's covenantal relationship with the Jewish people remains unbroken and that the advent of Christianity neither erased nor canceled it.... No parallel spiritual generosity exists in Islam.

Well, sadly, all of that is perfectly true, and it is a wonderful example of how a clever liar can use the truth to tell a monstrous lie. It also is an example of the breathtaking height of arrogance to which Jews customarily rise in their lying.

There's much more I could say about such things as the way in which the Jews used such techniques as "interfaith dialogue" to completely vitiate Christianity and make the Christian churches into obedient lapdogs, but I don't want to offend my Christian friends any more than I already have. Study Steinlight's paper for yourself and see where it leads you.

The Club

We have spent much of our time during the past three months examining the significance of the September 11 attack and the government's response to that attack, both in America and in the Middle East. And there are a hundred more facets of this subject that we could discuss.

For example, during the past week the TV screens have been full of Mr. Bush's program of providing Christmas gifts for Afghan children, while he continues to bomb their country. I don't know what Muslims think about Christmas gifts, strictly from a religious standpoint, but I can imagine what they must be saying to each other, from a patriotic standpoint. Suppose that we were in an all-out war with China, and the Chinese government, after destroying our cities with a surprise nuclear attack, announced a program of gifts for American children while they continued to mop up American resistance to a Chinese invasion of our country. The Chinese premier would announce that the war was not against the American people, but only against the capitalist-terrorist government in Washington, and that the Chinese were truly concerned about the welfare and happiness of American children. I suspect that most of us would be inclined to tell the Chinese to take their toys and stuff them. Of course, it should be clear to anyone with half a brain that the toys-for-Afghan-children program is strictly a public relations stunt aimed at American public opinion and that George Bush cares no more for the children of Afghanistan than he does for the Taliban prisoners of his Northern Alliance buddies, who are still being tortured and murdered.

We also could talk more about the conflict between the Jews and the Palestinians and the attitude of the politicians over here to that conflict. The Jews are continuing to send murder teams into Palestinian towns to murder Palestinian leaders, still sending bulldozers to destroy the homes of the families of suspected Palestinian resistance fighters, still sending helicopter gunships -- supplied by the United States -- to shoot up Palestinian police stations for the purpose of killing the Palestinian prisoners being held there that Arafat has had arrested on suspicion of opposing the Jews, and no politician over here ever has a complaint about this Jewish terrorism, and that's the only word for it: terrorism.

Yet whenever the Palestinians strike back at their oppressors, whether with a suicide bombing or some other attack against the Israelis, Mr.Bush and virtually every other politician over here immediately and loudly denounce it as "terrorism." This week the governor of the state of New York, the present and future mayors of New York City, and a passel of other American politicians are all over in Israel, wearing yarmulkes to show their solidarity with the Jews in our "common fight against terrorism." And Mr. Bush, on orders from Mr. Sharon, refuses to meet with Mr. Arafat because Arafat, he says, isn't doing enough to stop Palestinian terrorism.

The crookedness and hypocrisy of this whole relationship between Israel and the United States really turns the stomach of any honest observer, but I guess it still plays well enough on American television to keep the lemmings fooled. Anyway, just remember all of this crookedness the next time a lot of Americans lose their lives in another reprisal attack from the long-suffering Muslim world, and the Bush crowd tells us that the attack was "unprovoked."

Well, as I said, we've talked a lot about the Middle East situation recently, and we don't want to neglect the other very important things that are happening around us. We could discuss the extraordinarily depressing situation in South Africa and Rhodesia, where things have continued downhill since the last time we talked about the increasingly precarious position of White people there. Black dictator Robert Mugabe in Rhodesia seems hell bent not only on driving the last White Rhodesians out of their country but also on destroying Rhodesia altogether.

Black rule in South Africa is carrying that once-proud White nation deeper and deeper into savagery and depravity. South Africa has the highest incidence of rape of any country in the world, and one in every eight Black South Africans is infected with HIV or has full-blown AIDS. The belief is widespread among Blacks that sex with a virgin -- or more generally with an uninfected woman -- will cure AIDS: supposedly the woman's uninfected body draws the infection out of the body of the man who is having sex with her. Because the HIV infection rate is far lower among White women than among Blacks, White women increasingly are the targets of Black rapists, as are infants of either race. A recent series of gang rapes of South African infants, as young as five months old, has caused shock even in that crime-ridden country, although there has been very little news in America about the rapes. The media here, having played the key role in bringing Black rule and subsequent ruin to South Africa, largely have ignored the consequences of their destructive work.

If there is a pattern to be seen in all this, it is the deliberate destruction of independent nations, the deliberate wrecking of patriotic governments everywhere and their replacement with more corruptible governments, governments more easily controlled by alien forces. That is what has happened not only to South Africa and to Yugoslavia within the past decade, but it is what the U.S. government tried to do to Iraq a decade ago and seems determined to try again to do in the very near future, as soon as it finishes off Afghanistan.

The crippling of Iraq and Afghanistan is understandable solely in terms of the conflict between Jews and Muslims in the Middle East and the Jewish control of public opinion in the United States. When we consider also the U.S. government's bombing of Belgrade and the economic and diplomatic pressure that undermined the White government of South Africa, and when we also look at domestic governmental policies in the United States and in virtually every country in Europe, a much larger -- and much more sinister -- pattern emerges. The big picture that we can see is a concerted effort to decrease national autonomy everywhere; to break down national traditions and national and racial consciousness; to force everyone into a uniform, cosmopolitan mold; to subject people everywhere to a central authority controlling every aspect of their lives.

This big picture has been given the name "New World Order" by its partisans. The first major actor in the campaign to impose the New World Order on an unwilling world who used the name in public was George Bush's father, during the latter's term as President ten years ago; at least, he was the first person I heard bragging about it. But the campaign has been going on much longer than that. The planning was well underway early in the last century, but it took a communist revolution and two horribly murderous and destructive world wars to destroy the old world order -- the White world order -- and make way for the new.

And really, it is only when we look at the major events of the past century in the light of a deliberate, widely concerted effort to destroy the political and social order of the White world that we begin to see a pattern, and things start to make sense. Why, for example, would two great, capitalist nations -- the United States and Great Britain -- ally themselves with the communist Soviet Empire to destroy a third great, capitalist nation, Germany?

Certainly, there were various motives at work. There was longstanding ethnic animosity, as between Germans and Poles and between French and Germans. There was the greed of British capitalists for a bigger part of the market that their competitor, Germany, was sharing with them. Capitalists had, in other circumstances, shown themselves quite capable of mass murder and nation wrecking in their greed for more wealth. But really, none of this is a sufficient explanation for the Second World War and its aftermath. Many British capitalists may have been willing enough to see German economic power destroyed, but I doubt that they planned on seeing the destruction of British economic power and the postwar dismantling of the British Empire, or the rise of the Soviet Union to a dominant position in Europe.

To me the most compelling evidence of a plan behind the disasters of the 20th century is the astounding uniformity of government policy everywhere in the Western world: really, nearly everywhere in the White world, that emerged after the Second World War. Today, for example, every White country has opened its borders to a flood of non-White immigrants from the Third World, and they are pouring in: France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Denmark, England, Scotland, even Ireland. If a popular vote were held in any of these countries as to whether or not the flow of non-White immigrants should be continued, the continuation would be overwhelmingly rejected. But, just as in the United States, the people are never given an opportunity to reject non-White immigration. They are never asked their opinion on the matter. An overwhelmingly unpopular program is crammed down the throats of the people because the top politicians -- presidents and prime ministers -- support it, and the rest of the politicians go along obediently.

So why are the top politicians from every country in the White world marching in ideological lockstep? Why is there such uniformity of policy? It certainly wasn't that way 100 years ago. It used to be that there was a great deal of individuality among political leaders and national policies. The prime minister in Britain had one style; the chancellor in Germany had another; and the President of the United States had a third. Where are the individuals today who reflect the national peculiarities of their own people?

Well, of course, individuals do come along occasionally: Austria's Jörg Haider, for example. He was in favor of cutting off the immigration of non-Whites into Austria, because that's what the Austrian people wanted. When Haider's party won enough votes for Haider to implement some of his policies, the top politicians in all the other countries went berserk, recalling their ambassadors, threatening trade embargoes, and worse.

The problem with Haider was that he wasn't a member of the Club. The top politicians throughout the Western world were recruited into the Club by the planners before they were elected to public office. Candidates for the Club are selected, in most cases while still university students, and are initiated into a multinational society of young men on the make: ambitious and unscrupulous young men who have the requisite social skills for becoming successful politicians

and who are willing to sell out their people in return for the Club's support for their personal advancement.

This is an old idea. To a large degree it is the idea behind every political party: join our party and follow our party line, and we'll provide the money and the organization to get you into public office. There's more to the Club, though. For one thing, it's multinational. For another, it operates like a secret society instead of like a political party. It's not subject to the laws that are supposed to govern political parties in most countries.

In the past there have been other secret societies with political agendas, of course: even multinational secret societies. The people behind the international communist movement constituted such a multinational secret society. The huge advantage that the Club has -- the Club to which George Bush and his father and Bill Clinton and Tony Blair and nearly every other political leader in the White world belong -- its huge advantage is that its board of directors includes the people who control the mass media throughout the Western world.

It used to be that every country had its own mass media. Nowadays you can see the same Hollywood products on TV screens in Germany or England or the United States. Sometimes the local language is dubbed in, and sometimes it isn't, but the multicultural filth of MTV flows into the minds of young Swedes and Britons and Germans just as it does into the minds of young Americans. Because of this the Club can ensure the political success of its members nearly everywhere.

Well, there's more to it than that, but the key is that increasingly globalized mass media give increasingly globalized political control to the men who control the media. It is a natural thing that men who have the potential for exercising this political power would turn to the obvious tactic of recruiting front men to be actual electoral candidates. The media bosses themselves are not all Jews, but most of them are, and it wouldn't look good if they tried to fill the top political offices themselves. Besides they already are pretty busy running their media empires, and most of them don't have the personal traits needed to gain the affection of voters. So they recruit political candidates and then use the Club's power to make political leaders of them.

The Club's recruitment of potential political leaders is not quite like the recruitment of potential executives by IBM or General Motors. The Club doesn't exactly hire them and put them on the payroll. Instead it gives them Rhodes Scholarships and other perks. It opens doors for them. It invites them into social circles where they can rub shoulders with the superrich and powerful and ruthless. It helps them forge new connections. It dazzles them with the lure of money and status. It offers to buy their souls from them for a very good price indeed. And when they sell, they are thenceforth bound to follow the party line.

I said that the Club operates like a secret society, but it's really not all that secret. There's nothing that a member of the Club, if he later became disenchanted, could tell to the police that would lead to arrests or could announce to the public that would lead to outrage. The members of the Club understand the rules well enough without having to swear any oaths or sign their names in blood. They understand what they are receiving from the Club and what they must give in return.

They understand that if they stop giving they will stop receiving. And they understand the power of the Club to take away from them what they already have received from the Club.

The Club isn't even quite like a fraternity. Some of its members hate or despise other members. They often scheme and fight against one another for a bigger share of the Club's favors. But they do obey the Club's rules. They do follow the Club's policies.

It's a loose sort of thing, in that not everyone in public office belongs to the Club. But if someone not in the Club becomes too popular or begins acquiring too much influence, the Club keeps a close watch on him and may order the Club's members to attack him, the way they have attacked Austria's Jörg Haider and France's Jean-Marie LePen. The Club even tolerates a certain amount of erratic behavior from its members. But at its core the Club is hard and disciplined, and its leaders know exactly what they want.

They want to bring the whole White world more and more tightly under their control. They want to eliminate every challenge and every potential challenge to their rule. They want to stamp out every influence and every idea that might become a danger to them, and that includes every nationalism and every religion that they haven't already infiltrated and corrupted. To this end they have been working to break down all national borders, pollute all ethnically clean populations with a flood of non-White immigrants, wipe out all sense of racial identity or loyalty, erase the memory of all traditions and all history, and undermine discipline and morality everywhere. They promote the hip-hop anti-culture of non-White savages; they promote homosexuality and feminism; they denounce every voice of opposition to themselves as "hate" and every act of opposition as "terrorism."

They corrupt and they destroy, so that they can suck out the lifeblood of the world. They employ George Bush and his crew now the way they employed Bill Clinton and his crew earlier and the older George Bush before that. They are largely Jewish, but not entirely. They are waging war now to break the power of militant Islam, which they see as a danger to Israel, but they are as strongly entrenched in Hollywood and New York and Washington as they are in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem.

If our race is to live and if our civilization is to survive, we must destroy them and those who work for them before they have gone much further with their own evil work of destruction. Destroying the Club and its adherents will be an extraordinarily difficult and dangerous and inevitably bloody task, but no matter how bloody, that is infinitely preferable to permitting the Club to continue with its evil activity unopposed.

I can understand why some people strike out at the Club with acts of terrorism, but I do not believe that terrorism by itself can defeat the Club. Control of the mass media of news and entertainment is what gave the Club its power and enables it to keep its power. Before the power of the Club can be broken and its members and its policies can be discredited and neutralized, the Club's control of the media must be broken. These weekly *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts are one small step in that direction. The books published and distributed by National Vanguard Books are another small step. The resistance music distributed by Resistance Records is another step.

But all of these things that I and the other members of the National Alliance are doing are not enough by themselves to break the Club. If I reach 100,000 White men and women each week with this broadcast, the Club can reach 100 million each day with its poison. The only way that we can destroy the Club and its evil is for you to do more than listen to me speaking. You must speak out yourself. You must multiply your own voice by persuading others to speak out also. You must persuade people you know who aren't listening to these broadcasts to begin listening.

And please, don't tell me that you can't speak out because you will be expelled from your university or fired from your job or investigated by the FBI or divorced by your wife or disowned by your parents if you do. It's time now for an end to excuses, for an end to cowardice and timidity. I don't want anyone to be expelled from his university or fired from his job. In some cases that will happen, although in most cases it won't. Most people have exaggerated fears, groundless fears. But groundless or not, the time is growing very late, and if you don't speak out, if you don't do everything you can and do it now, you betray not only your nation and your civilization and your race, you also betray yourself.

Speak out! Act now! And if you want to work together with others who are speaking out and acting, become a member of the National Alliance. You'll find an application form at natvan.com.

Labels

"Terrorism" and "terrorist" have been the most-used words on television and in the other controlled news media recently. We've heard over and over about al-Quaeda terrorism and Iraqi terrorism and Palestinian terrorism -- especially about Palestinian terrorism during the past week, with the Bush government repeatedly demanding that Yasser Arafat arrest every Palestinian designated as a "terrorist" on a list given to him by Israel. But we haven't heard anything about Israeli terrorism or about U.S. terrorism: not even a word. The controlled news media in America would have us believe that the governments of Israel and the United States don't engage in terrorism.

So how do we decide what is terrorism and what isn't? Is terrorism what individuals or small groups do when they're angry at a government, but what governments do is legitimate warfare or self-defense or something else other than terrorism?

No, no, that can't be, because we were told that the government of Afghanistan that we just destroyed was a terrorist government, and so is the government of Iraq, which the media want us to destroy next. So maybe it's the type of weapon that's used that determines whether an action is terrorism or not. If one uses a car bomb or a human bomb, as the Palestinians often do, it's terrorism. If one uses a helicopter gun ship, as the Israelis often use to assassinate Palestinian leaders, or an airplane, like we use to bomb Afghanistan, it's not terrorism.

No, no, that can't be right, because Osama bin Laden used airplanes in his attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and we were assured that was terrorism. So why is Mr. Bush's aerial bombing of Kabul or Kandahar not terrorism, while Osama bin Laden's aerial bombing of New York and Washington was? Why wasn't the Clinton government's aerial bombing of Belgrade two years ago called "terrorism" by the media?

Perhaps what distinguishes legitimate warfare from terrorism is motivation. In warfare one attempts to destroy the enemy's military forces and to capture territory from the enemy; in terrorism one attempts to demoralize or terrify the enemy. But then what should we call the carpet-bombing of German cities by the United States during the Second World War? The motive there was to kill as many German civilians as possible and demoralize the German public. That also was the motive behind Britain's program to drop millions of anthrax bombs on Germany during the war. Fortunately, the Second World War ended before Britain could use the anthrax bombs it had prepared, but Churchill had fully intended to use them -- and to use them when it already was apparent that Germany was losing the war. Why is Winston Churchill regarded by all of the controlled media as a hero, as a great and good man, while whoever is mailing anthrax-infected letters to politicians and media bosses in the United States today is regarded as a "terrorist" and is described as "evil" and "cowardly"?

Well, by now the reason why an act of terror is sometimes called "terrorism" and sometimes isn't should be obvious. If someone we don't like does it to us, it's terrorism; if we do it to someone else, it isn't. More to the point, if someone the media bosses don't like strikes at Jews -- Israelis, for example -- or at someone friendly to the Jews -- the U.S. government, for example -- then it's

terrorism. If Jews -- Israelis, for example -- strike at Palestinians, or if the U.S. government strikes at anyone -- Afghans or Iraqis, for example -- on behalf of the Jews, then it isn't terrorism.

A somewhat trickier case was the attempt by the Israelis in 1967 to sink the U.S. Navy ship, the *Liberty,* so that it could be blamed on the Egyptians, generating U.S. hostility against Egypt. Although the attempt failed, the Israelis did kill 35 Americans in their terror attack on the *Liberty.* The controlled media, of course, not only didn't call it "terrorism" but did their best to hush it up by giving it minimal news coverage. So the rule is: if it's an attack by Jews or on behalf of Jews it's not terrorism. If it's an attack against Jews or against Jewish interests, it is terrorism. That's why Ariel Sharon isn't a terrorist, and Osama bin Laden is. Understand?

In this regard, things are better for the U.S. government today than they were 30 years ago, during the Vietnam War. The media bosses didn't consider the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese to be enemies, and so they were pretty quick to jump on the government when it prosecuted the war too vigorously. More than anything else it was the media slant on the war in Vietnam which led the U.S. government to tie the hands of the U.S. military and prevent a U.S. victory. The politicians were scared to death of being called "baby killers" or "warmongers" by the Jewish media if they urged more aggressive action against the communists in Vietnam.

Today no U.S. politician would even dream of telling the U.S. military to take it easy on Israel's enemies in the Middle East. He immediately would be denounced by the media as "soft on terrorism."

So today "terrorism" and "terrorist" are for all practical purposes media labels used as propaganda, much in the same way the media use the labels "racism" and "racist." If I denounce Whites who have sexual relations with non-Whites -- if I say that miscegenation is a terrible thing because it will destroy our race if we permit it to continue -- I am denounced by the Jewish media as a "racist." The same Jewish media, however, would never think of referring to a Jewish leader who expresses concern about the high rate of intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles as a "racist." In fact, Jewish media such as the *New York Times* regularly carry advertisements for Jewish groups urging Jews not to intermarry with Gentiles, urging them to marry only other Jews.

I'll give you another example of the crooked and deceptive way in which the controlled media in America use labels. I mentioned in my broadcast a few weeks ago -- actually, it was my broadcast of October 27 -- that the government's Centers for Disease Control had published a report on bioterrorism written by a Jewess, Jessica Stern, in which she referred to me as a "terrorist." My primary concern in that broadcast was the increasingly cozy relationship between Jewish pressure groups and U.S. government agencies: especially law enforcement agencies. The total subservience of the politicians to the controlled mass media has allowed Jewish groups to present themselves to government agencies as "experts" on just about everything: most recently as experts on "terrorism." Many of these groups -- the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Southern Poverty Law Center come immediately to mind -- have been given a quasi-official status by the media and by the government. They tell the government who is a "terrorist" and who isn't, and the government accepts their word.

For the record, I have never been charged with any terrorist act, nor have I ever advocated terrorism, and yet Jessica Stern, who falsely labeled me a "terrorist" in an official government publication has now been elevated to the status of Jewish guru by *Time* magazine. She is hailed as an expert on terrorism in *Time's* December 17 issue, and really, her only qualification for this status is her Jewishness. You can be sure that any government agency to whom she offers her expert advice will accept it as unquestioningly as do the mass media. Meanwhile, the real terrorists get a free ride, both abroad and at home.

Jessica Stern is not the only lying Jewish propagandist who has labeled me a "terrorist," simply because I am opposed to Jewish media control, and is accepted without question by the U.S. government as an expert. The two Jewish pressure groups I just mentioned -- the Anti-Defamation League and the Southern Poverty Law Center -- regularly label me as "dangerous" and imply that I am up to my neck in criminal activity and violence, when the truth is that I am completely non-violent and never have been involved in any criminal activity at all.

But guess who is heavily involved in criminal activity and in actual terrorism but is never labeled "terrorist." How about the Jewish Anti-Defamation League? How about the Jewish Defense League? I'll bet you've never seen a media reference to either of these criminal Jewish organizations as "dangerous" or "criminal" or "terrorist." The Anti-Defamation League is routinely referred to by the controlled media as a "public service organization" or as a "human rights organization" and is routinely quoted as an expert source on matters such as "hate crime" and "terrorism." The Anti-Defamation League has been snuggling up to government agencies -- especially law-enforcement agencies -- for decades, despite its association with notorious felons and its own record of criminal activity, and despite its role as an unregistered agent of a foreign power: namely, Israel. With the Jewish media on its side the Anti-Defamation League has managed to wriggle out of the criminal charges it has faced and always gets good press.

Another Jewish group, the Jewish Defense League, may have run out of luck in that regard recently. The Jewish Defense League, like the Jewish Anti-Defamation League, has always had criminal associations and has faced numerous criminal charges, but always has managed to beat the rap, with the help of its cheering section in the media and the government's reluctance to prosecute a Jewish group. As long ago as 1985 the Jewish Defense League had a string of 37 terrorist acts to its record and was identified by the FBI as the "second most active terrorist group in the United States," beating out both the Teamster's Union and the Mafia. Of course, you weren't likely to see the FBI's report on the Jewish Defense League in the controlled media.

The FBI's specific concern with the Jewish Defense League in 1985 was based on the bombing of the California offices of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee in that year. The regional director of the Arab group, Alex Odeh, was killed in the bombing. The Jewish Defense League members who were the principal suspects in that terrorist bombing fled to Israel to avoid prosecution, and the Jewish Defense League continued its terrorist activities without government interference and without any labeling by the Jewish media. The chances are that you've never heard anything about the Jewish Defense League's terrorist activity -- unless you listened very carefully to the news last week -- and you've never heard the Jewish media or any of the other Jewish pressure groups who have called me a "terrorist" say an unkind word about the Jewish Defense League.

Well, as I said, last week the Jewish Defense League's luck finally ran out. The chairman of the group, Irv Rubin, and his number-two Jew, Earl Krugel, both were arrested red-handed in Los Angeles by the FBI as they assembled the components for terrorist bombs intended to be set off in a Los Angeles mosque and in the southern California office of U.S. Congressman Darrell Issa. Jewish groups are very cozy with most congressmen, but the Jewish Defense League took exception to Congressman Issa's Lebanese ancestry and his lack of enthusiasm for the continuing U.S. support of Israel's terrorist activity.

Now, if I had been caught preparing bombs to blow up a synagogue and a Jewish congressman's office, you would never hear the end of it. It would be on every news program for weeks. The media would be crowing about it. The Jewish Anti-Defamation League, the Jewish Defense League, and the Southern Poverty Law Center would have people on the talk-show circuit for months bragging about how they had labeled me a "terrorist" and had been proved right. But you certainly will not see that sort of publicity about the very real terrorist activity of the Jewish Defense League or the arrest of its two top leaders on Wednesday of last week as they prepared to blow up a congressman's office and a mosque. None of these Jewish groups will be labeled in a negative way as long as Jews continue to control America's mass media, just as Israel, which carries out more terrorism than all the other countries in the Middle East together, never will be labeled a terrorist state by the controlled media.

Israeli assassination teams that murder Palestinians never will be labeled "terrorists" by the media, but every time a Palestinian strikes back at his Israeli oppressors he is described by the media here as a "terrorist." When George Bush and the other politicians here preach about the need to fight terrorism in the Middle East, they are talking about Palestinian terrorism, about al-Quaeda terrorism, about Iraqi terrorism, about Muslim terrorism, but never about Israeli terrorism or Jewish terrorism.

All of this has important consequences for all of us. When the tiny Jewish minority in America has the power, through its stranglehold on the mass media of news and entertainment, to label in a negative way any individuals or groups or even countries the Jews don't like, and the great majority of the American people, the lemmings, who absorb all of their ideas and attitudes and opinions from television, accept these labels unquestioningly, it is bad for all of us.

It is not just that by labeling me a "terrorist" the Jewish media lead many foolish and unthinking people who believe whatever they see on television to actually think that I am a dangerous terrorist and accordingly shun me -- and believe me, that sort of false labeling can be quite a personal burden and make life much more difficult than it otherwise would be.

It is not just that by labeling Jewish criminal organizations like the Jewish Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish Defense League as "public service" organizations, the media shield the criminal activity of these groups and make law enforcement agencies reluctant to prosecute them. If the Jewish Anti-Defamation League had been adequately prosecuted for its massive thefts of confidential police files a few years ago, its leaders could have been put in prison and the organization itself could have been put out of business before it had a chance to persuade Bill Clinton last year to grant a pardon to billionaire Jewish gangster Marc Rich.

If the Jewish Defense League had been adequately prosecuted after its first terrorist bombing more than 20 years ago instead of being permitted to continue its campaign of terrorist activity with more bombings and arson, the lives of more than one innocent victim could have been saved.

But the consequences of false labeling by the Jewish media go far beyond these things. It is the false use by the controlled media of the label "terrorist" in the Middle East that underlies the continuing U.S. support for Israeli terrorism and is responsible for the September 11 attacks on the United States and for the present war against Afghanistan.

It is the deceptive use by the Jewish media of labels such as "racist" and "neo-Nazi" and "hater" and "bigot" that is largely responsible for the disastrous racial policies of the government that have been wrecking our society for the past four decades. First the Jewish media bosses saturated the public with these labels, giving them intensely negative connotations. The Jews used these labels in both the news and the entertainment media until they had the general public -- that is, the lemmings -- conditioned like Pavlov's dogs. They had the public reacting in horror and revulsion to the label "racist," for example, regardless of the circumstances.

If an authority figure on his TV screen labels someone a "racist," the average American viewer doesn't stop to ask questions; the conditioned response that the media already have implanted in him kicks in, and he reacts negatively. He doesn't stop to think, any more than Pavlov's dogs stopped to think when they heard the dinner bell. He doesn't ask himself, "What did this person who has been labeled a "racist" really do? Is he really a bad or an unreasonable person? Why do the TV people want me to hate him? What is racism, anyway? Is it really a bad or unreasonable thing?" The average viewer doesn't ask himself these questions, and he doesn't even think. He simply responds in the way he has been conditioned by years of TV brainwashing to respond.

And the average person knows that if he says anything negative about "diversity" or "multiculturalism" or uncontrolled immigration, he will be labeled a "racist," with all of the bad connotations that deliberately have been attached to that label by the media, and so he doesn't say anything against these government policies that are destroying America. And the destruction goes on.

I'll say this again because it's so important: the media bosses, by having the power to create labels and to implant conditioned responses to these labels in the minds of most members of the public, are able to control the attitudes of the public to ideas, to individuals, to countries, to government policies, and to everything else. And the media bosses use this power for their advantage and for our destruction.

It is the Jewish media bosses who more than anyone else are responsible for the government's destructive racial policies, for the government's Israel-first policy in the Middle East, for the fact that the Jewish Anti-Defamation League is able to engage in criminal activity without being prosecuted, for the fact that for more than 20 years the government permitted the Jewish Defense League to commit dozens of terrorist acts, including bombings, arson, and murder, and to get away with it -- until last week. And I get labeled a "terrorist."

For better or for worse, we have a mass democracy in the United States. The politicians who make our government's policies are elected to office by voters whose attitudes and opinions are formed primarily by the mass media: by television and Hollywood movies and newspapers and news magazines, which are almost entirely in the hands of Jews. With the power of the mass media at their disposal it's not really difficult for them to control the way the public thinks about important issues, and therefore to control government policy. They've made a science out of controlling public opinion. They have become masters at it. And one of the most important tools they use is labels that they themselves have created and tailored to suit their needs.

That's why our immigration situation is out of control. That's why America's cities and schools are becoming darker and darker. That's why you see so many young White women with Black mates. That's why we ignored Israel's terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty* in 1967. That's why George Bush dances to whatever tune is played by Ariel Sharon, the Butcher of Beirut. That's why more than 3,000 Americans were killed on September 11. That's why we're waging an unnecessary war in the Middle East now. That's why groups like the Jewish Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish Defense League are permitted to ignore our laws most of the time.

It's about time that we did something to take the power of false labeling away from the Jewish media bosses. It's about time for us to speak out and begin having an effect on American public opinion ourselves.

The Greatest Betrayal

Let's begin today by tying up a few loose ends from previous broadcasts. Last week, in commenting on the December 12 arrests of the head of the Jewish Defense League and his second-in-command in Los Angeles as they prepared to bomb a mosque and the office of a California congressmen of Lebanese ancestry, I predicted that unless you kept a very close eye on the news you probably wouldn't hear a peep from the Jewish media bosses about these arrests, that the Jews would attempt to protect their own, just as they have covered up for numerous terrorist acts by the Jewish Defense League in the past and also have covered up for a long history of criminal activity and gangland associations by the Jewish Anti-Defamation League.

Actually, there was more news coverage of this latest Jewish Defense League terrorism than I expected. The best coverage outside the Los Angeles area was in the *Washington Times,* which is not owned or controlled by Jews, but there also were two pretty good stories in the December 16 issue of the very Jewish *New York Times.* I hadn't yet seen those *New York Times* stories when I prepared last week's broadcast.

In my October 13 broadcast I quoted part of a cabinet meeting debate between Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Israeli Foreign Minister Simon Perez that supposedly was broadcast on a Hebrew-language radio station in Jerusalem, Kol Yisrael, in which Sharon angrily told Perez to stop worrying about how Americans might respond to the actions of the Israeli government, because America is firmly under Jewish control.

A couple of listeners questioned me about that, saying that they were unable to find any source for the quote I used. Well, in my broadcast I mentioned that I hadn't been able to find Sharon's statement in print myself. What I meant was that I hadn't been able to find it in any English-language Jewish publication, which is what I normally require to establish the credibility of such a statement. I did see the statement in an English-language Palestinian publication, but I really shouldn't have relied solely on that. I should have gotten it straight from the horse's mouth.

I find the statement Sharon supposedly made easy enough to believe, because that's the sort of thing other Jews more cautious and less boastful than Sharon have said, but I should not have relied solely on a source hostile to Sharon and to the Jews generally. At this point I really don't know whether Sharon made the statement I quoted or not. I'll try to be more careful about my sources in the future.

Now let's talk about Attorney General John Ashcroft and his job as America's chief law-enforcement officer. Every time I see Ashcroft on television, he sends cold shivers down my spine. Look at that cold, Puritanical expression on his face. He's the type of man who believes he has a God-given right to read your mail, to listen to your private telephone conversations, and to torture a confession from you if he suspects that you have bad thoughts about the government. He is looking forward to the New World Order, where he expects that there will be an even greater degree of regimentation of citizens, and he really can crack down hard on anyone who gets out of line. Ashcroft's main regret is that he did not live in the Soviet Union 75 years ago,

where he could have converted to Judaism, become commissar for the Cheka, and organized mass shootings of dissidents in the cellars of the secret police.

I don't know what sort of sexual abuse Ashcroft was subjected to as a child that made him what he is, but I believe that it is his chekist personality that makes him such a worshipful admirer of Israel and the Israelis. He really respects a country that permits its police to torture prisoners, that practices collective punishment of the families of children who throw rocks at soldiers and of villages that are suspected of harboring resistance fighters, and that has a genocidal mass murderer as its prime minister.

Ashcroft is an ardent supporter of George Bush's policy of collective punishment, a policy apparently inspired by Israel. If the Israelis suspect that a Palestinian resistance fighter has been hiding in a village, they send in tanks and bulldozers to level the village. If George Bush believes that an alleged terrorist is hiding in a country, he sends in cruise missiles and B-52s to bomb the country back into the Stone Age. That policy doesn't apply to Israel, of course. If it did, our Middle Eastern problem would have been solved a long time ago.

Unfortunately, that problem still is very much with us. One aspect of the problem recently came to light after the September 11 attack, when the FBI began rounding up and interrogating illegal aliens who came here from Middle Eastern countries, including Israel. What the FBI uncovered is the largest espionage ring ever to operate in America.

Actually, the investigation of Israeli spying began before September 11, and many Jewish spies already had been identified. According to a Fox News report two weeks ago, as many as 140 Jewish spies already had been arrested before September 11, but there had been very little publicity about these arrests. The Bush government and most of the media were hoping no one would notice. The post-September 11 roundup of Middle Easterners uncovered another 60 or so Israelis engaged in espionage inside the United States and brought the previously secret investigation of Israeli espionage into the open -- or at least, more nearly into the open than before. The lemmings still are so busy watching their ball games that they haven't noticed.

Several very disturbing revelations have come out of this roundup. One is a very strong hint that the Jews here, through their spying on other Middle Easterners in the United States, had gained prior knowledge of the September 11 attack but did not share their information with the U.S. government. I reported my own suspicions in this regard immediately after the attack, but since then Fox News has reported even stronger suspicions among FBI investigators. A Fox News report of December 12, by reporter Carl Cameron, says:

There is no indication the Israelis were involved in the September 11 attacks, but investigators suspect that they may have gathered intelligence about the attacks in advance and not shared it.

Well, of course, we expect that sort of behavior on the part of the Jews. Once they had gathered their own information about the impending attack, which they anticipated with glee because it could only generate hostility between the United States and Israel's enemies in the Middle East, they saw no reason to warn Americans and thereby forestall the attack. So they waited quietly for

the attack and then as soon as it happened began urging that the United States wage war against Israel's enemies.

This is the sort of thing that both the Israelis and the Israel-worshipping Bush government would like to keep quiet, and the FBI is being very tight-lipped about it now, but I will not be surprised to see the beans spilled about the Jewish foreknowledge of the attack as the investigation proceeds. The reason I say that is that the roundup of Jewish spies has revealed many other things about Israeli activities that are damaging to Americans, and it will be very difficult for the government and the media to keep everything covered up.

Here's an example: As the government has become increasingly intrusive, snooping into every aspect of our lives, the need for telephonic wiretaps and other forms of electronic surveillance has risen dramatically. You might be surprised to learn that the government doesn't do most of the electronic snooping itself; the work has become quite high-tech these days and is farmed out to private companies that specialize in electronic eavesdropping and in the storage and analysis of intercepted data. There are a number of companies, in the United States and elsewhere, that have the equipment and the expertise to do this very sophisticated work. Guess which companies our government uses to spy on us: the two companies that do nearly all of this work for the Federal government are both located in Israel.

Did you get that? The politicians who run our government decided that the country that gave us Jonathan Pollard and the murderous assault on the U.S.S. *Liberty,* the country run by the most notorious war criminal now on the loose, the country that is the world capital of the White slave trade and that holds a monopoly on the distribution of several illegal drugs in the United States, is the country we should trust to help us catch our criminals and spies and keep an eye on the private business of our citizens. Really! Most state and local police agencies also depend on the same two Israeli companies.

I'll quote again directly from a Fox News report by Carl Cameron, this one dated December 13:

Here's how the system works. Most directory assistance calls and virtually all call records and billing in the U.S. are done for the phone companies by Amdocs, Ltd., an Israeli-based private telecommunications company. Amdocs has contracts with the 25 biggest phone companies in America, and more worldwide. The White House and other secure government phones are protected, but it is virtually impossible to make a call on normal phones without generating an Amdocs record of it. In recent years the FBI and other government agencies have investigated Amdocs more than once. The firm has repeatedly and adamantly denied any security breaches or wrongdoing. But sources tell Fox News that in 1999 the super-secret National Security Agency, headquartered in northern Maryland, issued what's called a Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmentalized Information report, TS/SCI, warning that records of calls in the United States were getting into foreign hands -- in Israel, in particular.

Indeed, there has been more than one warning about the misuse of confidential communications. Law enforcement officials have reported that they are certain that their own communications have been intercepted by criminals they were investigating. They believe that the interception of their communications has led to the murder of several of their confidential informants and

otherwise has hampered their investigations of illegal drug distribution by crime syndicates. And I should mention that the fastest-growing illegal drug syndicate in the United States during the past decade is the syndicate that distributes the drug known as "Ecstasy." This syndicate is entirely Jewish, and most of the Jews in the illegal distribution of "Ecstasy" in the United States are Israeli nationals. No wonder that business has been good for them!

Well, Jewish organized crime got a big boost in 1994, during the Clinton administration, with the passage of a new law, the so-called "Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act," or CALEA for short. What the public was told about CALEA is that it would increase public safety by providing new tools for the cops to go after the bad guys. It would centralize and expedite the business of wiretapping, making it easier for law enforcement to eavesdrop on communications between criminals -- well, to tell the truth, easier to eavesdrop on everybody. The key to CALEA was its centralizing of wiretap operations, so that now any law-enforcement official in the country who needs a wiretap knows where to go. He goes to a private company that specializes in providing wiretapping services and equipment. Now I will quote again from a Fox News report. This one was broadcast last week:

The company is Comverse Infosys, a subsidiary of an Israeli-run private telecommunications firm, with offices throughout the U.S. It provides wiretapping equipment for law enforcement. Here's how wiretapping works in the U.S.

Every time you make a call it passes through the nation's elaborate network of switchers and routers run by the phone companies. Custom computers and software, made by companies like Comverse, are tied into that network to intercept, record, and store the wiretapped calls and at the same time transmit them to investigators.

The manufacturers have continuing access to the computers so they can service them and keep them free of glitches. This process was authorized by the 1994 Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act, or CALEA. Senior government officials have now told Fox News that while CALEA made wiretapping easier, it has led to a system that is seriously vulnerable to compromise and may have undermined the whole wiretapping system....

[T]he complaint about this system is that the wiretap computer programs made by Comverse have, in effect, a back door through which wiretaps themselves can be intercepted by unauthorized parties.

Adding to the suspicions is the fact that in Israel Comverse works closely with the Israeli government and under special programs gets reimbursed for up to 50 per cent of its research and development costs by the Israeli Ministry of Industry and Trade. But investigators within the DEA, INS, and FBI have all told Fox News that to pursue or even suggest Israeli spying through Comverse is considered career suicide.

Now I'll repeat just the last sentence of that quote from the December 17 Fox News report:

Investigators within the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have all told Fox News that to pursue or even suggest Israeli spying through Comverse is considered career suicide.

Did you get that? And the Fox News report goes on to say that every FBI inquiry into Comverse has been halted before the actual equipment could be tested for leaks.

And that's not all that's been halted. This series of Fox News reports by reporter Carl Cameron from which I have quoted was available on the Internet from the Fox News Web site through the early part of last week. The report I just quoted, which was the third in what was intended to be a four-part series, was posted on December 17. But as you can imagine our "chosen" minority did not like the series. A December 20 story from the Jewish Telegraphic Agency says:

Jewish organizations have been receiving frantic calls from Jews concerned that the reports may fuel anti-Semitism.

Did you get that? The Fox News reports were making Jews "frantic." The Jewish Telegraphic Agency story also says:

American Jewish leaders and Israeli officials said they are holding conversations with Fox News representatives but refused to elaborate.

Well, that JTA story was from December 20, and apparently the "conversations" between Jewish leaders and Fox News were effective, because within 24 hours the Fox News series on Israeli spying was cancelled, and the three installments that already had been broadcast were yanked from the Internet and dropped into the memory hole as if they never had existed. You'll look for them in vain at the Fox News site now. The only places you'll find them are on sites that copied them from the Fox News sites before Fox News was pressured into pulling them.

To me the most interesting information in this Fox News series really is old news to a lot of people in the government and the media. The FBI and other government agencies knew what these Jewish companies, Amdocs and Comverse Infosys, were doing a long time ago. They knew that Israeli organized crime was getting information about U.S. government, business, and private telephone conversations and also about U.S. law enforcement wiretaps and was using this information for criminal purposes to the detriment of Americans. They also knew that they were supposed to pretend that they didn't know, or else: career suicide.

The only Politically Correct position for the bureaucrats and politicians and media people to take is that Jews are just like us, except for a different religion, and that Israelis are just like Americans, with the same values and interests we have. Israel is our brave, friendly, little democratic ally. To suggest that the Jews not only are fundamentally and irremediably different from us but that they have been, since Old Testament times, in a state of undeclared war with the rest of the world, a war waged primarily through deception and betrayal and behind-the-scenes influence, and that Israel is no ally but is a vampire clinging to America's back and sucking our blood while betraying us at every turn -- to suggest this basic truth simply is unthinkable to this career-oriented crowd. So the politicians and bureaucrats looked on the Israeli access to our

telephone information and the misuse of this information as merely a detail, an aberration, not to be mentioned lest it damage U.S.-Israeli relations -- and their careers, whereas to me it is one more confirmation of a basic and cosmically important truth.

Actually, the Jews reported by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency as screaming frantically about the series of Fox News reports weren't worried primarily about the revelations as to what Amdocs and Comverse Infosys have been up to. That's something too complicated for the lemmings to understand anyway. What worried the Jews about the Fox News reports was the suggestion that the Israelis knew in advance about the September 11 attack and didn't tell us. That's a betrayal that even the lemmings can understand. That's a betrayal that even the politicians and bureaucrats who take the position I just outlined -- namely, that Jews are just like us and Israel is our ally -- can use as an excuse to change their position. That's what the Jews really are afraid of.

I'll quote one more paragraph from the December 17 Fox News report about the Israeli penetration of our wiretap system:

And what troubles investigators most, particularly in New York, in the counter-terrorism investigation of the World Trade Center attack, is that on a number of cases, suspects that they had sought to wiretap and survey immediately changed their telecommunications processes. They started acting much differently as soon as those supposedly secret wiretaps went into place.

It's information of this sort, hinting that the Israelis not only knew about the September 11 attack in advance but now are doing everything they can to hinder the American investigation into the attack, that the Jews don't want the American people to have. They don't want the American people to know that they have been betrayed by Israel. That is why the Fox News series was cancelled last week and the parts that already had been published were pulled from public access and tossed down the memory hole.

Well, regardless of what eventually comes out about what the Israelis knew before September 11, it is clear that Israel has been engaged in an ongoing betrayal of America. What is an even greater betrayal of America than that, however, is what Attorney General John Ashcroft and George Bush and the rest of the politicians and bureaucrats in Washington have been engaged in throughout their careers.

Journalists and Canadians

A few years ago, when I first began describing the lemming phenomenon, I had the naïve idea that lemmings were mostly a pretty dull bunch: grossly overweight couch potatoes who munched snacks while they watched television and believed everything they were told. I thought that intelligence was a reasonably good guarantee that a person wasn't a lemming. Since then I've learned that isn't true. I believe there probably is some correlation between intelligence and the ability to think independently, on the average, but there certainly are many, many intelligent men and women who are just as much lemmings as the dullest couch potato or baseball fan.

Talking to journalists helped me understand that. Many of the journalists with whom I've spoken in the past few years have been at least a little more intelligent, quicker witted, better educated, and generally more knowledgeable than the average member of the population. My estimate is that, on the average, the journalists for the more important mass media are a bit brighter than bus drivers and retail clerks, but I've met many more independent-minded bus drivers and retail clerks than journalists who could think for themselves. As a class, journalists are the most lemming-like professionals I've encountered. Virtually all of them march in ideological lockstep. There may be an independent-minded journalist somewhere, but I haven't yet met him.

When I first began to realize the uniform nature of journalistic thinking I wondered whether it was crookedness instead of lemming behavior I was seeing. I wondered whether journalists are simply a corrupt, mercenary, amoral bunch, who tell whatever lies they are paid to tell and follow whatever party line the owner of their newspaper or television network lays down for them. I suspected that there might be some editorial directive I hadn't seen that instructs newspaper writers and editors that in any story they publish about me the word "hate" must be used at least once in the headline and at least twice in every paragraph of text. There are certain buzzwords that are used so consistently and predictably, "hate" or its derivatives being the most common, that it seems unlikely that every journalist would have hit on them independently and begun using them of his own volition.

Well, to make a long story short, I'm sure that there are plenty of corrupt journalists, but the more experience I have with journalists generally the more I'm inclined to believe that in most cases they really are lemmings. They really believe the nonsense they say on television or write for their newspapers. It's not just that they're paid to do that; they really are incapable of believing anything except the party line. Maybe so many journalists, even bright ones, are lemmings because journalism departments at universities deliberately weed out the independent thinkers.

Well, maybe, but I'm not much of a believer in giant conspiracies, involving many people and crossing ethnic boundaries. If journalism students are selected for their lemming-like characteristics, I suspect that the selection is unconscious rather than calculated. Which is to say, journalism professors are lemmings themselves and they favor the more lemming-like students. More likely, it is the fundamental nature of the profession that guarantees that nearly all of them will think alike. Journalism, after all, is a fundamentally extroverted profession. Journalists spend all their lives talking with other people and writing about other people. They are less private and more highly socialized than the people in most other lines of work.

I've tried to talk about this and related subjects with journalists, but usually I haven't had much luck. So my own writing about the mass media has focused less on what makes Gentile reporters tick so uniformly than on what motivates their employers, the Jewish media bosses. With more than 3,000 years of Jewish history to provide examples, the motivation of the media bosses is easier to understand and to explain.

Last month, however, something came to light that I found very interesting in this regard. As you may be aware, the mass media in Canada are as much under Jewish control as in the United States. The undisputed top media mogul in Canada is Israel Asper, who is commonly known by his nickname "Izzy." With his sons Leonard and David and other family members, Izzy Asper owns CanWest Global Communications Corporation.

A Gentile, Conrad Black, also used to be a major player in the Canadian media, but a little over a year ago Black's Southam News, Inc., was bought out by Izzy. CanWest now owns more than 60 per cent of Canada's newspapers and other media outlets. That's more than 60 per cent of all of Canada's mass media in the hands of one Jew. Included are 14 metropolitan dailies and 128 local newspapers across the country, including the Vancouver *Sun,* the Vancouver *Province,* the Calgary *Herald,* and the Montreal *Gazette.* CanWest also owns the *National Post,* which is distributed throughout Canada. In addition Izzy owns media in the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and Northern Ireland.

Last month Izzy issued a written directive to his newspapers, instructing them that from now on they must print nothing critical of Israel or of Israeli actions or policies. This is a rare thing. Usually directives of this sort are oral only, and great care is taken to keep them from coming to the attention of the public. But Izzy, with even more brass than is customary for his tribe, made his directive public. He announced that, beginning three weeks ago, December 12, the editorial content of all of his newspapers would be homogenized, and they all would be pro-Israel.

Now here's the interesting part: if all of Izzy's Gentile underlings were simply corrupt -- were simply paid mercenaries who wrote what they were told to write -- then there would be no controversy; all of the local editors and reporters and columnists simply would follow orders. But there is a controversy. A group of reporters and writers at the Montreal *Gazette* have rebelled, at least for the moment. One of them, Bill Marsden, an investigative reporter, revealed on a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation radio program called "As It Happens" that his editor at the *Gazette* had instructed him never to report anything that might reflect badly on Israel. Paraphrasing Izzy's directive, Marsden said:

We do not run in our newspaper op-ed pieces that express criticism of Israel and what it is doing in the Middle East.

Marsden and 54 other reporters at the Montreal *Gazette* went on strike in protest at what they describe as undue corporate interference with freedom of the press.

Their strike has infuriated Izzy. Izzy's son David characterized the striking reporters as "childish" and "self-righteous." He said:

Why don't they just quit and have the courage of their convictions? Maybe they should go out and, for the first time in their lives, take a risk, put their money where their mouth is, and start their own newspaper.

How's that for *chutzpah,* as the Jews like to call it? One can read in David Asper's reaction to the reporters the thought, "How dare these mere Gentiles, these mere *goyim,* question what we, God's Chosen People, decide should be the party line for Canada's newspapers! How dare they!" I mean it's not just that Izzy owns the Montreal *Gazette,* and so he is entitled to set the editorial policy, and other newspapers can set different policies. Izzy thinks that he is entitled to set the editorial policy for all of Canada's newspapers and determine what all Canadians think.

The man chosen by the Aspers to write the editorials for all of their newspapers is Murdoch Davis. When asked by "As It Happens" whether or not one of CanWest's newspapers would be permitted to buck the party line on Israel, Davis replied:

No. It is clearly the intent that the newspapers will speak with one voice on certain issues of overarching national or international importance.

When asked specifically whether or not one of the Asper newspapers would be permitted to raise the question of Israel's long-standing violation of international law and its defiance of UN resolutions calling for withdrawal from illegally occupied Palestinian territory, Davis again responded in the negative.

So that's the present situation with freedom of the press in Canada: not really very different from the situation in the United States. So what about the mentality of journalists? The fact that the reporters at the Montreal *Gazette* are protesting Izzy's directive that they can report nothing negative about Israel indicates that they are not entirely mercenary. To me, however, it does not indicate that they are independent thinkers. I believe that they are as much lemmings as the dullest couch potato or sports fan. What caused their protest was the arrogant and contemptuous way in which the Aspers went about reconciling two conflicting elements in the Jewish party line.

On the one hand journalists have been taught that the United Nations is a splendid and admirable organization, whose resolutions should be obeyed. They also have been taught that all races and ethnic groups are equal -- in fact, essentially the same -- but that racial minorities and underdogs generally deserve our special sympathy, and that in any conflict with a ruling group the underdogs are in the right. That's standard liberal dogma. You have to believe that in order to be a journalist. On the other hand, journalists have been taught that Jews are wonderful people who can do no wrong, and that to think otherwise is anti-Semitism, which is as bad as or worse than racism.

It's hard enough reconciling the elevated status of Jews with the concept of racial and ethnic equality, but most journalists by working at it are able to do it -- except where the conflict between Jews and Palestinians is concerned. That requires a special effort and really careful handling by their Jewish bosses.

How do you explain to a journalist who already believes all of the liberal dogma that if Iraq ignores a UN resolution it should be bombed into the Stone Age and then starved into submission with a rigid trade embargo, but if Israel ignores 14 UN resolutions we should respond by sending the Israelis more military and economic aid?

How do you explain to a journalist who has been taught that when South Africa used to be a White country and practiced apartheid, and the South African police sometimes beat information out of captured Black terrorists, it was a terrible thing and had to be condemned in the strongest terms, but when Israel practices apartheid, assassinates Palestinian leaders, and tortures Palestinian prisoners, nothing should be said about it?

How do you explain to a journalist that it is an intolerable threat to the security of the world if some Muslim country develops weapons of mass destruction, and the United States is justified in a preemptive strike to destroy the weapons production facilities, but when a psychotic little country like Israel builds an arsenal of chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons, using materials and technology stolen from us, it's OK, and we should ignore it?

How do you explain to a journalist steeped in the tenets of feminism that he shouldn't say anything about Israel's booming slave trade in girls and women kidnapped from eastern Europe and forced to work as sex slaves?

How do you explain to a journalist who believes wholeheartedly in egalitarianism that it's perhaps regrettable but certainly excusable when Jews rocket Palestinian villages and use Palestinian children for target practice, but it's "terrorism" and completely unjustifiable when the Palestinians hit back?

Believe me, explaining these things is tricky, but it can be done, if it's done with patience and care. It can be done, because when it comes to matters of faith, a lemming really isn't rational. He's quite capable of believing two mutually contradictory things at the same time. The problem that brought on the mini-rebellion at the Montreal *Gazette* is that Izzy wasn't patient and careful. He was arrogant and contemptuous of his Gentile reporters. But they'll get over it, I'm sure. They always do. They're lemmings.

But, as I said, what is happening now in Canada is interesting. It gives us insight into the workings of journalists' minds, and it also brings out into the open not only the monopoly Jewish control of the Canadian mass media but also the way in which that control is used to slant the news and Canadian public opinion so as to serve Jewish interests to the detriment of Canadian interests.

Do you think that any of these revelations will be of benefit to Canadians? Will the average Canadian say, "Oh, my goodness! I didn't realize that one man, and a Jew at that, controls more than 60 per cent of all the mass media in Canada and is using that control to deceive Canadians as to what is happening in the Middle East. That's terrible! We'd better have our lawmakers do something to break up this media monopoly, so that we will have a better chance to learn the truth about what's happening in the world when we read a newspaper or watch a television news program."

What do you think? I think that about 98 per cent of Canadians won't even look up from their ball games. I think that there's not a politician in Canada who will dare go up against Izzy Asper. This whole tempest at the Montreal *Gazette* will blow over in a few days, and all of Izzy's newspapers and other media will toe the party line as if nothing had happened.

And now I'm talking only to the two or three or four per cent of Canadians -- and also to the two or three or four per cent of Americans -- who aren't so absorbed in their ball games that they don't notice things like this and don't really care either. I'm talking to the small portion of the White population in both countries -- and in fact, in countries around the world -- who do notice and do care. I want you to understand that this is the way nations lose their freedom. More than that, this is the way races become extinct.

The majority of the population in Canada and the United States and in every country in Europe consists of lemmings, who always have been manipulated by whoever is in power. For approximately the last 100 years the power to manipulate the thinking of the lemmings -- of the masses, if you prefer -- has been shifting from the authority figures in the government and in the churches to the people who control the mass media. These days the people who control the media also control the government for all practical purposes, and the churches have become irrelevant, which is why the Canadian government won't try to break up Izzy's media monopoly and why the politicians in the United States will never go beyond pretending to be concerned about too much sex and violence on television when they have a mock fight with the media.

Controlling a country's mass media doesn't mean just being able to exert a decisive influence on a country's foreign policy, as Izzy Asper is doing in Canada, and as his fellow Jews long have done in the United States. It doesn't mean just getting a country involved in unnecessary wars and subjecting its citizens to retaliatory terrorist attacks. It means influencing immigration policy. It means influencing educational policy. It means influencing social policy. It means being able to control the way most of a country's people think about everything: about race and morality and lifestyles and other countries and freedom and the meaning of life. Most of the degenerative changes that have taken place in America and in Canada since the Second World War have been consequences of Jewish media influence. As that influence continues to grow, the chances of our people being able to throw off the yoke and regain control of our own destiny become smaller and smaller.

In Canada at the moment, Izzy Asper's surfeit of *chutzpah* has brought to the attention of the public -- that is to the attention of that small portion of the public that cares about such things -- his monopoly control of Canada's mass media and his intent to use those media for Jewish propaganda purposes. Light has been cast on this grave situation because most journalists are lemmings, and a few of them are chattering excitedly now about things such as "freedom of the press." Really, the whole debate is silly. Canada had no freedom of the press even before Izzy got his greedy hands on most of Canada's newspapers. For years it has been illegal in Canada to publish anything considered "racist" or "anti-Semitic" or even Politically Incorrect. When a Canadian buys copies of any of my books and they are mailed to him, the Canadian secret police confiscate them at the border. Publicly challenging the details of the Jewish "Holocaust" story can result in a prison term for a Canadian. Canada's journalists thought all of that -- stopping "hate," as they called it -- was just fine. Pretty soon they will realize that requiring all mass

media to say only nice things about what the Jews are doing to the Palestinians is also part of the noble effort to stop "hate," and that also will be just fine with them.

We can't change the nature of lemmings. Someone always will manipulate them. What is of the utmost importance is who it is that manipulates them, because whoever that is will determine the course taken by the whole society, by the nation, by the race. In the past, when it was a king or a pope or a dictator who set the party line, many mistakes were made, sometimes due to selfishness or irresponsibility, sometimes due to ignorance or carelessness or stupidity or prejudice. But at least the people setting the party line for the masses were our people, members of our own race. Now, increasingly, the arbiters of the party line are Jews or people wholly under Jewish influence. And the Jews, as always, are looking out only for their own interests, not for ours. To them we are merely tools to be used in advancing their interests.

And that's at best. At worst they are pursuing policies intended not only to advance their interests, but also to destroy us. Don't try to debate this matter with the Jews; they will, of course, deny it. Just look at the policies they have been pushing for the past 50 years and where those policies have been taking us. Just consider the facts, not their specious arguments designed to keep you demoralized and non-resisting.

My fellow Americans and my fellow Canadians: we are in a bad situation. Let us stop ignoring it. Let us begin deciding what we're going to do about it. I'm doing what I can do in speaking out about it and getting others to speak out. You must decide what you are able and willing to do and then begin doing it.

What Is Moral?

A few days ago I spoke with a friend who is a historian and a writer and is interested in many of the things we discuss on these weekly broadcasts. He congratulated me on the growing influence of *American Dissident Voices.* He said:
Many more people than you realize listen to your broadcasts. They mail the texts to many other people. I meet many people at universities and in other countries as well as here in southern California who listen to your broadcasts and talk about them with each other.

My response was: "Then where are these people when I need them? Why don't I hear from more of them? Don't they realize that I can't continue doing these broadcasts all by myself forever? The country is going down the drain, and all that these people you mention are doing is talking about my broadcasts and sitting on their hands. Why don't they help? Are they afraid that they'll be kicked out of the country club if they associate with me?"

My historian friend said that it isn't fear that keeps these people from contacting me; it is their moral concerns. In the past, he said, my broadcasts were very harsh, very brutal. I talked about ethnic cleansing and approved of genocide and other things that these people find shocking, he said. They won't support any cause unless they feel that it is a just cause. They think that I am willing to hurt too many people. They feel that I have no Christian constraints. They would rather commit suicide than become associated with an unjust cause, my friend told me.

I responded to him: "Don't these people believe that making a decent world for future generations of our people is a just cause? Don't they believe that preventing the extinction of our race and our civilization is a just cause?"

My friend didn't really have a good answer for that, but I gathered from his response that he believes my approach to our problems is too "rough," too uncivilized, too un-Christian for the people he talks with, and it makes them uncomfortable. Then he congratulated me on becoming more acceptable in the last year than I was before. He says that I do talk now about the issues in a way that is easier for these people to relate to, and he thinks that has a lot to do with the fact that more people are listening to the programs now and discussing them with their friends.

Since this conversation with my friend a little more than a week ago I've been thinking hard about what he said. I believe that I understand what he said, but I don't really agree with him. I don't really believe that it is very meaningful to say that Christian constraints make the academics and other perceptive people he knows hold back from the necessarily unpleasant solutions to our race's problems. In the first place, most of these people aren't really Christians. They were raised in a Christian environment, and Christian moral doctrine may still have a subconscious effect on them, but most of them are fairly intelligent and sophisticated people. I believe that a reasonably high percentage of the pilots and other military officers that the Bush government, and a long line of governments before that, have sent to blast Afghan villages to smithereens or to bomb a European city like Belgrade or to carpet-bomb German cities are Christians: a higher percentage, anyway, than among the academics and other people that my friend talks with. I also think that most of them have no qualms of conscience about what they do

for a living. And these pilots, most of them, are not Neanderthal rednecks or bloody-minded sadists. They are university graduates who are loving husbands and caring fathers. In the past, Christians -- American Christians -- repeatedly have shown themselves quite capable of doing the most atrocious and bloody things without hesitation.

The key, I believe, is social rather than religious or moral. The concern, I believe, is not about whether a cause is "just" or not, whatever that means, but whether it is socially acceptable or not: that is, socially acceptable in the peer group to which the person belongs who claims to be concerned about the justness of my cause. To tell the truth, I don't believe that I have changed or moderated or "softened" my message during the past year. I always have tried to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and I don't hold back from stating unpleasant facts or conclusions any more today than I did a year ago.

I do try to avoid being unnecessarily offensive. I don't ordinarily use the word "nigger" in talking about racial matters, for example, because it makes so many people flinch, and I can be completely clear in what I want to say without using that word. But that is no more true today than it was five years ago. I've always tried to avoid being unnecessarily offensive.

I think that what has changed is not my message but the social environment. I believe that the social environment of most of the writers and professors and others who talk about my broadcasts but won't talk with me has shifted enough during the past couple of years so that hard facts about race and the Jews are a little more acceptable than before. I think that reality is not quite as déclassé as it was a year or two ago.

You know, I believe that I know these people about as well as anyone. I never was very fashion-conscious myself, even before I began saying unfashionable things. I never worried much about whether I was wearing the latest style in cuff links or neckties, and occasionally my socks wouldn't match. I probably would have been classified as a "nerd" by most fashion-conscious people today. But I was a university professor, and I generally behaved in a socially approved manner. I could even figure out which fork to use for the salad in most cases, and I didn't slurp my soup or wipe my greasy fingers on my shirt or the tablecloth.

If there was a difference between me and most of my peers, I think it was this: they took the conventions and taboos by which we lived a little more seriously than I did. I think that I appreciate these things more now than I did then. Now I understand that conventions and good manners and politeness and gentlemanly behavior are important in a structured, well functioning society. But they are not the most important things. Honesty and facing reality without evasion are more important than politeness.

In the early 1960s, we all saw the society in which we lived coming unraveled. We all could look ahead and see that very bad things were likely to be encountered just down the road if present trends continued. But it was not entirely acceptable to talk frankly about these things. That is, it made many of my peers uncomfortable to talk frankly about where racial integration was taking America. It made them even more uncomfortable to talk about the Jewish role in the dangerous policies being pursued by the government. I think that social conditioning was more important than Christianity or any other ethical considerations in imposing these constraints.

We didn't feel personally threatened by Blacks, and the people who were personally threatened were the White manual workers at the bottom of the White social ladder, who reacted to the threat in ways that seemed very vulgar and uncouth to us. To us, Blacks were still the underdogs, and it seemed uncharitable to most of my peers for Whites to attack Blacks for wanting to better their positions. The media-generated image of sweaty, unshaven Ku Klux Klansmen and other rednecks screaming insults at peacefully marching Black demonstrators was an unpleasant one that made us squirm. We certainly didn't want to put ourselves in the same boat with the Ku Kluxers and other working-class Whites who were behaving in such an ungentlemanly manner.

I not only understood the feeling of my peers back in the 1960s; I shared it. Standing on a street corner and screaming insults at Blacks or shouting "White power!" while shaking one's fist or giving a Roman salute was not only rude and impolite, it was low class. I believe that was what made us most uncomfortable. Despite all of the pretensions to democracy and egalitarianism, America was and still is a very class-conscious society. And that is not necessarily a bad thing. I think that in a well-ordered society it is reasonable to expect the more privileged and influential members of the society to have a stricter and more refined code of behavior and to hold themselves apart from those with less-strict codes. And in the early 1960s America still had a reasonably well-ordered society.

As I already mentioned, I was a little less reverent toward things such as the polite behavior expected of academics and professionals than most of my peers were, and so while many of them joined conservative think tanks and respectably conservative debating societies, I decided to say what I thought needed to be said, polite or not. The consequence of that decision was that the Jewish media immediately began doing a hatchet job on me, portraying me as the sort of person that any member of polite society would be ashamed to associate with. And so I spent the next 35 years as an outcast of sorts. It didn't bother me a great deal, because the luxury of being able to tell the whole truth was a bit intoxicating. Of course, I always tried to persuade other professionals to tell the whole truth too, and a few of them did, but not many were willing to take that step.

That's beginning to change a little now, but not, I think, because I have become more polite or more moral. I think that it's because the threat that we all could see way back in the 1960s is no longer distant and theoretical. It is looming darkly over all of us now, not just over the manual workers at the bottom of the White social ladder. But I must say that, even as more professionals are screwing up their courage and choosing truth instead of the country club, I am becoming more impatient with those who still hold back from a full commitment to the struggle for the survival of our race and our civilization.

I don't mean to seem condescending or offensive, but I do think that it is time to quit making excuses that claim moral reservations. It is time to face the fact that what is holding you back is not morality but fear: the fear of being labeled a "hater" or a "neo-Nazi" by the media, the fear of being thought uncouth or low class for finally admitting that those low-class Whites who were screaming obscenities at Black demonstrators in the 1960s and who were using the word "nigger" were right. We didn't have to stand on street corners and do things in the low-class way the Klan did, but we were obliged to do something -- we were obliged to do whatever our

positions and our abilities enabled us to do most effectively -- and most of us dodged that obligation.

Let's talk about morality and just causes for a moment. I believe that the most common "moral reservation" I hear from the shirkers is that the solutions to our problems that I talk about entail the punishment of the innocent with the guilty. Intelligent people tell me that they agree that we should have a separation of the races. But, they protest, not all Blacks will go voluntarily to some African country, and many of those who won't want to go are hard-working, law-abiding Blacks. And the same is true for the mestizos who won't want to go back to Mexico or El Salvador. And what about the mixed-race children, whose mothers were persuaded by Hollywood or MTV to let Blacks impregnate them? How can we possibly have a White society again without hurting millions of people?

And my answer is that we can't, and you must decide whether it is more moral to stand aside and permit Western civilization and the race that built that civilization over the millennia to become extinct in the very near future, or to hurt many people, White as well as non-White, to ensure that both the race and the civilization survive.

When our ancestors arrived in America from Europe in the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries, they encountered intense opposition from the Indians, which was natural enough, since the Indians were here first and didn't want us taking their land. But after the first few massacres of White settlers by Indians, our ancestors rolled up their sleeves and virtually exterminated the Indians, and I don't think they had to do a lot of moral agonizing about it first. And it wasn't a gentlemanly war either. We deliberately left smallpox-infected blankets for the Indians to find, knowing that the Indians had no natural resistance to the disease. When we raided Indian villages we killed everybody, young and old, male and female, just like they did when they raided a White settlement. To our ancestors, the choice was: get rid of the Indians, or give up and go back to Europe. I doubt that moral qualms led many to go back to Europe so as not to have to kill Indians. To virtually all of them it was more moral to conquer the land for their descendants and to increase the territory and the power of their race than to let the Indians keep the land. Theirs was the morality of survival, the morality of life.

A couple of things have changed since those days. First, we had a much stronger sense of identity, a much stronger sense of racial community, then than now. When it was a matter of Whites versus Indians, everyone knew whose side he was on. Second, we lived much closer to Nature then. We had not been softened by so much security and so many comforts, and reality was something we had to deal with every day in order to survive.

Actually, I've oversimplified this example of Whites versus Indians. By the 19th century some East Coast White liberals had decided they were on the Indian side. They were Whites who had been safely established in the cities for a couple of generations and softened thereby, and they didn't have to face Indians on the frontier. They wrote books, gave lectures to groups of gentlemen, and preached Sunday sermons to the credulous that idealized the Indians as "noble savages," ignored the horrible atrocities committed by the Indians against White settlers, and emphasized White depredations against the Indians. Fortunately, by the time their activities began to have much effect on public opinion or government policy, the Indians were pretty well

finished; otherwise the population of the United States today might look much like that of Mexico.

Today the process is somewhat similar, but in reverse. Back in the 1960s nearly all of us already were too soft, too comfortable, too secure, and the propagandists for a new morality, the morality of surrender and death, already had poisoned our souls. We had to treat the Blacks fairly, we believed. We must not accuse the good Jews along with the bad Jews, along with the Zionists. We must not advocate anything that would punish the innocent with the guilty. We had to have a just cause before we could do anything. But now, with the hour of decision at hand, with the grim reality of racial extinction before us, some of us are beginning to understand that the morality of survival is a higher morality than the morality of fairness. I hope that the books I have written, and the lectures and sermons I have been giving, as unpolished and ungentlemanly as they are, have had some small part in bringing this understanding to some of our people.

It is time now for the polite chatter at fashionable dinners and cocktail parties to give way to hardheaded talk and planning aimed at saving our people and saving our civilization, no matter what it takes, no matter how unfair we must be in claiming this planet for our descendants. Perhaps the polite and gentlemanly Americans holding back now may find some much-needed courage in news of developments in polite circles overseas. In Britain, for example, the Jews and their hangers-on in the government and the media have been complaining bitterly for the past month about a remark the French ambassador, Daniel Bernard, made at a very polite dinner party in London. Ambassador Bernard described Israel as "that shitty little country" and asked, "Why should we be in danger of World War Three because of these people?"

The Jews are bemoaning the fact that not only did Bernard have the courage to make that comment, but that others at the dinner party agreed with him. I'll quote from a story in the December 23 issue of the London newspaper, *The Independent:*

Representatives of Britain's Jews fear that "polite society" is embracing anti-Semitism and making it appear acceptable. It is being nurtured, they say, around the dinner tables of London's "chattering classes" where Jew- and Israel-bashing has, according to some, become *de rigueur*. Jo Wagerman, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, said: "Anti-Semitism is raising its head again. It has become acceptable for the first time in 50 years. People who have a respectable veneer can express these views in public and now get support rather than condemnation. I think much of what is expressed is anti-Zionist in content but within that is a very strong anti-Semitic element."

And it's not just polite society in Britain and in France that is beginning to talk at least a bit more frankly about the world's Jewish problem. Academics, journalists, government officials, and intellectuals throughout the Muslim world, from Iran to Indonesia, are showing increasing willingness to speak out not just about Israel and not just about so-called "Zionists," but about all Jews, about Jews as a race whose monomaniacal scheming poses an enormous danger to the whole world. There always has been an undercurrent of anti-Jewish thought and feeling in most Muslim countries, but in most cases it was only an undercurrent. In official circles it was denounced. The Jews in America would complain to the U.S. government whenever an anti-Israel cartoon appeared in an Egyptian newspaper or the foreign minister of Syria made an anti-

Jewish comment in public. The U.S. government would obediently threaten the offending country with unpleasant consequences if the offensive behavior continued, and the appropriate officials in that country would promise to crack down on it.

That situation has been changing during the past couple of years, however, and especially since September 11. Now the governments throughout most of the Muslim world no longer are trying to suppress criticism of the Jews but are participating in the effort to inform their people of the Jewish menace. The influential Saudi Arabian daily newspaper, *Al-Watan,* published a long, two-part article last month, on December 8 and 9, that I might have written myself. It talked about the Jews' ambition to control the world, from Old Testament times to the present. It went into their scheming before the First World War to use the war to advance their interests, and it went into Jewish media control in depth, pointing out that the Jews everywhere work to undermine the racial and national solidarity of their host countries. *Al-Watan,* like all of the newspapers in Saudi Arabia, is financed by the government. And at least one major Islamic newspaper in the United States, *Muslims*, published in New York, has been reprinting the texts of several of these *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts. The chattering classes in America may be a bit behind those in France and Britain and Saudi Arabia, but I do have hopes that they will begin catching up -- soon.

The Culture of Lies

A time-honored saying is, "All is fair in love and war." Certainly, it seems a reasonable saying and one in accord with Nature. It expresses the fact that when at war even otherwise honorable men resort to trickery, deceit, and outright lying. In a strictly personal conflict a man may feel obliged by his sense of honor to be truthful; at least, it used to be that way before we got so much democracy and multiculturalism, and we still had some understanding of the concept of personal honor. But when a nation or a race is at war, and survival depends upon victory -- or at least, upon avoiding defeat -- a man must think of more than his personal honor; he must put the survival of his people above all else, and he must do whatever is necessary to win.

It's stretching things a bit, however, when we lie in order to make our job of beating up someone much smaller and weaker a little easier for us. When our government lies not because it's a matter of national survival but just for the sake of convenience, that should be troubling for all of us. That's the case of our propaganda war in Afghanistan, for example. We drop leaflets with doctored photographs and lies all over the place, in order to turn the people against their former Taliban leaders and Osama bin Laden. We should be saying simply, "We're coming for you, Osama bin Laden, and we'll get you." Instead, we try to make our job easier by lying outrageously.

Well, lying is the way of democrats and multiculturalists -- and that includes Republicans -- but I question whether or not it really makes our job easier. We air-dropped leaflets on Afghanistan with a phony photograph of Osama bin Laden wearing a Western suit and with his beard shaved and his hair cut short and announced that he had given up the fight so that he could escape to a life of luxury and ease in the West. That really didn't fool anyone, and it was a completely unnecessary lie. Then a little later Mr. Bush produced a video tape that he claimed had been found in an al-Quaida hideout and showed Osama bin Laden confessing, in effect, to the September 11 attack. Should we be surprised when Muslims all over the Middle East don't believe Bush and denounce the video tape as phony?

Actually, I believe it very likely that Osama bin Laden was behind the September 11 attack, and I think most Muslims believe that too. But I and a lot of other people are very skeptical about Mr. Bush's very convenient video tape. Perhaps it's genuine, but I'm not inclined to believe that just because George Bush or Donald Rumsfeld or any other lying politician says it is.

The fact is that politicians are so accustomed to lying about everything that they don't even stop to consider the consequences of their lies. If a lie seems more convenient than the truth at any moment, they lie -- and not just to little people they're beating up at the moment. American politicians will lie just as readily to their fellow Americans as they will to Afghans or Pakistanis. And one can hardly blame them, because the American people have come to expect it of them and don't seem to hold it against them. Teddy Kennedy murdered his girlfriend Mary Jo Kopechne and lied outrageously about it, and yet he's still in the U.S. Senate today. Bill Clinton lied outrageously about nearly everything, and the voters reelected him.

And as I said, it's not just Democratic politicians. George Bush may not be as skillful a liar as Bill Clinton, but he's just as much a liar. That's the democratic way. We live in a culture of lies, a culture shaped for us by the controlled mass media, in which lying not only is acceptable, it is required whenever it helps the cause of Political Correctness. Consider the current twittering in New York about the 19-foot bronze statue being erected in honor of the city's firemen. The statue is based on a news photograph of three New York firemen raising an American flag, Iwo Jima style, on a mound of rubble at the site of the former World Trade Center. The three firemen who raised the flag are all White men, as are 94 per cent of New York City's firemen, and the Whiteness of the firemen raising the flag can be seen quite clearly in the news photograph.

Well, that's a Politically Inconvenient fact, and so the 19-foot statue based on the photograph will show one Negro fireman, one mestizo fireman, and one White fireman raising the flag. Naturally, the White firemen who actually raised the flag on the rubble were not happy when they saw the multicultural model for the statue, and neither were many of their fellow White firemen.

Tough luck. I suspect that the media bosses, the politicians, and the Jewish businessmen who favor the multicultural statue will have their way, and groups of schoolchildren who are shown the statue will be told that it's an actual depiction of the flag-raising. I'm surprised they didn't include a female fireman and an Asian fireman helping to raise the flag and show a couple of gay firemen fondling each other in the background.

Perhaps it's unfair of me to put too much blame on politicians and Jewish businessmen for this sort of lying and distortion of reality for the sake of Political Correctness. Gentile businessmen seem about as willing to lie as Jewish businessmen. Jesse Jackson, the Black rabble rouser, con man, and extortionist whose empire seems to be collapsing now, made a very good living for many years by persuading businessmen -- most of them Gentiles -- to lie about race for him. With the Jewish media backing him, Jackson would threaten White businessmen with Black boycotts unless they multiculturalized their operations to his satisfaction -- and kicked in a nice, big payoff to Jesse himself. Jesse would demand that the White businessmen hire Black executives, picture Blacks in their advertising, and subcontract to Black-owned businesses.

Instead of standing up to Jackson and calling him an extortionist, virtually all of the White businessmen decided it would be cheaper to pay him off, make the changes in personnel and advertising and subcontracting he demanded, and pretend that they liked it. They paid for advertising showing White women cuddling up to Black men in order to please Jesse and pretended that they were doing this of their own free will. They wanted everyone to know that they were on the multicultural bandwagon. To me, this is at least as bad as the sort of lying the politicians do.

And the Gentile academics and publicists are just as crooked these days. There was a bit of nervous twittering among academic historians last month when a supposedly scholarly study of firearms ownership in 18th-century America by an Emory University history professor, Michael Bellesiles, turned out to be fraudulent. Bellesiles claimed to have studied thousands of 18th-century probate records and found that very few American families -- fewer than 10 per cent -- actually owned firearms in the 18th century; therefore, the legislators who wrote the Second

Amendment obviously didn't intend to guarantee the right of individuals to keep and bear arms, just militias. Well, that pleased the nutcase feminist gun-control crowd, but as it turned out, Bellesiles had faked it. Professional historians professed embarrassment and outrage over Bellesiles' chicanery, but what Bellesiles did in trying to scuttle the Second Amendment is quite innocuous compared to the fraud committed by thousands of other professional historians, who don't have to worry about being called to account for their deceit.

I'm talking about the historians of the Second World War and related subjects, such as the so-called "Holocaust." Every academic historian worth his salt understands that nearly all the histories of the Second World War are fraudulent through commission, omission, or both, yet almost none of these historians will challenge the fraud in the way Bellesiles' work has been challenged. Why is that?

The reason is that Jews as a whole have a vested interest in the fraudulent version of the war and of the "Holocaust." Anyone who questions even the smallest detail of the fraud is attacked viciously as a "Holocaust denier" or a "Nazi sympathizer." In the case of gun control, nearly all Jews are for it, but they don't have the vested interest in it that they have in the "Holocaust" and a number of other myths about the Second World War. So it is still permissible to be objective in writing about the history of firearms ownership in America -- but it is not permissible to write or teach anything contrary to revealed dogma about the Second World War. Even the historians who aren't partisans of the Jews and who don't want to lie don't have the courage to be truthful.

Imagine that a history professor is teaching his students 20th-century history, and to avoid violating any taboos he teaches the approved, "kosher" version. He teaches that in the years prior to the Second World War the Germans wanted the Jews out of Germany, but he doesn't explain why. He doesn't talk about what the Jewish commissars were doing to Russians and Ukrainians in the Soviet death camps. He doesn't mention the murder of millions of kulaks by the communists, and he doesn't mention the extraordinarily high percentage of Jews in the Soviet bureaucracy and in the Soviet secret police and among the administrators of the Soviet death camps. He doesn't tell his students that while these things were kept quiet by the media in the United States, the media in Germany talked openly about them, and the German people were aware of how the Jews had turned on the helpless Gentiles under communist rule and butchered them by the millions. He leaves his students with the impression that the German desire to get the Jews out of Germany was entirely irrational or was based on jealousy of Jewish wealth and success.

When he talks about the year preceding Pearl Harbor, he is not likely to mention that the Roosevelt government was so hot to get the United States involved in the war against Germany at the behest of the Jews that the United States was waging undeclared war against Germany in the Atlantic, hoping for an "incident" that could be used as a pretext for full-scale hostilities, but that the German Navy was under strict orders not to respond to U.S. provocations, or that when the Pearl Harbor attack came it was more of a surprise to the Germans than it was to the war party in the Roosevelt government, which previously had broken the Japanese naval code. He leaves his students with the impression that the United States wanted only peace, and the Germans wanted only to wage war against us in their mad campaign to conquer the world.

When he talks about the behavior of the various combatants during the war, he is likely to follow the Jewish party line and paint the Germans as barbarians who committed more atrocities than anyone else, and to paint the Jews as the principal victims of the war. He may not feel obliged to repeat all of the more fanciful Jewish lies, such as Jews being skinned by the Germans to make lamp shades and then boiled down to make soap, but he certainly will not describe these lies for what they are, and he will not challenge the central myth of "six million" innocent, blameless Jews killed in "gas ovens" by the wicked Nazis. He will skim lightly over the genocide committed by the Soviets against the Germans, the Poles, the Balts, and other nationalities during and after the war, and he will not even hint at the leading role played by the Jews in this genocide. He is likely to leave his students believing the oft-repeated lie that the so-called "Holocaust" was the greatest crime ever committed.

Is such a history professor less culpable than the most mendacious politician? I think not. And what about the professor of biology or anthropology who, knowing of the profound differences in mentality, in psychology, in inborn behavioral patterns that separate the races, lets his students use a textbook that asserts the sameness of the races and fails to point out this lie? Should he be forgiven for betraying the trust placed in him simply because he wants to keep his job?

As I said, we live in a culture of lies. It's not just the politicians and the businessmen and the teachers and the news reporters who lie to us: it's everyone to whom the Jews have a string tied, and that means most people involved in shaping the popular culture: advertisers and entertainers and editors and publishers and writers and the rest. Here's an example: the February issue of *Playboy* magazine has been on the newsstands for a couple of weeks now. There's an article in the magazine titled "Virtual Reich," with a subhead that reads:

Fascism is back, featuring a strange cast of Islamic fundamentalists, skinheads, and homegrown terrorists. Here's the sinister part: they're all talking to one another.

It's a trashy article in a trashy magazine, but it mentions me at length, and that was my reason for choosing it as an example. And with a circulation of more than 3 million copies each month and probably half again that many readers, *Playboy* does have a significant role in the popular culture. The article is almost entirely make-believe. It has a few quotations from things I've written, a few quotations from other people, most of whom I've never met or even corresponded with, and then it throws us all into one pot and stirs us up as if we're part of a giant, worldwide, terrorist conspiracy: me along with Muslim fundamentalists, German and English nationalists, anti-abortionists, Tim McVeigh and Ted Kaczynski, nutcase Christian millennialists, environmental activists, and elderly SS veterans -- just about everyone the Jews don't like. It's not only the basic theme of the article that is wrong -- claiming one giant conspiracy where there is none -- but the details are chock full of errors too. It's clear that no one bothered to check the article for accuracy.

But of course, no one really cared about truthfulness or accuracy in this article: certainly not the publisher or any of *Playboy's* editors or the author, Mike Reynolds, who used to write for the Southern Poverty Law Center, the ultra-sleazy Jewish propaganda outfit run by direct-mail fund raising huckster Morris Dees. The purpose of the article was to frighten America's Joe Sixpacks and Sally Soccermoms, to send a cold shiver down their spines with the specter of all the bad

guys who want to throw a crimp into their mall shopping and ballgame watching, ganging up on them. If you can scare them more easily by lying, then lie.

That's the American spirit these days. The politicians lie, the teachers and professors lie, the media people lie, the businessmen lie, the magazine writers lie, and for the most part the American people don't care. Just keep those shopping malls well stocked and keep plenty of ball games on TV, and they don't care. It's the acquiescence of the American people in all of this lying, rather than the liars themselves, that convinces me that the end times are near. At least, I hope so.

You know, a few minutes ago I mentioned that before the Second World War the Germans wanted to get the Jews out of their country, and I told you part of the reason for that. The Germans saw what the Jews were doing to the Russians and the Ukrainians, and they didn't want to give the Jews a chance to do the same thing to them. From the end of the First World War in 1918 until 1933, there was combat in the streets of Germany's cities between the communists, whose leadership was heavily Jewish, and the Nazis. There was a real danger that the communists would win and take over Germany the way they had taken over Russia. And the German people also knew the role the Jews had had in bringing the United States into the First World War, causing Germany's defeat, and leaving the country open to the possibility of a communist takeover.

But these weren't the only reasons the Germans wanted to be rid of the Jews. The Jews were very influential in Germany after the First World War. They were strongly entrenched in the legal profession, in banking, in advertising and merchandising, in show business, in organized vice, in publishing and other media. They were trying hard to change the spirit of Germany. They were pushing modernism in art, music, and literature. They were pushing for "diversity" and "tolerance." They were ridiculing German tradition and culture and morality and the German sense of personal honor, trying hard to make young Germans believe that it was "cool" to be rootless and cosmopolitan. They were promoting the same culture of lies that they have been promoting here.

That was the so-called "Weimar" period, because right after the First World War some important government business, including the ratification of a new German constitution, took place in the city of Weimar. The Jews loved the Weimar period, but it was, in fact, the most degenerate period in Germany's history. The Jews, of course, didn't think of it as degenerate. They thought of it as "modern" and "progressive" and "cool." Really, it was a very Jewish period, where lying was considered a virtue. The Jews were riding high. Many books have been written by Jews in America about Weimar Germany, all praising it to the skies and looking back on it with nostalgia. Even without the so-called "Holocaust," they never have forgiven the Nazis for bringing an end to the Weimar period.

There was a Hollywood film made 30 years ago, in 1972, about Weimar Germany. The film was called *Cabaret,* and it starred Liza Minelli. It depicted Berlin nightlife, with all its degeneracy, including the flourishing of homosexuality, and also depicted the fight between the communists and the Jews and the other proponents of modernism on the one hand and the Nazis on the other hand. The Hollywood filmmakers, of course, were solidly on the side of the degenerates and

portrayed the Nazis as the bad guys, but this film is another example of the Jews outsmarting themselves. The Jews who made the film saw everything from their viewpoint, through their own eyes, and the degenerate Gentiles under their spell also saw things from the Jewish viewpoint, but the Jews apparently didn't stop to think -- or didn't care -- that a normal, healthy White person would view things differently. Check it out for yourself. *Cabaret* is still available in video stores.

The point I am making is this: In the 1920s, after the First World War, the Jews were trying to do to Germany what they began doing to America after the Second World War, in the 1960s. Many Germans, the healthiest elements in Germany, resisted the Jews' efforts, just as many Americans have resisted the Jews' efforts in America. In Germany the Jews were a bit premature. Although they had much of the media under their control, they didn't control all of the media. They tried to move too fast. The healthiest Germans resisted and beat them.

In America, in the 1960s, the Jews had almost total media control before they began their big push, and they proceeded more carefully. In America they are winning. The culture of lies has prevailed in America. It's still possible for Americans to win, but it's going to be a lot tougher this time. We'd better get started. The first step is to regain at least partial control of our media, so that we can begin contradicting the lies. This *American Dissident Voices* broadcast is a part of that first step.

Multicultural Justice

Last Sunday I listened to a Harvard Law School professor advocate a return to the use of torture to extract information and confessions from suspects. The professor was Alan Dershowitz. That's the Jewish lawyer who helped get O.J. Simpson acquitted in 1995 after he cut the throats of his wife and her boyfriend. Ironically, Dershowitz also has a reputation as a civil libertarian.

Dershowitz was interviewed by Mike Wallace on the CBS program *60 Minutes*, which made the entire scene appropriately Jewish: a Jewish interviewer, Wallace; a Jewish interviewee, Dershowitz; and a television network owned by the Jew Sumner Redstone. I say "appropriately Jewish" because, despite the waffling and qualifications and opposing opinions about the use of torture by the government to obtain confessions, the net effect of the program -- and really, it was the intended effect -- was to leave viewers with the thought that, although some people are against it, it is not an entirely bad thing for the government to torture suspects, at least in some cases. It is not unthinkable.

Dershowitz's argument is that when torture may save lives it is justified: for example, when the government is holding someone who may have knowledge of a bomb that is set to go off at an undisclosed location. Tear his fingernails out to find out whether or not he really does know something about a bomb. If he admits that he does, then use a red-hot poker to find out where the bomb is and when it is set to go off. Hundreds of lives may be saved. If the poor bastard really didn't know anything about a bomb -- if the secret police had the wrong man -- well, hey, all he's lost are his fingernails. Seems like a reasonable trade-off, doesn't it: one man's fingernails against the possibility of saving hundreds of lives? Alan Dershowitz thinks that's a fair trade. The FBI, which has been hinting that it may need to use torture to do its job of protecting the public from terrorists in the future, thinks it is too. The Israeli government, which tortures Palestinian prisoners whether it suspects they know something about a bomb or not, agrees.

Of course, the people who founded this country and wrote our Constitution thought the government should be prohibited from torturing prisoners under any circumstances. They forbade it absolutely. They were willing to sacrifice lives, including their own, to uphold that and the other provisions of the Constitution. They believed that certain principles are even more important than saving lives.

But, hey, what did they know? They were completely out of touch with the problems we face today. They were all White racists and male chauvinists, and most of them didn't even own flush toilets. How could they know how important it is for us to feel secure from terrorism while we're watching our ball games or shopping in our malls?

OK, let's drop the sarcasm. Alan Dershowitz isn't advocating torture as a means of saving American lives. He believes that torture may be useful here to safeguard Jewish interests, just as it is useful in Israel for that purpose. That's all the man cares about. Fundamentally, he's not a lawyer or a civil libertarian; he's not an American; he's not even a fellow human being. Alan Dershowitz is a Jew, and that says it all. He understands that the United States, by letting itself be used as Israel's bully boy, leaves itself open to further terrorist attacks from Muslims and

other victims of Israel. He wants the U.S. government to have all the weapons at its disposal that may be helpful in defeating Israel's enemies. He is convinced that the torture of suspects can be a useful weapon -- as long as those suspects are enemies of Israel, enemies of the Jews, of course.

I'll guarantee you that Dershowitz would be singing quite a different tune if the people we needed to torture in order to find out where the bomb is hidden were Jews. I'll guarantee you that he is not in favor of torturing members of the Jewish Defense League to find out about the next mosque bombing they have planned. I'll guarantee you that he would not have been in favor of torturing the Israeli spy, Jonathan Pollard, to find out all of the U.S. military secrets Pollard stole for Israel and that Israel in turn sold to China. That is likely to cost us many lives some day, but you can be certain that Alan Dershowitz doesn't believe that we should have tortured Pollard in order to gain information that may minimize the number of casualties we'll suffer in a conflict with China.

Well, that's another subject. Today I want to talk about what people like Dershowitz have done to the American system of justice. Scrapping our prohibition against torturing people to make them confess is the least of it. The whole judicial system in this country has become terminally corrupt. Most of the same outward forms are maintained that we had 200 years ago, but in its actual workings and in its spirit the system has been thoroughly corrupted. But instead of talking in generalities about this problem, I'll give you some specific examples.

Six months ago my organization, the National Alliance, organized a public protest demonstration outside the German Embassy in Washington. We were protesting the lack of free speech in Germany. Germans, of course, lost their freedom of speech and their right to keep and bear arms and other freedoms, along with much German territory and many German lives, when they lost the Second World War. Germans are prosecuted these days for writing or saying Politically Incorrect things -- even for being caught listening to Politically Incorrect music or reading Politically Incorrect books. We thought it would be nice to tell the German government that it shouldn't put people in prison for what they say -- that it's time to restore to the German people some of the civil liberties they had until 1945 -- and we also thought that the American public should be made aware of the lack of freedom in Germany. Most Americans don't know that Germans can be imprisoned for what they say, that many Germans are sitting in prison now for having made a Politically Incorrect comment in public.

So my organization held a demonstration outside the German Embassy last July 29 to make a public issue of this lack of freedom in Germany. We did everything strictly according to the law. We obtained a permit for our demonstration from the government of the District of Columbia. We notified the police well in advance, so that they would be prepared to control traffic at the demonstration and maintain order. We showed up at the appointed time and began marching in an orderly fashion along the sidewalk outside the German Embassy with our signs.

Then a gang of 40 or so Jews and communists, many of them wearing masks and carrying weapons, arrived on the scene. Two of these, one a Jew and the other a Caribbean mulatto, attacked the National Alliance member, Billy Roper, who was coordinating the demonstration. In full view of the police and news cameramen, they struck Billy in the head with a tire iron and a heavy lug wrench, cutting a nasty gash above his right eye and breaking a bone in his eye socket.

The police arrested the two attackers at the scene. The two were later identified in the newspaper of the Progressive Labor Party, a violent communist organization, as members of that group. The Progressive Labor Party newspaper praised the actions of its two members and urged more such attacks in order to prevent the National Alliance from holding further public demonstrations.

Despite our protests and all of the evidence presented to the prosecutor, the two communist thugs were charged only with simple assault, a misdemeanor, and they were released from custody on the same day they were arrested. Their trial came up in the Superior Court for the District of Columbia on the eighth of this month. The Assistant U.S. Attorney assigned to prosecute the case was a Negress from Nigeria. The two defense attorneys were Blacks. The judge was a Black. There was no jury, because the two communists asked to be tried by the Black judge only.

During the trial a videotape obtained from a news cameraman was played for the judge. It clearly showed one of the communists swinging a lug wrench at Billy Roper's head, with the other communist kicking him from behind. We also had eyewitnesses who had been at the demonstration, we had Billy Roper's medical records, we had photographs showing blood streaming down Billy's face from his wound, and we had the Progressive Labor Party newspaper bragging about the assault and urging its members to commit more such assaults. The Black judge ignored the evidence and on January 9 acquitted both communists.

Now, I can assure you that if the demonstrators at the German Embassy had been Jews demanding even further restrictions on German freedom, and if two National Alliance members had attacked one of the Jews with a tire iron, and the other circumstances were the same, our two members would have been charged with assault with a deadly weapon, assault resulting in serious bodily harm, assault with intent to kill -- all felonies -- and also with conspiracy to commit all of these felonies. If I had then bragged about the assault on one of my broadcasts, identified the assailants as members of the National Alliance, and urged more such assaults in order to keep the Jews from demonstrating, additional criminal charges of attempting to deny the Jews their civil rights would have been filed, and our two members would be looking now at sentences of 50 years each.

I'll tell you about another real example of the working of our judicial system. The unchecked influx of non-White illegal immigrants into the United States is a problem all across the country, but it is especially irritating to White residents in some areas that have received an unusually heavy influx of illegals, such as the suburbs of New York City. Especially heavily impacted is the Long Island town of Farmingville, where illegal immigrants are to be seen on street corners every morning looking for day labor, and the government does nothing about them. On September 17, 2000, two White men who live in Farmingville decided that they'd had enough. They picked up two illegal mestizos in their truck under the pretense of offering them work, drove them to a vacant building, and gave them a beating.

The two illegal aliens returned to Mexico after that, but the two White men, Chris Slavin and Ryan Wagner, were arrested and charged with assaulting them. Both White men were convicted, and on the ninth day of this month -- the same day the two communist thugs who attacked Billy Roper with a tire iron and a lug wrench were acquitted by a Black judge in the District of Columbia -- a Jewish judge in New York, Stephen Braslow, sentenced 20-year-old Ryan Wagner

to 25 years in prison. Earlier, 29-year-old Chris Slavin also was sentenced to 25 years in prison for beating up the two illegal aliens.

It's interesting to compare these two assault cases, which wound up on the same day this month, isn't it? Now, I realize that we never did have a perfect system of justice in America, and that going on trial always was a little like playing Russian roulette. But I think that in the past -- before the Second World War, for example -- judges and juries and prosecutors more often than not actually wanted to see justice done. They wanted to see the guilty punished and the innocent acquitted. It used to be a White man's system, and it worked moderately well.

If 65 or 70 years ago two communist thugs, one a Jew and one a mulatto, had attacked a law-abiding White citizen on a sidewalk in the nation's capital and tried to keep him from peacefully expressing his opinion by beating his head in with a tire iron, they would have been lucky to be sentenced to only 25 years in prison. If 65 or 70 years ago two young White men, exasperated by the failure of the government to keep illegal non-White aliens out of the country, had taken it upon themselves to beat up a couple of them, they might have been fined for disorderly conduct, but they certainly wouldn't have had their lives destroyed by being sentenced to 25 years in prison.

And the difference isn't just that what used to be a White man's justice system is now substantially polluted by a heavy infusion of non-Whites, with Black and Jewish judges and prosecutors everywhere, especially in the eastern metropolitan areas. Everyone in the system, including the Whites, has been corrupted. The Blacks and Jews and other non-Whites are feeling their oats, of course, and are enjoying their opportunity to use the White man's own system against him. They don't even bother to apologize when they commit judicial atrocities of the sort they committed on January 9 that I have cited here. Their attitude is, "Hey, Whitey, we're in charge now, and we're going to stick it to you, and there's nothing you can do about it." And the White lawyers remaining in the system, instead of fighting the corruption, are going along with it. They're not only terrified of being accused of being "racists" if they don't go along; they're jumping on the bandwagon with enthusiasm, as eager to demonstrate their anti-White bias as the Blacks and Jews, and they are sticking it to any poor White person who falls into their clutches in any case that has racial overtones.

Here's another example: Last month two young members of the National Alliance were arrested in Philadelphia and charged with several felonies, including "ethnic intimidation" and something called "institutional vandalism," which is the vandalizing of an "institution," such as a church or a synagogue, and causing more than $5,000 damage. The judge set their bonds at $50,000 each.

What had they actually done? They had put a National Alliance sticker on a "no parking" sign. The sticker said, "Don't catch AIDS!" and warned White women not to have sex with Blacks, citing the fact that heterosexual Black males are 14 times as likely as heterosexual White males to be infected with HIV. Because the sticker mentioned Blacks it was called "ethnic intimidation." Because the "no parking" sign was on a chain-link construction fence around a memorial to Vietnam veterans -- that is, an "institution" -- it was called "institutional vandalism." How the judge figured that more than $5,000 damage was done to the "no parking" sign by a gummed sticker is a mystery.

Actually, in a city such as Philadelphia, which certainly has one of the most corrupt establishments in the country, there's not even an effort made to justify such charges. The local politicians and bureaucrats figure they don't have to justify themselves. They are the law, and you'd better watch out! If you try to exercise what you thought were your Constitutional rights in their town, they'll lock you up in a hurry. And I'm talking now about White politicians and bureaucrats. A Philadelphia-area newspaper, the *Burlington County Times*, reporting on the arrests, quoted a police captain, Thomas Quinn -- solidly Irish, judging from the name. Said Captain Quinn:

This is not something we're going to take lightly. If you come into the city, and we catch you doing this, you're going to be charged with felonies.

Did you catch that? Captain Quinn says the Philadelphia Police Department isn't going to take it lightly if someone comes into Philadelphia and expresses a Politically Incorrect opinion. If someone puts up a Politically Incorrect sticker he will be charged with felonies. What Captain Quinn meant, but didn't say, is that if you're White, you'll be charged with felonies. Certainly, if you're a Black and you put up a sticker that says "Black Power!" Captain Quinn isn't going to mess with you. No judge is going to charge you with a felony for that. The White judicial and law-enforcement establishment in Philadelphia knows that if a Black got charged with multiple felonies for putting up a sticker, the Blacks would riot, and every Jewish lawyer in the city would be screaming for the offending White police official or judge to be fired.

Philadelphia, like New York and Washington, is undoubtedly a bit worse than most of the rest of the country, but we can see the same tendency everywhere. And you know, it shouldn't be like that. Our Constitutional rights should be respected by the police and the courts without our having to threaten to riot. That's the way it used to be, when we had a White man's system. That's when principles were more important than comfort and security or Political Correctness. What has happened?

I'll tell you what's happened. First, we let Jews infiltrate and begin taking over our mass media: the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the weekly news magazines, Hollywood, Madison Avenue, the TV networks, and eventually all the rest. Through the media they began pumping Jewish spiritual poison into our society: egalitarianism and White guilt. This paved the way for the multicultural insanity that has corrupted our justice system and is now destroying Western civilization. In the 1960s this primed our young people for the so-called "counterculture revolution": the revolution in which Jewish gurus taught our young people that principles don't matter; that if it feels good, do it; that only the individual and what he wants is important; that race and nation and tradition and culture are irrelevant; that it's every man for himself.

And so now we have a justice system in America in which not even the White judges and prosecutors care about justice but only about what is good for their careers in a Politically Correct system. And with such a system, it only makes sense to take the next step and begin using torture to get confessions. Jews like Alan Dershowitz will continue to push that idea, a step at a time, and the yahoos who have little American flags tied to their car antennas will cheer the Jews on, believing that it's only Muslim terrorists who will have their fingernails torn out, and that using torture on Muslims will allow the yahoos to watch their ball games in greater safety.

But I'll guarantee you that ultimately it's not just Muslims that Dershowitz and his tribe have in mind when they advocate torture: it's you and I; it's everyone who stands in the way of the total supremacy of their tribe.

One final thought today: Do you remember the enormous hullabaloo back in 1998 when three White men in Jasper, Texas, picked up a Black hitchhiker, beat him up, and then killed him by dragging him behind their truck? The trials of the White men became a media circus, and murder convictions and death sentences were guaranteed, as the local judicial system and also the local White lemmings fell all over themselves to do what the media expected of them.

Late Friday night of last week there was another killing of a hitchhiker in Jasper, Texas. A man was given a ride in a pickup truck by four other men, and when the hitchhiker refused to give them $50 they decided to kill him. They began beating him, and when he tried to escape they chased him along a country road in their truck and ran him down. Then they deliberately ran their truck over him and killed him, leaving his crushed body on the road. The big difference between the killing last week and the one in 1998 is that the victim last week was a White man, 44-year-old Ken Tillery, and the four men who deliberately ran their truck over his body are Blacks. Have you seen or heard anything about this murder in the media? There was a very brief Associated Press report on it this Monday, January 21, but very few newspapers have printed that report. Do you think there will be a big hullabaloo and a show trial with demands for the death penalty the way there was after the 1998 killing? Don't count on it. We now have a multicultural justice system, and we deserve it.

Media-Driven Law

Last week we talked about the corruption of America's judicial system, and I mentioned a few specific examples of this corruption. It's a very big and very important subject, though, and we ought to explore it further.

I'll talk about more examples of corruption in a minute, but first let's look at the general context, at the overall framework of law in American life. The men who founded America and wrote our Constitution understood the need for a government and for laws. They understood that the country couldn't survive, couldn't maintain its identity and its independence, without a government to provide certain essential, collective functions, such as national defense. They also understood the need for laws and a judicial system, without which there will be only mob rule or some other form of tyranny, and civilization cannot flourish.

But the Founding Fathers also were basically suspicious of government. As determined as they were to provide a framework of law that would allow citizens to live without the threat of domination by mobs or tyrants or foreign invaders, they were at least as determined to protect citizens from the unchecked power of government. They believed in the minimum amount of government and the minimum number of laws necessary to protect the independence of the country and the freedom of its citizens and provide for the most essential needs of civilized life. They believed that the government should not restrict the freedom of citizens or intrude upon their private affairs any more than absolutely necessary. They believed that to the greatest degree possible, individual citizens should be responsible for their own behavior and their own welfare. It was not the government's business to tell people how to conduct their own affairs or to keep them from hurting themselves or to take care of them if they wouldn't or couldn't take care of themselves.

Well, of course, such an ideal system couldn't last. Even if the average genetic quality of the population had been maintained, the mere fact of increased population density and increased urbanization required more laws and more government simply to maintain order. And of course, the average quality of the population wasn't maintained. The strongest immigrants were the first to arrive, at a time when there still was a frontier to be conquered and a lot of hard and dangerous work to be done. After the frontier was won and life had become much easier, the weaker, less independent immigrants were willing to try life in America, and things have gone downhill ever since. The Civil War and the subsequent release of millions of freed slaves into the population was a blow to the system from which it couldn't recover without drastic measures, and those measures never came. On top of this there was the increasing feminization of public life throughout the 20th century: the increasing demand for more services, more guarantees, and more protection, along with less concern for freedom.

All of these things were bound to change the system, even if there were no malice involved. And there was malice. There is malice. There are those whose goal throughout the last century has been the subversion of our system of laws and government, those whose goal has been to use our system to take away what remains of our freedom, then to enslave us and plunder our civilization, and eventually to destroy us. Their instruments of subversion are the mass media of

news and entertainment. And they always have had allies aplenty among the masses of envious and resentful ne'er-do-wells, among the irresponsible and amoral climbers, and among the ever-so-greedy rich hoping to become even richer by collaborating with the enemies of our people.

On top of these the enemies of America have created whole new classes of allies by encouraging and promoting certain pathologies in our own people--homosexuality and feminism, for example--and then giving these pathological groups a vested interest in the destruction of the old order, in which their sickness was neither encouraged nor tolerated. This is the age-old tactic of divide and rule, but it has been applied during the past century with an especially fiendish degree of ingenuity.

What we see today, in fact, is a huge array of groups, large and small, with various vested interests in the continued corruption of our system of laws and law enforcement. We have employers so greedy for profit that they encourage the continued influx of illegal aliens and discourage the enforcement of immigration laws just so they'll have a supply of cheap labor. We have a huge welfare class receiving handouts or benefits from the public treasury ranging from food stamps to rent subsidies to special tax deductions, who will fight--or at least will vote--to keep the laws in place that provide their benefits--and I'm talking only about the White welfare class. These welfare laws never should have been enacted. They are the work of greedy politicians aiming to buy votes with other people's money. We have a lot of people in comfortable or prosperous or prestigious positions today who wouldn't have gotten where they are if they'd had to depend on their own merits in competition with others, so instead they managed to get legislation enacted requiring employers to give them preference in hiring and promotion. And again, I'm talking only about White people. If we add the damage done to our system of laws by non-Whites scrambling to gain advantages for themselves, we have a real mess.

In the midst of all of this complexity and all of this complicity in the ongoing corruption of American laws and government, however, there is a central thread pulling it all together, a primary corrupting force that has motivated and facilitated most of the damage that has been done, and that primary corrupting force is made up of the mass media of news and entertainment--or more accurately, the Jewish minority that effectively controls the mass media. I'll mention some recent events that illustrate the way in which this central role is played by the media.

I mentioned one of these events in last week's program, and that was the murder last month of a White hitchhiker in Jasper, Texas, by four Blacks who chased him along a country road in their pickup truck, ran him down, and then deliberately ran their truck over his body and left him lying dead in the road. As I said last week, there was a January 21 Associated Press report on this murder, but almost no newspapers or other news media have picked it up. The average American couch potato still hasn't heard a word about it.

Compare that with the dragging death of a Black in Jasper by three White men in 1998. The Jewish media gave that 1998 killing non-stop publicity for months on end. I myself was interviewed at least a dozen times about it simply because the media wanted to emphasize the racial angle and so they needed to associate a White racist, namely me, with it--and besides, one

of the three Whites reportedly had read a book I wrote. The media message in 1998 was: "Isn't White racism awful? White racism was responsible for this gruesome murder. White racism is murder!"

We heard that message over and over and over again. Even now, nearly four years later, whenever they do a special on racism or on "hate crime" or something similar for television, they talk about the 1998 Jasper dragging, portraying the Black victim as a choir boy and a credit to his community, whereas he actually was a convicted felon and a habitual drug abuser. And while you and I can see through this propaganda trickery, and such a message only makes us angry at the Jews behind the trickery, 95 per cent or so of Americans believe whatever they are told to believe by television. They don't see the puppeteers; they just see the puppets, and they believe. They chatter among themselves at their churches and in their beauty parlors: "Isn't it just awful what happened in Jasper? It's because those three Whites are racists! Isn't White racism awful?"

And when the lemmings absorb such a message, it does have a big effect on the way in which America's system of government and laws works. The politicians scramble to take a Politically Correct position--and among the politicians are the judges and the prosecutors and the chiefs of police. And the lemmings themselves, feeling the sense of White racial guilt the Jews' propaganda was meant to make them feel, are determined to atone for their guilt by punishing someone severely.

And it is all a media production: if there's no media propaganda, there's no Politically Correct posturing by the politicians, and there's no feeling by the lemmings that they have to punish someone. That's the way it is with the murder last month in Jasper. Because the media aren't interested in it, neither is anyone else. And the similarity in the two murders is amazing. In both cases, a group of lowlifes in a pickup truck in the little East Texas town of Jasper offered a ride late at night to a lowlife of a different race that the lowlifes in the truck were at least casually acquainted with. In neither case was there any prior plan, any conspiracy to kill anyone. In both cases, at some time during the ride an argument ensued, with the lowlifes in the truck administering a beating to the lowlife to whom they had given a ride. And then the lowlifes in the pickup truck killed the other lowlife in an especially atrocious way: in one case by dragging him behind the truck until he was dead, and in the other case by chasing him in their truck as he ran along the road, running him down, and then killing him by deliberately driving their truck over him and crushing his body. In both cases the killers drove off and left the body of their victim lying in the road.

Why did the media bosses decide to make an enormous hullabaloo--a real media circus --out of the first Jasper killing and to ignore the second one? Obviously because of the one significant difference in the two cases: in the first case the killers were White, and the victim was Black; and in the second case the killers were Black, and the victim was White. This doesn't mean, of course, that the Blacks who killed the White hitchhiker Ken Tillery in Jasper last month won't be prosecuted, or that the Whites who killed the Black, James Byrd, in Jasper four years ago wouldn't have been prosecuted if the media had ignored that killing. But the difference in media coverage nevertheless does make a big difference, not just in the way in which the law is applied to the immediate case, but also to the changing climate of the laws and government for future cases.

Justice is traditionally portrayed as a blindfolded woman holding a sword in one hand and scales in the other, but today the blindfold really isn't doing its job. Today Justice is peeping under the blindfold so that she can see to do the Politically Correct thing. And she has a Jew whispering into her ear just to be sure that she makes decisions that not only are Politically Correct but that also don't inconvenience the arbiters of Political Correctness themselves.

In past broadcasts I've talked about the breakdown of law and order in Russia in the wake of communist rule. The communists--which is to say, the Jews--sucked the country dry and then headed for greener pastures. At least most of them did. Some Jews stayed behind to squeeze still more blood out of the Russian people. In several broadcasts we've looked at the trade in White sex slaves centered in Israel. Jewish organized crime gangs kidnap Russian and Ukrainian girls--or in some cases lure them to Israel with the promise of employment as secretaries or housekeepers or nannies--and then force them to work as sex slaves in Jewish brothels.

Other Jewish crime gangs in Russia exploit Russian children for the pedophile market around the world. I reported in my broadcast of October 7, 2000, the breakup of a child pornography ring operating from Moscow and selling videos of Russian children, some of them only two or three years old, being raped, sexually tortured, and even murdered. There actually are perverts who obtain sexual gratification from viewing such horrors, and child pornography is big business. The child-porn videos coming from Moscow sell for hundreds or even thousands of dollars to pedophiles in the West. The pornographers in Moscow obtain children from Russian orphanages by bribing corrupt administrators at the orphanages, or they simply kidnap them from public parks or playgrounds. My report of October 7, 2000, was based on the breakup of one child-porn operation in Moscow after an investigation by Italian police and postal officials of the shipment of videos from Russia to pedophiles in Italy. In that report I quoted from a Reuters news dispatch datelined Naples, Italy, September 27. I'll read you again what I quoted in my report:

Police said on Wednesday they had arrested eight Italians suspected of belonging to a child-pornography ring that traded videos over the Internet, including films of Russian children who were abused to death. Police specializing in Internet crime told reporters that their 19-month investigation had given them enough information to begin investigations into 1,700 people suspected of buying the material over the Web.... They said three people in Moscow ran an operation to kidnap children from orphanages, circuses, and public parks and film them while they were forced to commit sexual acts. Police said they had intercepted some 3,000 tapes and CDs and digital video discs of child pornography, including some involving children only several months old.

These arrests were big news in Italy, where TV newsmen horrified millions of Italians by broadcasting excerpts from of a couple of the child-porn videos on a prime-time national television news program. I reported that the newsmen responsible for the broadcast were immediately fired by the news director of the government-run network, Gad Lerner, a Jew, who obviously was very unhappy that the news had gotten out.

Perverts in the United States also buy child-porn videos from Russia, and I commented in my report of October 7, 2000, that in the United States there was practically a media blackout on the Italian investigation and the subsequent arrests in Italy and in Russia. But there was an

Associated Press release on September 29, two days after the arrests. I'll quote a few lines from that release:

...[P]olice said they had broken up an online international child-pornography ring, arrested eight Italians and three Russians, and seized thousands of videos and photographs. The Russian-run ring, which distributed an explicit catalog on the Internet, catered to clients in the United States, Germany, and Italy. Its inventory included films of children being tortured and killed.

...Investigators say the pornography ring produces and distributes images showing children as young as two years old being sexually abused. Some of the victims reportedly were stolen from orphanages, others from families. Its catalog offers films of killings for about $20,000 and images of people having sex with children for about half that.

That Associated Press release from September 29, 2000, was virtually ignored by news media in the United States.

Then on January 4 of last year a man described by Federal authorities as the U.S. West Coast distributor for a child-pornography ring operating in Moscow was arrested in Walnut Creek, California. That was Seth Bekenstein, a Jew. And at the time I thought, "At last! Now the media cannot avoid reporting this filthy business to the American people. There will be a hearing and a trial for Bekenstein, and the whole story will come out."

But of course, the story didn't come out. The mass media did avoid reporting anything about Bekenstein's arrest or his trial. Even the big newspapers in California were silent. The American public remained completely ignorant of the whole business.

Do you understand what Bekenstein was doing? He was selling films to thousands of American perverts that showed Russian children and infants being raped, sexually tortured, and murdered. He was a part of the operation that kidnapped, raped, sexually tortured, and murdered these Russian children. Without people like Bekenstein to sell the films, the business couldn't have operated. He was placing wholesale orders to Moscow for more films, new films, and wiring the money that kept the operation going. He was as guilty as the people who actually did the kidnapping, raping, torture, and murder.

Well, last month, on January 4, exactly a year after his arrest, Seth Bekenstein, who has been out of jail on bond the whole time, was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment after pleading guilty. That's just 18 months for being a major part of an operation involving the most horrific criminal activity imaginable--18 months for raping, torturing, and murdering hundreds of White children for the gratification of unspeakably perverted freaks. And there still hasn't been a peep about Bekenstein or the child-pornography operation in which he was engaged in any major media outlets in the United States. So far as the TV-watching public is concerned it never happened.

Imagine how differently the Bekenstein case would have been handled by the courts if the Jews had decided that it served their interests to make a *cause célèbre* of it. Imagine what would have happened to Bekenstein if the Jewish media had given him the 1998 Jasper, Texas, treatment. Gruesome excerpts from the films he was peddling would be shown on prime-time TV in

America night after night. TV crews would have interviewed some of Bekenstein's customers and had them tell everyone how much they enjoyed seeing little girls or little boys sexually tortured. There would have been tearful interviews with the Russian parents of some of the kidnapped children. The Jews would have kept this up week after week and month after month, until the lemmings all across America finally had gotten it and were screaming for Bekenstein's blood.

And, behold!, the Federal prosecutor would have seen the light and realized that Bekenstein had not only violated a law against sending child porn through the mail, he also was guilty of kidnapping, rape, and murder. And the judge would have seen the light too. And Bekenstein would be sitting on death row now, hoping that the other inmates didn't get their hands on him before he got his lethal injection.

But the Jewish media bosses had no interest in punishing their fellow tribesman for his exploitation of Russian children. After all, the children were only Gentiles, only *goyim.* And their fellow tribesmen in Israel were making a very good living in the sex-slave trade, exploiting the older sisters of these Russian children. Why stir things up? And they didn't even have to tell the prosecutor and the judge in the Bekenstein case to take it easy on Seth. The court system already has become so corrupted in America that the prosecutor and the judge understood without being told that they shouldn't be too hard on Bekenstein. And now this depraved monster will be back in business again in a few months.

I'll sum it up for you: our whole system of laws and government in America has become media-driven. Until we drag the filthy creatures controlling the mass media of news and entertainment out of their offices and drive stakes through their hearts, the system will only become more and more corrupt.

The Martyrdom of Wafa Idris

I am sure that nearly all patriotic Americans are so embarrassed now about the Bush government's activity in the Middle East that you don't really want to hear more about it. I understand and sympathize with that feeling, but I think that the Middle East situation nevertheless merits more serious commentary.

It is quite clear now that what I announced from the beginning about the Bush government's war aim in the Middle East was right on target. The aim was not primarily to catch or kill Osama bin Laden; it was to replace the Islamic fundamentalist government of Afghanistan with a puppet government that would accept handouts from the United States and do whatever it was told to do: thus ending Afghanistan's independence, bringing it under Washington's control, and eliminating Afghanistan as an obstacle to Israeli policy in the Middle East. This war aim, though never openly admitted by the Bush government, was justified to the American people with much baloney about the mistreatment of Afghan women by Muslim fundamentalists and the importance of "restoring democracy" to Afghanistan. So what we did with all of our cruise missiles, laser-guided bombs, and so-called "daisy cutters" was overthrow the real government of Afghanistan and replace it with a coalition of gangsters willing to accept bribes from Washington and headed by a yes-man who will say to the TV cameras whatever he is told to say.

Does this make America more secure or serve genuine American interests in any other way? Well, it does insure a much larger supply of heroin on America's streets and school playgrounds. Afghanistan used to be the world's largest source of opium, heroin, and related drugs. The Taliban government put an end to that, for religious reasons, by outlawing the growing of opium poppies. The first act of the gangster government installed by George Bush and headed by Hamid Karzai has been to scrap the ban on opium production. It is a big source of money for the gangsters--and "gangsters" is indeed the proper term for the motley assortment of warlords who have been armed and financed by the United States and who now have replaced the Taliban government, at least in Kabul.

While American aircraft continue to bomb areas of stubborn patriotic resistance in Afghanistan, the Bush government is making plans for attacking the next country on Israel's hit list, as soon as the munitions factories can replenish its depleted supply of cruise missiles. George Bush, in fact, is carrying out step by step the program demanded by Jewish leaders in Israel and the United States immediately after September 11. I remember especially well former Israeli prime minister Binyamin Netanyahu stating that the United States must not stop with finding and punishing those responsible for the September 11 attack, but it must eliminate every government that might conceivably permit hostile elements to operate from its territory, and he had in mind specifically Afghanistan, Iraq, and Iran. We must eliminate every possibility for future terrorism, he demanded, and we must do it now.

Jewish organizations and their neo-conservative camp followers in this country made similar demands, the controlled media indicated agreement, and everyone in the Bush administration saluted and shouted, "Yes, sir!" in unison.

There's a famous photograph that has been given a wide circulation recently in many publications. It was taken on December 11 in the East Room of the White House during a memorial ceremony for the victims of the September 11 attack. It shows George Bush posing with his right hand over his heart as if pledging allegiance to the flag, but the only flag visible is an Israeli flag, filling the entire right side of the photograph. When I first saw this rather startling photograph I thought that the White House photographer must have inadvertently framed this picture the way he did. But certainly, it was no mistake. It was a carefully posed photograph, and it was approved by the White House for release to the news media. Its message is clear: "I, George Bush, pledge allegiance to Israel. I am an obedient servant of the Jews. I and my government stand ready to carry out your orders." If you haven't yet seen this photograph, you can easily find it on the Internet. I suspect that your interpretation will be the same as mine.

And really, this explains many things in addition to the current war we are waging in the Middle East to replace all of the governments in that part of the world with ones more to the liking of the Jews, regardless of the cost to America. It explains why when George Bush or anyone in his administration rages on television about how the United States will wage war against terrorism to the very end, that any government that sponsors terrorism or harbors terrorists will suffer the same fate as Afghanistan, Israel is never mentioned. The politicians and media people completely ignore the fact that Israel engages in more state-sponsored terrorism--more state-sponsored car bombings, political assassinations, and other acts of terror--than any other country in the Middle East. They also ignore the fact that Israel's prime minister, Ariel Sharon, is a terrorist and a war criminal, and despite his record, whenever he comes to Washington he is treated as an honored guest.

Sharon is on the verge of having an international arrest warrant issued for him by a court in Belgium on account of his arranging the mass murder of thousands of Palestinian civilians in the Sabra and Chatila refugee camps in Lebanon in 1982. Two weeks ago a Lebanese Christian militia leader, Elie Hobeika, alleged to have been one of Sharon's accomplices in the 1982 massacre, met with Belgian investigators and agreed to testify against Sharon in a war-crimes trial. Just two days after that, on January 24, Hobeika was assassinated by a radio-controlled car bomb outside his home in Beirut which also killed three of his bodyguards. The assassination bore all of the earmarks of a Mossad "hit." A fine fellow, Sharon. Fine people, those Israelis. And there's not been a peep out of the Bush administration about this particular act of terror. And the mass media here are pretending that it didn't even happen.

Bush's East Room photograph beside the Israeli flag also explains why the U.S. government maintains the pretense that it is attempting to arbitrate a peace settlement between Palestinians and Jews, while at the same time supporting the Jewish war of genocide against the Palestinians and severely condemning any effort by the Palestinians to defend themselves. Israeli Prime Minister Sharon sends out his assassination teams on a daily basis, while George Bush continues to shake his hand, hug him, and give him enormous amounts of U.S. financial and military aid, but whenever the Palestinians make any move at all to defend themselves, the Bush government echoes Sharon's demand that Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat arrest the Palestinians responsible. Arafat is in the doghouse now, shunned by every politician in Washington, because he has not been arresting enough of his own people to satisfy Sharon. When the Palestinians recently attempted to purchase a shipment of arms from Iran to defend themselves, the Bush government

acted as if Arafat had been caught red-handed in a criminal act. Every Palestinian who strikes at the Jewish occupiers of his homeland, at the Jewish oppressors of his people, is denounced as a "terrorist" not only by the Israelis but also by George Bush and every other politician in Washington.

Two weeks ago, on January 27, another of these Palestinian "terrorists" carried out a suicide bombing in Jerusalem, killing one Israeli and wounding 100 others. The bomber was Wafa Idris, a 27-year-old Palestinian woman who lived in Ramallah and worked as a volunteer nurse, riding in ambulances and providing emergency care in field hospitals for Palestinians wounded by Israeli soldiers. Wafa was no wild-eyed Muslim fundamentalist or fanatical Palestinian nationalist. She was not involved in politics and was not even considered to be a Muslim by her friends and family. She didn't even wear the traditional head covering for Palestinian women. She was described by everyone who knew her as a friendly, open, caring, and fun-loving young woman. She used her spare time to give free lessons in language and mathematics to children in the Ramallah refugee camp. She simply had had enough of seeing her people humiliated and brutalized and murdered by Jews. She had had enough Palestinian children die in her arms after they were shot by Israeli soldiers. She had taken care of enough Palestinian children who had lost an eye or a leg at the hands of the Israelis.

She herself had been shot at repeatedly by Israeli soldiers while she was on ambulance duty and was wearing her Red Crescent uniform, and on three occasions she had been wounded by rubber bullets. Israelis consider shooting at Palestinian medical personnel to be a sport. On January 27 Wafa had had enough and decided to hit back. The spokesmen for America's controlled media consider her a "terrorist." So do George Bush and Donald Rumsfeld and John Ashcroft and Dick Cheney, and all of them vow to continue their war against terrorism and against terrorists such as Wafa Idris. And the mindless, TV-watching yahoos with little American flags on their cars cheer the Bush team on. To them also, Wafa was a terrorist.

Well, maybe so. But let me tell you, when America fights against idealistic young women like Wafa Idris and for murderous thugs like Ariel Sharon, it should be clear to everyone but the most clueless, flag-waving yahoos that we are fighting on the wrong side. And let me tell you something else: people everywhere in the world are beginning to understand this: not just Palestinians; not just Muslims; not just people who don't like Jews, but ordinary people everywhere who have any sort of clue about what's actually happening in the world, people everywhere who pay attention to the news and care about more than the latest ball-game scores.

More and more of them, like Wafa Idris, have simply had enough of Jewish lies and Jewish arrogance and Jewish bullying. They're fed up. They've had enough of the Jews' using their "Holocaust" tales from the Second World War to excuse their behavior and silence criticism. They've had enough of Jews worming their way into everything, trying to take over everything, trying to tell everyone else what to do and what to say and what to think. They're sick of Jewish television, of Jewish corruption, of Jewish self-righteousness, of Jewish meddling.

In the past most people were inclined to give the Jews the benefit of the doubt. They were afraid of being thought anti-Semitic. But now, from India to England, from Argentina to Australia, from Brazil to Bangladesh, people have had enough of the Jews. Their patience with the Jews

has run out. They want the Jewish monkey off their backs and off other people's backs too. A real shift in attitude toward Jews is taking place around the world. The funny thing is that the Jews, who usually have very sensitive antennae for what people are thinking about them, for the most part don't seem to realize now that a profound change is taking place. Maybe they're just too drunk with their own power, too impressed with the fact that they have a ring in George Bush's nose and the U.S. armed forces at their disposal. And the politicians and the others that the Jews have corrupted don't seem to realize what's happening either.

But I can sense it, and many others around the world can sense it. Certainly the Palestinians can sense it. The martyrdom of Wafa Idris has had a powerful effect on them. Women simply have not done before what she did. They left the bombing and the shooting to the men, but now thousands of Palestinian women vow that they will follow in Wafa's footsteps. She has become a Palestinian superhero, a model for Palestinian women to emulate. Huge posters of her have appeared all over Palestine. There will be more martyrs like Wafa Idris, many more, and disgust with the Jews will continue to grow around the world.

The problem for the Jews is not just that the number of Palestinians they have to worry about attacking them suddenly has doubled. It is not just that the Palestinians have gained new inspiration and new determination. The Jews' problem goes beyond the Middle East. In occupied Palestine the Jews will respond to the Palestinians with more repression, more brutality, more arrests and torture and assassinations. Ariel Sharon may have his Mossad murder squads knock off other witnesses who might testify against him in a war crimes trial. But around the world the hostility against the Jews will continue growing.

The mere fact that the government of Belgium is moving to put the prime minister of Israel on trial for genocide, that Belgium is moving against the very symbol of Jewish power and influence in the world, is a remarkable phenomenon in itself. That couldn't have happened a few years ago. It couldn't happen in the United States today, of course. But it is happening in Belgium, and similar developments will occur elsewhere.

The Jews will try to counter this by cranking out more "Holocaust" films from Hollywood, by forcing all school children to read *The Diary of Anne Frank* and go on field trips to the nearest Holocaust Memorial. And that will work to keep the yahoos and most of the other lemmings in line. And certainly the politicians will continue to take orders from the Jews as long as the Jews continue to own or control most of the mass media of news and entertainment. George Bush will continue his blather about the "axis of evil" and will denounce as "evil" any country or government or group or individual that refuses to take orders and will threaten to annihilate anyone he designates as "evil" with all of the high-tech military might at his disposal.

But in the long run none of that will be enough. No matter how many witnesses to his crimes Ariel Sharon orders murdered, awareness of those crimes will continue to spread; more people today are willing to talk about Sharon's genocide than were willing to do so five years ago. No matter how many cruise missiles George Bush fires at Iraqis or Iranians or others who won't knuckle under, hatred against the United States and Israel will only grow, and patriots everywhere who value the freedom and independence of their people will come to see America as the greatest threat to that freedom and independence. No matter how often the controlled news

media denounce martyrs like Wafa Idris as "terrorists," more and more people everywhere will understand who the real terrorists are. No matter how often George Bush denounces uncooperative patriots in other countries as "evil," more and more people around the world will know that it is he and his associates and the Jews for whom they work that are really evil. No matter how many new laws are passed forbidding people from criticizing Jews or exposing their lies, under the guise of outlawing "hate," more and more young people everywhere will see the Jews for the deceivers and corrupters and destroyers that they are.

Part of the reason that the Jews and their camp-followers will fail is Wafa Idris.

And part of the reason is that it's harder for them to keep secrets now than it was 50 years ago. Fifty years ago I might have had all sorts of important information, but it would have been much more difficult for me to share that information with you. There was no Internet, and generally the media of mass communication were accessible only to the very wealthy. Now I am able to distribute information and ideas to you and to the public through a dozen different media: through leaflets and stickers and pamphlets and posters and hundreds of books and other printed materials, and through recorded telephone messages, and through music and video compact discs and tapes, and through AM and shortwave broadcasting, and through the Internet.

Part of the reason they will fail is arrogance. The Jews have never been more arrogant and obnoxious than they are today. They believe that it is no longer necessary for them to be cautious. The politicians who take orders from them seem to believe the same thing. They believe that they can do anything they want and then lie their way out of it if they're caught. They believe that as long as they have the baseball fans and the Sally Soccermoms and the mass media on their side--as long as they can count of the votes of the lemmings and the support of the Jews--it doesn't matter what anyone else thinks about them. Remember Bill Clinton, who thought that he could lie and charm his way out of anything? Remember George Bush's September 11 lie that America was attacked only because "Osama bin Laden hates our freedom," and that the attack certainly had nothing to do with the U.S. support of Israel's aggression in the Middle East? The Jews and the politicians don't expect intelligent people to believe their lies. All they care is that the lemmings believe them. But believe me, in the long run it does matter what intelligent and responsible and honest and patriotic people believe.

And part of the reason is that the danger to you and to me and to the whole world of letting the Jews and their gangster underlings continue to run wild, bombing nations into submission, replacing governments that refuse to take orders, passing laws to stifle any criticism of their behavior, destroying populations and cultures with their insane immigration policies, greedily grabbing for more and more control, poisoning the minds and souls of young people everywhere with their television propaganda, and lying about everything--the danger of all this is more apparent now than it ever was, more imminent, more threatening. In the past we all tended to ignore it, to put off doing anything about it as long as we could, but there is a growing understanding that we can't continue to put it off and evade the consequences. We must act against the Jews and the gangsters. September 11 helped to convince us of that.

We are in for some unpleasant times. The fighting will be dirty on both sides. There will be no Geneva Convention rules. The gangsters will claim that their opponents, being "evil," are not

entitled to humane treatment. There will be more torture and more shooting of unarmed prisoners. The sort of cold-blooded murders carried out by the U.S. military at Uruzgan, near Kandahar, two weeks ago will become much more common and will be justified by the Bush gang and their successors on the basis that the people who were shot were "evil." Indeed, we wouldn't even have heard about the January 24 Uruzgan massacre if Bush's troops hadn't made a mistake and accidentally slaughtered their own collaborators. And no matter how atrocious things become the yahoos will continue to wave their flags and do what they're told.

Yes, things will be very nasty for a while, and much that is good will be lost. But ultimately the Jews and their collaborators will be destroyed, and there will come a time to begin rebuilding. We will build a saner, cleaner, more beautiful world. Let's begin preparing for that now. Let me hear from you.

Enron, Fastow, and the Looting of America

This Enron thing becomes more interesting every day. Business and finance are not my strong areas, and so I don't talk much about them. The Enron collapse, however, has some very interesting political and Jewish angles. We can see some fascinating parallels with other recent financial catastrophes in the United States.

The general pattern is this: Jews will move into an area of economic activity and with a lot of fast patter and sleight of hand persuade the Gentiles in charge that they are financial geniuses who can benefit the economy generally with their activity and along the way can make a lot of money for any Gentiles fortunate enough to be allowed to collaborate with them. The greediest among the Gentiles climb on board, and for a while there is a flurry of activity, with a great deal of money changing hands and moving to and fro. Then the bubble bursts, the Gentiles all find that their wallets are missing, and the Jews claim that it wasn't their fault, while they count their profits.

Remember Michael Milken, Ivan Boesky, Marty Siegel, Dennis Levine, and the insider-trading scandal that nearly wrecked Wall Street a dozen years ago--and incidentally bankrupted tens of thousands of ordinary Americans who lost their investments as a result of the artificial manipulation of stock prices? Every major actor in that scandal was a Jew.

Remember the enormous savings-and-loan catastrophe during the 1980s that ended up costing American taxpayers 500 billion dollars? A big part of the reason for the collapse of the savings-and-loan industry in the 1980s was the huge investments in so-called "junk bonds" by so many savings-and-loan institutions. Junk bonds are bonds issued by corporations in need of cash that are unrated by Standard and Poor's or Moody's because they are considered too risky, but which have much higher yields than rated bonds. And the man behind the junk bonds --the financial genius persuading the savings-and-loans to buy them--was none other than Michael Milken. At the height of his junk-bond promotions, Milken had a personal income of more than $500 million a year: a fast-talking Jewboy, still in his 30s, taking home more than half a billion dollars a year in personal income by selling junk bonds to savings-and-loan institutions.

Well, that bubble eventually burst, and it took hundreds of banks and savings-and-loan institutions with it. Hundreds of thousands of ordinary Americans had their life savings invested in these institutions. By the time the bubble had burst, however, Milken already was a billionaire several times over. There was much chatter in the media and in the Congress about the failures of all of these financial institutions, much dark talk about foul play, but nothing ever came of it, primarily because many politicians--including members of both Bill Clinton's family and George Bush's family--had accepted money from Milken or from one of the failed savings-and-loans. With so many corrupt but powerful people standing to be burned if a thorough investigation and exposé took place, none ever did, and the scandal was allowed to die quietly with the full collaboration of the mass media.

A few politicians were thrown to the wolves to protect the rest--the most notable sacrifice being Speaker of the House Jim Wright, who was forced to resign from Congress in 1989 as a result of

his involvement. And remnants of the scandal continued to haunt a few of those involved for years--Bill and Hillary Clinton, for example, who were targets of the so-called "Whitewater" investigation--but most of the perpetrators were never called to account for their crimes and were allowed to sneak away with their loot. The real victims of the looting of America's savings-and-loan institutions ended up being you and I and the rest of America's taxpayers, who were forced to cough up the $500 billion lost when the institutions collapsed.

I hope that you will forgive me for expressing my suspicion that if so many of the principals involved hadn't been Jews the mass media would have had a lot more to say about the savings-and-loan disaster of the 1980s.

It wasn't until Michael Milken hooked up with fellow Jews Ivan Boesky, Marty Siegel, and Dennis Levine and tried his hand at insider trading that the law finally caught up with him. In 1990 he was sentenced to ten years in prison and forced to pay back $600 million of what he had stolen, a small portion of his ill-gotten loot. He ended up serving less than two years, and that time was spent in a minimum-security, "country-club" prison.

Do you remember Martin Frankel, who stole more than $200 million dollars from insurance companies in five states and then fled the country in 1999 as police were closing in? Probably you don't remember Frankel, because, despite the magnitude of his theft, there was very little publicity about him in the media.

Do you remember Sholam Weiss, the ultra-Orthodox New York rabbi who plundered $450 million from the National Heritage Life Insurance Company in Florida, in the largest case of insurance theft in U.S. history? He stole the life savings of more than 25,000 mostly elderly Americans who had all of their retirement money invested in the insurance company. He was convicted in an Orlando, Florida, federal court in 1999 on 78 counts of racketeering, wire fraud, interstate transportation of stolen property, and money laundering. Weiss, who amazingly had been permitted by the court to be free on bond during his trial, immediately jumped bail and fled the country with a substantial part of his loot. He was sentenced in absentia to 845 years in prison. He was arrested in Austria last October, but on January 10 this year the Austrian government, sensitive to charges of anti-Semitism, decided not to extradite him. There has been even less publicity about Weiss than about Frankel, despite the unique magnitude of his theft.

Do you remember the New Square Four, the four Orthodox Jews in the all-Jewish town of New Square, New York, who set up a phony Jewish school, a *yeshiva*, that existed only on paper, and then collected more than $40 million dollars in government grants for their non-existent school? They are Chaim Berger, Kalmen Stern, David Goldstein, and Jacob Elbaum. When they got caught and sent to prison in 1999, they ran straight to the Clintons for help, and it is quite clear that a deal was struck. When Hillary ran for the U.S. Senate in New York the following year, the residents of all-Jewish New Square voted almost unanimously for her, giving her 1,359 votes to 10 votes for her opponent Rick Lazio. And a few weeks later, hours before leaving the White House, Bill Clinton commuted the sentences of the four Jewish swindlers, in effect canceling their prison terms. When they were sentenced in 1999 they were ordered by the court to repay the stolen $40 million, but to date not a cent has been recovered from them.

Certainly you remember Marc Rich and his partner Pincus Green. They're the two Jewish criminals who got the most attention last year when they received last-minute pardons from Bill Clinton. They are international commodities speculators who broke a great many laws in their wheeling and dealing and stashed away a few billion dollars for themselves while doing it. When they were indicted for racketeering, wire fraud, and a number of other felonies, they fled the country with their money. Rich has given an estimated $200 million to Israel and an unknown amount to Bill Clinton to buy his pardon. That caused a bit of a stink last year, but it seems to have blown over now.

Rich wasn't even indicted for his most serious criminal activity, which was his collaboration with Jewish gangsters in Russia in the looting of Russia's wealth following the collapse of communism there. In a massive swindle known as "privatization," Jewish bureaucrats in the Soviet government sold Russia's factories and mineral wealth to Jewish "businessmen" in the private sector. The theory was that the businessmen would utilize these resources more productively than the Soviet government had, thus benefiting the Russian economy. But the sales of Soviet property actually were "sweetheart" deals that amounted to giveaways, and the Jewish businessmen who received the property were interested primarily in getting their loot safely out of Russia. Rich did that for them and made hundreds of millions of dollars for himself in the process.

And now we have the collapse of Enron, the huge gas-pipeline and energy conglomerate in Houston. When it went down it took the life savings of thousands of employees with it. Sound familiar? Members of George Bush's family had their hands in Enron's operations up to their elbows. Sound familiar? And, digging through the rubble of Enron's collapse and turning over a very large flat stone at the bottom of the heap, what do we find but another Jewish "financial genius" blinking at the light and trying to scurry away like a startled cockroach, a bulging suitcase full of money in each hand. Sound familiar?

Enron's chief financial officer was Andy Fastow. He went to work for Enron in 1990 and was given the position of CFO in 1998 at the tender age of 36, because his fast talk had convinced Enron's Gentile officers that he was a financial genius and could make a lot of money for them. Over the next two years, in fact, Fastow made a lot of money for himself, squirreling away more than $50 million in personal gain. He did that with a lot of fast sleight-of-hand and intricate financial deals that eventually brought about the collapse of Enron and the pauperizing of thousands of Enron's employees, who had all of their retirement money tied up in the company. Not Fastow, though: he had sold his Enron stock just before the collapse.

Fastow made most of his personal gains during the time he was the CFO of Enron by using his position to engage in private dealing on the side, often at the expense of Enron, the company whose interests he was supposed to represent. He was able to get away with this and other financial shenanigans by "cooking the books" as they say, so that it was very difficult for anyone but himself to know what was going on or what Enron's true financial situation was. But certainly he knew that his creative financing had gotten Enron into very serious trouble when he unloaded his own shares in the company at a substantial profit. He continued to tell other shareholders that the company's future was very rosy, however, even though he knew that the

collapse was imminent. As in the case of Michael Milken, Andy Fastow is described by the rabbi of his synagogue as a nice Jewish boy who gave generously to Jewish charities in Houston.

There are a number of investigations underway now into the collapse of Enron, and Andy Fastow may, like Milken, end up in prison for a while and be required to repay a portion of what he stole. Some of the investigations are fueled by the hope of Democrats to implicate George Bush in the scandal, as payback for the Republican effort to implicate Bill and Hillary Clinton in the savings-and-loan scandal through the "Whitewater" investigation. We'll see. But Fastow's Jewishness provides a motive for other very powerful interests--including the media--to let the whole matter die as soon as possible, the way the matter of the looting of America's savings-and-loan industry was allowed to die.

There's a lesson in all this. It's not that Jews are the only crooks who steal from the American people. George Bush is a crook, and he's not a Jew. Bill and Hillary Clinton are crooks, and they're not Jews either. Other Enron executives, who aren't Jews, collaborated with the chief financial officer in bringing about the ruin of the company. In fact, Jewish crooks such as Milken and Rich and Fastow would have a hard time stealing anything if they weren't able to play on the greed of Gentile crooks and enlist Gentile collaborators, such as the Bushes and the Clintons. There probably are more Gentile swindlers in America than Jewish swindlers, simply because Gentiles outnumber Jews 40 to one in the overall population.

No, Jews aren't the only crooks, but they're certainly the biggest crooks. If you hear about a 100-thousand-dollar swindle, it could be anybody. If you hear about a 100-million-dollar swindle, then you know that it has to be a Jew. Why is that? Why are most of the biggest swindlers Jews? Is it because they're smarter than Gentile crooks?

Perhaps. Certainly, Jews have certain traits to a stronger degree than non-Jews, on the average. They are more verbal. They can keep the average Gentile distracted with a flow of words while they pick his pocket. They are myth-makers. They seem to have a knack for spinning fanciful yarns skillfully enough to entrance Gentiles. This is a marketplace skill that they must have inherited from hundreds of generations of forebears who made their living in exchange, in buying and selling, in camel trading and money changing, in selling underwater real estate, rather than in productive work.

Jews also are much more effectively networked than Gentiles. A Gentile crook is more likely to work alone. A Jewish crook is more likely to have a number of other Jews as accomplices in one way or another. Milken and Rich are outstanding examples of this. Milken did his insider trading in cahoots with several other Jewish crooks. When Jewish gangsters in Russia were looking for the best way to smuggle their loot out of Russia, they naturally turned to another Jew, Marc Rich. After Milken and Rich were caught they had many Jews working for them behind the scenes to help them avoid punishment. The whole Jewish town of New Square, New York, pitched in to obtain freedom for Berger, Stern, Goldstein, and Elbaum.

Perhaps the biggest advantage a Jewish crook has is that he is an outsider. A Gentile swindler is nearly always stealing from fellow Gentiles, from his own people, and he realizes that he is committing not only a crime but also a moral offense in doing so. If he is caught he becomes an

outcast among his own people, and that's a very serious matter, reflection upon which tends to limit his reach. A Jewish swindler is nearly always stealing from Gentiles, and that is something condoned by his religion and by long-established custom among his people. He may be punished by the Gentiles if he is caught, but he does not become an outcast in the eyes of his own people, and so he is not held back by moral considerations. His tendency is to reach further than a Gentile crook in his place would.

I should mention here that most Jews will deny that their religion condones stealing from Gentiles, but in fact it does, and they know it, as I have pointed out in earlier broadcasts. Those who have the time for it and the interest can make a study of the Talmud for themselves. For those who are interested but who don't have the time to delve into the Talmud, I recommend the books by the late Israeli professor Israel Shahak that are available from the sponsor of this program, National Vanguard Books. I don't know about Martin Frankel's or Marc Rich's religious beliefs, but Michael Milken and Andy Fastow are both synagogue-going Jews. The New Square Four, as Orthodox Jews, are steeped in the teachings of the Talmud. And certainly that is true of Rabbi Sholam Weiss.

Well, regardless of the reason, the fact is that Jews are much more likely to be 100-million-dollar swindlers than Gentiles are, and they're more likely to get away with it. And the fact also is that without greedy, crooked Gentile accomplices they wouldn't be able to swindle our people out of so much money. We get swindled by clever and tricky Jews like Milken and Rich and Fastow because we have let our system become corrupt. We have a corrupt political system, corrupt leaders. That's one of the most important lessons in the Enron collapse.

Actually, these Jewish swindlers who get caught with their hands in our pockets do us much less damage than Jewish swindlers--Jewish myth-makers--of a different sort. Feminism is a myth spun by fast-talking Jews and Jewesses that has done enormous damage to our people, individually and collectively. It is the principal reason that the White birthrate has dropped well below the replacement level. The matron saint of modern feminism is the Jewess Betty Friedan, and most of the influential propagandists for feminism also have been Jewesses. The Jewish mass media have without exception been promoters of this sickness.

The post-World War Two destruction of White America by opening our borders to the Third World has been the work of fast-talking Jewish myth-makers. While Jews in the Congress worked with Gentile collaborators to scrap the immigration law that had favored Europeans, the Jews in the media promoted the fatuous notion that since America is a nation of immigrants, the American thing to do is to let everyone from Asia and Mexico and the Caribbean and the Middle East become an American immigrant too.

The lying and subversive slogan "diversity is our strength" is the creation of fast-talking Jewish myth-makers. Multiculturalism has been built on Jewish myths about the biological equality of the races. It was a Jewish myth that was behind the September 11 attack on America: namely, the myth that Israel is America's "ally" and deserves America's support. The Jewish swindlers who made all of these myths depended heavily on the support of corrupt or foolish Gentiles for their success, just as Michael Milken and Andy Fastow depended on the collaboration of corrupt and

greedy Gentiles for the success of their clever, Jewish shell games with stocks and bonds and money.

Well, anyway, what we can hope for now is that the Enron investigations will stay alive long enough for a few perceptive Americans to appreciate fully the truly Jewish role played by Enron's chief financial officer, Andy Fastow, in bringing about the ruin of the company.

Beyond that, I suppose it is too much to hope that many Americans will gain a deeper understanding of the essential role that the corruption of our government and our society has played in allowing Jews like Milken and Fastow to do their destructive work. But it is a fact, as I have said before, that without our own weakness and corruption the Jews would have no opportunity to do their destructive work: no opportunity to exploit us or to hypnotize us with their myths. Curing that weakness and cutting that corruption out of our society is the biggest task we have before us.

Our Biggest Mistake

Last week we talked about a number of especially egregious Jewish swindlers of the past decade. In every case they stole from Gentiles with the help of other Gentiles. I pointed out that the cases I discussed were illustrations of the general rule that the really big swindlers are nearly always Jews, and that they nearly always depend for their success upon the corruption of America's Gentile political and business elites. Corrupt Gentile businessmen help them steal, and corrupt Gentile politicians help them get away with it.

There's a brand new case of a hugely successful Jewish swindler that I didn't have time to talk about last week: that's the case of Gary Winnick and the bankruptcy of his fiber-optics telecommunications company, Global Crossing. Winnick started Global Crossing just five years ago with a $35 million loan from some Jewish friends in the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. The next year, in 1998, after issuing himself 100 million shares of stock in his new company, he sold $735 million in shares to the public. In June 1999, shares in Global Crossing were selling at 62 3/4-- $62.75 a share. That gave Winnick a personal fortune of more than 6 billion dollars--in just two years.

That's amazing, isn't it? He went from nothing to the richest man in Los Angeles in just two years. He did it by spinning a tale about linking the whole world with a 100,000-mile network of fiber-optic cable and selling that myth to the media and to the public. But of course, linking the world with fiber-optic cable was not what was really on Winnick's mind. Raking in as much money as possible as quickly as possible with a lot of fast patter and sleight of hand was what was on his mind. He had learned his trade not as a fiber-optic network builder but as a fast talker working with his buddy Michael Milken selling junk bonds.

Really, Winnick had worked in the same office with Milken in New York selling junk bonds. Even after Milken had been convicted and sent to prison, Winnick was able to scam the public and sell shares in his new company, Global Crossing. Of course, he didn't advertise his former association with Milken, and the media collaborated by not mentioning it either, even as Global Crossing became a high-profile, celebrity company in 1999.

Winnick began unloading his shares when the price peaked in 1999 above $60. And of course, as always with these Jewish scams built on fast talk instead of on creative work, the bubble eventually burst. Last month Winnick's company filed for bankruptcy, declaring more than $12 billion in debt that it cannot pay. That's like stealing $12 billion from the public, from all the people to whom Global Crossing owes money, and then asking the government for protection. That's the fifth largest bankruptcy ever declared in America. Shares in Global Crossing are now selling on the stock exchange for about a nickel each. Global Crossing's employees who had their shares in 401k retirement plans were prohibited from selling their shares for five years, and have lost everything. While Winnick was unloading his stock in the company at $60 a share, his 17,000 mostly Gentile employees were locked in and had to go down with the ship. Does that sound familiar?

Another characteristic Winnick has in common with Michael Milken and Andy Fastow is that he is a big contributor to Jewish charities--and especially to Israel. Two years ago, when Global Crossing still was flying high, Winnick gave $40 million to the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles so that it can open a branch in Jerusalem. A recent issue of the *Jewish Journal of Los Angeles* reports that despite the bankruptcy of Global Crossing, Winnick continues to give generously to Jewish institutions. From his sumptuous $90 million estate in Beverly Hills, a steady stream of multimillion-dollar gifts continues to flow to Hillel houses at various universities, to the Jewish Museum in New York, to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, to the American Jewish Committee, to the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington, and to a number of other Jewish groups and causes. But not to those 17,000 mostly Gentile former employees of Global Crossing who went down with the ship.

As I said, it's amazing. It just shows what can be done with a little greed, a complete lack of scruples, and the help of the media and the politicians--and when one has a Gentile population that has been so thoroughly brainwashed by the media that it simply lets itself be fleeced repeatedly by these avaricious Jews without even a peep of protest lest it be accused of "anti-Semitism." Do you believe that there's a court in this land that will hold Winnick accountable for what he has done? If you do, then you're even more gullible than the folks he fleeced to get his $6 billion. No, Winnick will get clean away with it and will continue enjoying life on his $90 million estate and giving to his fellow Jews the money he took from us. Do we deserve any better? I think not.

And I want to emphasize again, the super-swindlers we have discussed here--Winnick and Fastow and Rich and Milken and Boesky and Frankel and Weiss and the rest--are not crooks who just incidentally happened to be Jews and might just as well have been Gentiles: no, their criminal activity is an essential expression of their Jewishness. They did what they did because they are Jews. That's why nearly all of the really big swindlers, the most outrageously brazen swindlers, the super-swindlers, the ones who steal $6 billion in just two years--are Jews.

This is something for the egalitarians to think about. It's something to be pondered by those who believe that all featherless bipeds are essentially the same, except for superficial cultural differences, and that, in particular, the only difference between Jews and Gentiles is that Jews have a somewhat different religious tradition from the rest of us. They believe that if a Jew is raised from early childhood in a Gentile family he will grow up indistinguishable from a Gentile in his behavior and his thinking, and that a Gentile raised in a Jewish family will grow up to be indistinguishable from the Jews around him. Jews themselves don't believe that. That's contrary to what their religion teaches them and to what they themselves feel.

I don't believe it either.

Of course, egalitarians also believe that men and women are essentially the same--or that they would be the same, except for the fact that our old-fashioned, male chauvinist society artificially forces men and women into different stereotypical roles. I think that fewer people believe that than believe that Jews and Gentiles are the same--except for the lemmings, of course, who will believe whatever they're told to believe. Which is to say, more independent thinkers accept the fundamental and all-pervasive differences between men and women than accept the fact that

there are very important inborn differences between Jews and Gentiles. Actually, I believe that even many lemmings, despite their dutiful affirmation of whatever TV tells them, deep down inside don't believe that men and women are the same.

Back to the differences between Jews and Gentiles: I mentioned inborn differences, but we shouldn't ignore the cultural differences, especially as expressed in religious differences. The Jews' religion is an expression of their racial character. It grew out of their character over a very long period of time. The Jews look back on nearly 6,000 years of history. To them this is the year 5762, and in fact, Jewish religious books actually are being printed now with this date in them. Of course, it's really their tribal history they trace back that far. It would be more accurate to say that their religion, in its present form, is about 3,000 years old. But the fact is that it is their tribal religion. They developed it themselves. It was never imposed on them from outside. And it is an intensely ethnocentric religion, a religion for Jews only.

Compare that with the two other Semitic religions, Islam and Christianity, both of which are universalist. Muslims and Christians believe that their religion is for everyone. Anyone, regardless of race, who professes belief, can be a Christian or a Muslim. Christians send out missionaries to convert the heathens--especially Black, Brown, and Yellow heathens. When Jews send out missionaries, it is only to bring strayed Jews back into the fold, never to convert those who are not already members of the "chosen" race. The Jewish religion reinforces character traits which already are embedded in the Jewish genotype. Neither Islam nor Christianity can do that to the same degree, because they didn't develop indigenously. They were imposed by fire and sword on non-Semitic peoples.

My point is that Judaism strengthens and reinforces the traits that led Michael Milken, Andy Fastow, and Gary Winnick to be so enormously successful at getting other people's money into their pockets, but the traits were already there. They were born with them. And I can think of no Gentile who has been as successful at that sort of thing: that is at fast patter and sleight of hand, at selling myths for hard cash. And the reason is not just because of a religious difference. As I said, Jews and Gentiles are different, just as men and women are different, just as Whites and Blacks and Asians are different.

In some cases, these differences are a good thing, and they work well together: as in the case of men and women, for example. As long as we have a properly structured society that takes account of these differences, a society that permits men and women to complement one another in a natural way rather than forcing them into unnatural competition, then the differences make us strong and healthy.

When we pretend that the differences don't exist, however, as between Gentiles and Jews or between Whites and Blacks, we leave ourselves open to very bad and unhealthy things. In the case of Jews we leave ourselves open to exploitation of the sort we have just discussed. We pretend that there is no difference between them and us, and so we aren't expecting to be exploited. Our guard is down. And then we are exploited. In the case of Blacks and Whites, pretending that the only difference is in the color of our skin has led us into an enormous disaster. It is destroying America and our people and our civilization. It has made wastelands of large sections of our cities. It has devastated our schools and robbed many of our young people

of an education of the quality they need to make the most of themselves. It has exposed our people to the sort of criminal violence that is natural for Blacks but not for us. It has cost us many, many more billions of dollars in welfare programs and law enforcement than even Michael Milken and his fellow tribesmen have swindled from us.

Yesterday I was watching a television program that was mostly about my record company, Resistance Records, and the music we produce and distribute and the young people who compose and play the music and listen to it. The program came from VH1, which is a music channel owned by the same fellow who owns MTV. He uses the name Sumner Redstone but was born Murray Rothstein. Redstone/Rothstein is another of these billionaire Jews we've been talking about, and his program on VH1 gave the public the Jewish spin on me and Resistance Records and resistance music generally. He calls our music, "hate rock," because some of it expresses the anger and frustration of young White Americans who are forced to live with the real-world consequences of pretending that there is no difference between Blacks and Whites: the anger of young, White Americans who have experienced the reality of racially mixed neighborhoods and racially mixed schools.

The program pretends that I and these young Americans are hateful by nature, that there's really no reason for us to be angry, that everything would be rosy if we would just pretend, along with everyone else, that Blacks and Whites are the same, that there's no difference. Then we could all be happy and live together peacefully, and everything would be wonderful. It is just our perverse nature that makes us hateful and keeps us from pretending that we believe in racial equality and racial togetherness. That's the myth that Sumner Redstone has spun and is selling to the public through the mass media he owns: through his CBS television network and his MTV and VH1 channels, much like Michael Milken sold to the directors of America's savings-and-loan institutions the myth that they could become rich by investing in his junk bonds.

As I mentioned last week, Michael Milken's myth cost us $500 billion when the savings-and-loan industry went bankrupt 15 years ago. Sumner Redstone's myth of equality already has cost us vastly more than that and eventually will cost us our very existence if we continue to be deceived by it. And of course, it's not just Redstone's myth. It's a myth spun by and propagated by Redstone's whole tribe. The myth of diversity, equality, unity, and all of the other labels in which it's packaged is being peddled to the American public through every medium the Jews control: through television and radio, through newspapers, through magazine advertising, through Hollywood films, and all the rest. "Multiculturalism is a wonderful thing," they all proclaim. "Diversity is our strength." "Keep our borders open, because the Browns and Yellows that are pouring into America really are the same as Whites, and we are a nation of immigrants."

And of course, anyone who doesn't swallow the myth is a "hater." Any White person who stands up and says, "Hey! Multiculturalism is a bad idea. It's a nightmare. It's wrecking America," is attacked the way I and the other people involved in Resistance Records were attacked on Redstone's VH1 program. Pushing the idea that we ought to keep our borders open is a large-scale effort involving a very substantial portion of the Jewish community in America. Ramming multiculturalism down our throats is a joint effort involving virtually all of the mass media, and that means virtually all of the Jews in positions of control or ownership in the media, from

Hollywood to Madison Avenue. Spinning and selling the poisonous myth of equality is an effort supported by nearly every Jew, not just a few evil master mythmakers.

To be sure, just as in the financial swindling of America, this ideological swindling of America has had plenty of Gentile collaborators and co-conspirators. And I'm not referring only to the lemmings who parrot back whatever nonsense about equality and the wonders of diversity they have absorbed from television; I'm talking about the Gentile politicians and businessmen and teachers and preachers and publicists who know better, but who for one reason or another went along and still are going along with the Jewish campaign to multiculturalize America. Despite these collaborators and co-conspirators, however, it is clear that it has been Jewish Hollywood and Jewish Madison Avenue that have pushed the poison from the beginning and without which the campaign never would have been able to do the damage that it has done.

In the VH1 program about Resistance Records I saw yesterday, Mr. Redstone was taking a poll of viewers. "Should White resistance music be outlawed?" he asked. "Should the government prohibit the production and sale and performance of 'hate rock' music?"

Do you think that's a joke? I'll tell you, it certainly isn't. That's the standard way that Redstone and his fellow tribesmen deal with opposition or exposure. Once they have corrupted a country, they get their bought politicians to enact legislation making it illegal to criticize or contradict them. They've already done that in Canada and in most countries in Europe. They've made what they call "hate speech"--and that includes "hate music"--illegal. Black gangsta' rap, with its lyrics about killing Whites, is all right--in fact, some of Redstone's Jewish friends in the music business produce and distribute gangsta' rap--but in Canada or Germany you can go to jail for playing White resistance music, or for contradicting any of their "Holocaust" stories about the nasty Germans converting innocent, blameless Jews into lampshades or soap. They're pushing hard for the same sort of legislation here. They really would like to make it illegal for me to produce and distribute White resistance music and for you to listen to it.

Speaking of the "Holocaust"--as you know, that's another of my pet subjects. Although Redstone and his pals like to label me a "Holocaust denier," I'm really not. I don't deny that there was a campaign by the Germans before and during the Second World War to get the Jews out of their country and off their backs, and that during the war many Jews perished in the concentration camps and labor camps into which they were herded. What I deny is many of the details, such as Jewish lampshades and soap.

The Jews, as they do with everything where they see the possibility for a good swindle, spun a myth about what had happened to them, and they sold that myth to the Gentiles. They took the basic fact that the Germans wanted the Jews out of their society and to that end put many Jews in concentration camps, and they embellished that fact with a great many lies about lampshades and soap and gas chambers and medical experiments, and that myth became the "Holocaust."

They used their grip on our news and entertainment media, which was very strong even before the Second World War, to sell to the American people their myth about the terrible mistreatment of innocent and inoffensive Jews by beastly Germans. And as is nearly always the case they had plenty of corrupt Gentile politicians willing to collaborate with them. The result was that they got

us to go to war to save them from Hitler. We made an alliance with the communists, with the Soviet Union, for that purpose, and we killed millions of our own people, millions of our fellow Europeans, but we saved the Jews.

And look at what the Jews have done to us since the war to express their gratitude for being saved from Hitler! They have deliberately and with malice aforethought multiculturalized us. They have opened our borders to the Third World. They have given us feminism and Affirmative Action and gangsta' rap. They have promoted homosexuality as a "normal" lifestyle. With their advertising and their television they have persuaded millions of young, White women that it's OK to have a Black boyfriend, that it's fashionable. And Sumner Redstone, with his VH1 and his CBS network and his MTV, has been at the forefront of that particular campaign of genocide against us. And they have descended on us like a swarm of locusts with every sort of scam and swindle imaginable, fleecing us of hundreds of billions of dollars, a la Milken and Weiss and Fastow and Winnick.

The damage the Jews have done to America since 1945 far, far outweighs the damage done to the Jews by the Germans between 1933 and 1945. And the eventual death toll among our own people before we have cleaned up the mess the Jews have made of America will far exceed their losses during the so-called "Holocaust." We Americans have made some big mistakes, but really, going to war against our own kinsmen in Europe in order to save the Jews from Hitler was our biggest mistake.

Jewish Hate, the Media, and the ADL

Last week I mentioned that a record company I own, Resistance Records, was attacked in an hour-long special TV program on one of Sumner Redstone's music television channels, VH1. Redstone, who was born with the name Murray Rothstein, is one of the most powerful of the Jewish media masters. He owns not only VH1, but also MTV and the CBS network. His MTV specializes in encouraging young Whites to mix with and act like Blacks. He promotes "hip hop" culture and rap music among White kids, persuading White boys to talk Black and wear baggy shorts and backward baseball caps -- and persuading teenaged White girls to have sex with Blacks. He is probably the most destructive and hate-filled of all the Jewish media bosses.

The special VH1 program to which I referred was called "Inside Hate Rock." "Hate rock" is what Redstone and his people call the music that I produce and distribute. Actually there's nothing hateful at all about my music. Its purpose is to help young White people have a sense of identity and pride and purpose, all things that Redstone and company are trying to take away from them. Redstone's aim -- and the aim of the Jewish media bosses generally, whether they're in Hollywood or on Madison Avenue, is to alienate young White people, to uproot them, to destroy their sense of racial identity, to confuse them, to make them forget their traditions and their history, and to persuade them to mix with Blacks and other non-Whites. That's why Redstone promotes rap music so heavily. His ultimate aim is to destroy our people, our race. And because I'm trying to counter that with Resistance Records, he calls me a "hater" and calls the music that I produce and distribute "hate rock."

Well, in addition to music, Resistance Records also produces and distributes video games. A new game that we've just begun distributing is named *Ethnic Cleansing.* The kids really love it. It's selling like hotcakes. Not only was our music attacked in the VH1 special I mentioned, but our new video game also was denounced as "hateful." And then one of the most powerful and hateful Jewish pressure groups, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, also jumped on the bandwagon and began screaming about our new game. "It's violent!" they screamed. "It teaches children to hate!" they screamed.

Let me tell you: every video game I've seen is violent. Combat is the most common theme of video games. That was true even back in the days of the first, primitive video games, such as "Donkey Kong" and "Pac Man." Most video games today involve shooting people or hacking people up with swords or other weapons. And I'm talking about games marketed by Sumner Redstone's fellow tribesmen. I'm talking about games produced and distributed by Jewish media companies that make regular donations to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The Anti-Defamation League doesn't scream about those games.

Some parents are alarmed by the high level of violence in the video games that their children play, but the Anti-Defamation League isn't. Perhaps violent video games aren't good for kids. I don't really know, but they are a fact of life. Many kids spend most of their free time playing video games.

The point is that Sumner Redstone and the Anti-Defamation League think that our game is "hateful" and "dangerous," but not other video games. Why is that? What's the difference?

I'll tell you: our game -- *Ethnic Cleansing* -- is a game designed to raise the racial consciousness of the White kids who play it. That's why Sumner Redstone and the Anti-Defamation League hate it. That's why they are screaming about it. That's why they're denouncing our game as "dangerous" and complaining about the violence in it, but they aren't complaining about other video games that are at least as violent. A game that has an American GI in the Second World War shooting Germans is OK with Sumner Redstone and the Anti-Defamation League. Likewise for a Civil War game in which Yankees and Rebels slaughter each other. They think that's fine. But our game, which involves urban guerrilla warfare between Whites and non-Whites they call "hateful" and "dangerous." In other words, it's OK for Whites to fight against each other. It's OK for Whites to kill Whites. But it's not OK for Whites to fight against non-Whites. That's taboo.

Anyway, our game, *Ethnic Cleansing,* is designed to break that taboo. Our game is designed to teach White kids to stick up for their own people. It's designed to help White kids shed the racial guilt and self-hatred, the sense of racial inferiority, that Sumner Redstone and the folks in the Anti-Defamation League have worked so hard to instill in them. It's designed to help them think in terms of Whites against non-Whites instead of Whites against other Whites. That's why VH1 and the Anti-Defamation League hate it.

But, you know, we shouldn't be surprised about that. VH1 is owned by a Jew. It's a Jewish propaganda channel. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is a Jewish pressure group. Their aim is to destroy White racial consciousness and to break down any feeling of White solidarity. The last thing they want is for Whites to learn to stick up for themselves. So we expect them to hate us and to denounce us. They have their agenda, and we have ours.

Everyone should understand that, but most people don't. The reason that they don't is that all of the mass media, even those few not yet owned by Jews, collaborate to keep the Jewish agenda concealed from the public. The media routinely refer to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith -- and from here on I'll just call it "the ADL" -- not as a Jewish pressure group or a Jewish propaganda organization or even as a Jewish lobbying group, but as a "human rights organization" or as a "civil rights group." Really. The media want the public to believe that the ADL is an impartial group concerned with what's good for America rather than with what's good for the Jews. In fact, most media won't even tell you that it's a Jewish organization, with strong ties to Israel.

So let me tell you a little about the ADL, and you'll understand better why they do what they do. And you'll also see a little more clearly the crookedness of virtually all of the mainstream media in America. The ADL was organized in 1913 by a group of rich Jews specifically as a response to a notorious child-rape and murder in Georgia. Leo Frank was a Jew who owned a pencil factory in Atlanta. In 1913, he raped and murdered one of his White female employees, 14-year-old Mary Phagan. He was tried, convicted, and sentenced to death. The governor of Georgia, in response to Jewish lobbying -- and, most believe, in response to a large Jewish bribe -- almost immediately commuted the death sentence. Angry Georgians then seized the Jewish child-rapist and murderer and hanged him.

The Frank case was widely reported in Georgia newspapers in great detail and caused much hostile feeling against Jews. The purpose of the ADL was to deal with such matters in the future by attacking and attempting to discredit anyone opposed to Jews or Jewish policies, by generating pro-Jewish propaganda, and by exerting influence on legislators and other public officials in a more discreet manner than the rather clumsy way in which the Georgia governor had been persuaded to commute the death sentence of Leo Frank. After the formation of the state of Israel in 1948, lobbying for military and financial aid for Israel also became a major ADL activity.

The ADL still does all of those things today, and in my case the group's principal activity has been attacking me and attempting to discredit me. In fact, the ADL devotes so much of its effort to attempts to discredit anyone who opposes Jewish policies that it is known in some quarters as "the Defamation League." The ADL regularly refers to me as a "terrorist" and claims that I am "linked" not only to various terrorist acts, such as the Oklahoma City bombing, but also to bank robberies, murders, and other acts of criminal violence. For example, my "link" to the Oklahoma City bombing is that Tim McVeigh, whom I didn't even know existed until I saw him on television after he was arrested -- Tim McVeigh is said to have read and to have been fond of a novel that I wrote 27 years ago, *The Turner Diaries.* The other so-called "links" are even more tenuous. And yet the mainstream media regularly quote the ADL in saying that I am "linked" to terrorist and criminal activity, and they describe the ADL almost as if it were an official source of information.

So let me tell you: I have never been involved in any terrorist or criminal activity of any sort. But the ADL has. In November 1992, after confidential police files were stolen from the San Francisco Police Department, an investigation was begun that led eventually to search warrants being issued. On April 8, 1993, both the San Francisco and the Los Angeles offices of the ADL were searched by police teams armed with these warrants, and more than 12,000 stolen confidential police files were recovered. Most of these confidential police files didn't have anything to do with criminal activity but instead contained personal information on individuals collected by the police in connection with driver's license applications, pistol permits, security clearances, and other routine matters. What the individuals in all of these police files had in common is that the ADL considered them "enemies" because they had at one time or another, in some way, opposed some Jewish policy or some Jewish interest. Some of the individuals in the stolen files were legislators or other public officials that the ADL wanted to bring pressure against.

Other criminal activity by the ADL, in addition to the possession of the stolen police files, came to light in 1993. A San Francisco Police Department inspector, Tom Gerrard, who had been receiving payments by the ADL to steal the files for them, fled to the Philippines to avoid prosecution. And evidence was found during the search of the ADL's San Francisco and Los Angeles offices that the same sort of bribery, corruption of police agencies, and illegal collection of confidential police files was occurring in New York, Washington, Chicago, St. Louis, and Atlanta.

Unfortunately, the ADL already had corrupted the judicial system in California to the point that it was able to stifle further law enforcement action, and very shortly thereafter the mass media in

California, which initially had given substantial coverage to the case, were persuaded to drop the matter as well.

Some of the individuals whose confidential files had been stolen by the ADL were not ready to drop the matter, however, and they filed civil suits against the ADL for invasion of their privacy. With the enormous resources of organized Jewry behind it the ADL fought these lawsuits tenaciously, appealing every adverse decision. Finally, however, after nine years in the courts, the ADL last week paid damages of $178,000 to the last three victims of its illegal spying. I'm sure that you didn't see anything about that in the news last week, because after the initial publicity back in 1993 the mainstream media have ignored the case. They continue to refer with respect to the ADL as a "human rights organization," with never a mention of its criminal activity. And they continue to quote the ADL's hints and suggestions and insinuations that I am somehow "linked" to terrorist and criminal activity. It is, of course, the ADL, not I, who is engaged in criminal activity, but you would never know that if your only source of information is the mainstream media. For those listeners who have access to good reference sources, however, find yourself a copy of the *Los Angeles Times* from April 9, 1993, and read all about it.

Actually, the ADL's stealing of police files is the least of its criminal activities. It just happens to be one activity where the group made a slip and got exposed momentarily. Far more serious are the ADL's links to organized crime: to the Jewish master swindler Marc Rich, for example, or to the Jewish gang boss Moe Dalitz. If you were following the news closely in January of last year, when Bill Clinton, just hours before leaving the White House, issued a number of pardons for criminals, an inordinately large percentage of whom were Jews, you will perhaps remember the controversy around his pardon for Marc Rich. Rich is a billionaire international commodities trader. He was indicted on a large number of criminal charges, including wire fraud and money laundering, before fleeing the country to avoid prosecution. He has given huge sums from his ill-gotten loot to Israel and to the ADL. The ADL chairman, Abe Foxman, wrote to Clinton specifically requesting a pardon for Rich -- and of course, Rich got his pardon.

Moe Dalitz was the boss of Detroit's all-Jewish "Purple Gang," which got its start smuggling illegal whiskey into the country and then branched out into White slavery, loan-sharking, illegal gambling, and contract murder. After the Second World War, Dalitz moved into the casino business in Las Vegas and eventually became the leading gang boss there. And he gave generously to the ADL and other Jewish organizations. He was one of the ADL's biggest donors during the 1970s and early 1980s. The ADL reciprocated by presenting Dalitz with its annual "Torch of Liberty" award at a formal dinner in his honor in Las Vegas in 1985. Dalitz and seven other gangsters were killed in a gang shootout shortly thereafter.

What's important is not that the ADL consorts with gangsters and engages in criminal activity. What's important is that the news media conceal that from the public and treat the ADL as a respectable "human rights organization" that can be relied on for accurate information about people like me -- or about anyone the Jews consider an obstacle to their policies. That's bad. That's very bad, and it's dangerous -- and not just because it misinforms the public about people like me. It's dangerous because it allows the ADL to represent itself as an authority. It gives the ADL much more power to corrupt.

It was bad enough when Jewish groups had only their money to bribe politicians and judges and law-enforcement officials, as in the days of Leo Frank. But now, with the collusion of the mass media, the ADL is able to wear a false cloak of authority. And the unfortunate fact is that whenever a military or law-enforcement person sees someone wearing a cloak of authority, his tendency is to salute and wait for orders. Most of us have at least a bit of an authoritarian streak in us, and I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing. Military and law-enforcement people, on the average, have a much bigger streak of authoritarianism in their personalities, and that's not necessarily a bad thing either. But when the ADL uses its false cloak of authority to influence America's legislative, judicial, military, and law-enforcement establishments, that's a very bad thing -- and very dangerous for the freedom and even for the survival of our people.

And in fact, the ADL is using the false cloak of authority bestowed on it by the mass media to cozy up to and corrupt military and law-enforcement people all across America. The Jewish mass media have prepared the ground by talking so much about "hate crimes" and "hate speech" that they have convinced large segments of the public that any printed material or public statement that is not Politically Correct is "hate." Anything I publish, for example, is automatically labeled as "hate" by the media. If I criticize America's insane immigration policy, the media will call that "hate." If I complain about the government's policy of putting Israel's interests ahead of America's interests in the Middle East, that's "hate" too. I could publish a book on bicycle repair, and the Jewish media would call it "hate." The media have the public sensitized to that word -- and they've done that deliberately. And they have the more simpleminded elements of the public convinced that there's something illegal about publishing or distributing anything that the media have labeled as "hate."

If, for example, members of my organization, the National Alliance, distribute leaflets calling for a halt to immigration from the Third World -- or even demanding that the government enforce the immigration laws it already has by stopping illegal aliens from coming across our southern border -- the media invariably will use the word "hate" in every other sentence in reporting our distribution. And then some of the simpletons will call the local police or the FBI to report that our leaflets were left on their front porches, believing that a crime has been committed.

All of that is bad enough. But then somebody from the local office of the ADL will approach the local police chief and offer the ADL's help as an authority on "hate" and "extremism." "We will explain to you how to recognize 'hate crimes' and 'speech crimes,'" the ADL will say. "We will teach your officers who the haters are, and we will explain why you should keep an eye on them and harass them and arrest them whenever you can."

Ordinarily any self-respecting police chief would resent someone like that telling him how to do his job. He would tell the ADL busybody to buzz off -- especially if he knows that the organization offering its advice is a criminal organization. But usually he doesn't know that, because the media have kept that a secret. Usually he thinks that the ADL is an authority, almost with an official status, because the media deliberately have created that impression. And so the ADL is able to worm its way into local law enforcement and exert its destructive influence on the way the law is enforced. In many cases, it is able to persuade the police to violate the civil rights of people that it doesn't like. For the police to let the ADL tell them how to recognize and

to treat so-called "haters" is like the police going to the Mafia for advice on how to deal with organized crime.

And the ADL does the same thing with our Armed Forces. It's like having the Pentagon hiring active, practicing al-Quaeda members to teach the military about terrorism and how to recognize a terrorist. It sounds crazy, but we actually have the greasiest of Jews whispering into the ears of police and military officials all over America, telling them how they should do their jobs. We actually have such Jews with ADL connections installed in offices in the Pentagon, in the White House, and in the Justice Department.

That's a bad situation. Like many other bad situations in America today, it has arisen directly from the Jewish control of the mass media.

What can we do about it? Well, you know what I'm doing. I'm building alternative media as fast as I can to counter the Jewish media. I'm happy to have your support for my work.

Here's something else you can do. If you know anyone in law enforcement, ask him whether or not his department has been approached by the ADL or has hired the ADL to give training of any sort to the personnel in his department, or whether or not any ADL propaganda has been circulating among members of his department. If his department has had any contact at all with the ADL, tell him what you know. Tell him that you are alarmed and outraged that his department is involved with a criminal, anti-American organization that is working to undermine our Bill of Rights and to destroy our Constitution. Get him to help you spread this information to other members of his department.

The New "Patriotism"

You know, I think that the word "patriotism" has a different meaning today than it did when I was growing up. It used to mean a love of one's native land and one's people: one's fatherland, according to the etymology of the word. The fatherland was the land where one's ancestors had been born and where a large extended family -- everyone descended from those ancestors who originally had settled the land -- now lived. Patriotism really had a tribal or racial meaning. It was a feeling based on blood. And although our ancestors had come to America from all parts of Europe, they were enough alike that they still could feel the bond of blood. They still felt themselves members of a large family, a family with European roots, and they could stand together as brothers against those who were not part of the nation. Whether they came from Scotland or Ireland or England or Sweden or Germany or Poland they could fight together against Indians or Mexicans. They felt their kinship, and that was the basis of their patriotism.

Well, that racial meaning of patriotism is a meaning that the controllers of our mass media obviously don't like. They've multiculturalized patriotism along with everything else. Their propaganda for a new brand of patriotism is pretty blatant stuff. I'm sure you've seen the television ads a hundred times where a very diverse bunch indeed -- Blacks and Browns and Yellows, with a few Whites thrown in -- proclaim sequentially, "I-am-an-American."

These days, to be "patriotic" means to wave the flag and shout slogans whenever the mass media deem it appropriate. It means to cheer the government whenever the government decides to use its cruise missiles or its smart bombs to kill a bunch of people in some other country, regardless of the reason. Instead of blood-based patriotism, today we have government-based patriotism. If you wave the flag and support the government, you're a patriot. If you don't like what the government is doing and you say so, then all of the flag-waving, slogan-shouting yahoos look at you as if you were the enemy.

Back in the 19th century, American patriots -- real patriots -- were winning land for us from mestizos and pushing them back across the Rio Grande. "Remember the Alamo!" was a patriotic slogan then. Today it's something the media and the government want us to forget or to feel embarrassed about, as the mestizos come flooding back in this direction again in a great wave of re-conquest: the *reconquista.* And the government in Washington is helping them. They're flooding not just into Texas and the other parts of the Southwest, but wherever greedy employers want cheap labor. And if you raise your hand against this government-sponsored invasion, if you try to push a few mestizos back across the border, you're not considered a patriot; you're a terrorist or a "hate criminal."

Two years ago, in July 2000, a group of White men chased some Mexicans out of a park in Billings, Montana. Just chased them out, told them the park was for Whites, but didn't hurt anyone. Last week, a Federal judge in Billings sentenced one of the White men to 15 years in prison, and two other White men to 10 years each, for chasing some Mexicans out of a park. The media thought that those sentences were just about right. So did the Bush government, which had one of its Justice Department Jews, a Mark Blumberg, acting as prosecutor. Fifteen years in a Federal prison for chasing some Mexicans out of a traditionally White park, without actually

hurting anyone. If you looked carefully, you could have seen that in an Associated Press report from Billings last Saturday.

Imagine the Billings situation reversed: Mexicans chasing Whites out of a *barrio* park in some Browned-out area of Texas or California. Do you think the Federal government would rush a Jewish prosecutor to the area to make sure that the Mexicans were locked up for 15 years? Let me tell you, the Bush government would pretend that nothing had happened. There wouldn't even be a prosecution. Patriotism, government style, these days means not fighting back against what is being done to the country that our ancestors fought and bled to win for us.

At least, that's one side of government-style patriotism. The other side, as I said a moment ago, is to wave your flag and cheer mindlessly whenever the government, on orders from Israel, kicks the bejesus out of some little country without an adequate air-defense system. The government-style patriots never ask why we're beating up somebody or pounding some other country back into the Stone Age. They don't really care. They're as mindless as baseball fans. To them, all that matters is that our team is pounding the other team, and so they cheer.

It used to be that, in order to have the patriotic support of the people, the government had to have a good reason for starting a war. It used to be that our people had to feel that they were defending themselves -- or at least, defending some legitimate American interest -- before they could feel patriotic about killing people in other countries. Making it easier for Israel to hang on to stolen Arab land in the Middle East is not a legitimate American interest. But the government-style patriots, with the little flags tied to their car antennas, don't need a reason. It makes them feel good that their government is able to kick sand in the face of just about anybody else on the beach and get away with it. They like cheering for the biggest bully in the block, as long as the bully is successful. They cheer the government in the same way the Roman mob used to cheer for their favorite gladiator in the Colosseum.

I spend half an hour every day scanning through the TV news channels -- not primarily to find out what has happened in the world, but rather to find out what the party line is on what's happened in the world. In this regard, Fox News is probably the most revealing. Nearly every day, Fox interviews one or more Defense Department consultants or retired generals or other government officials as "experts" on the current U.S. war in the Middle East. Without an exception, these "experts" are enthusiastic supporters of the current war. Was our blasting of Afghanistan and the ousting of the government there a good thing? They are absolutely certain that it was. Should we start another war with Iraq next? They are unanimous in their opinion that we should. What about Iran? Hell, yes, we can lick them too. But never a reason. Never an explanation of why it is good for us to tear up all of these countries, beyond the fact that we're bigger than they are and can get away with it: no explanation of how it serves our interests, of how it makes the world a better place for America.

With "experts" like that to set the tone, it is no wonder that the yahoos are going around with their chests stuck out now because we beat up Afghanistan and will go around with their chests stuck out even further after we beat up Iraq or Iran.

You know, I just said that no one ever asks why we have to whip all of these other countries. Of course, the stock answer, if you raise the question to one of the Fox News "experts," is that we're "fighting terrorism." What we're doing in the Middle East now is waging a "war against terrorism," they'll tell us. Well, that's an explanation that doesn't bear close examination. If our war aim is to protect ourselves from terrorism, why do we need to wage war against Iraq? Iraq has never inflicted any terrorism on us or even threatened to do so. Every Fox News "expert" takes it for granted that it would be a good thing to kill Saddam Hussein. Why is that? Saddam Hussein is not a fanatical Muslim fundamentalist who is likely to do anything wild and crazy against America that would provoke retaliation.

I'll tell you what Saddam Hussein is. He is a strong leader of his nation. He may be a mean and ruthless SOB -- he may be the kind of fellow you wouldn't want your sister to marry -- but he is a strong leader who refuses to take orders from Jews or from the U.S. government. He does not threaten America and has no reason to do so unless he is pushed into a corner, but the Jews are worried that he might provide help to the Palestinians. They are worried that he will be a threat to further Israeli expansion in the Middle East because he refuses to be bullied or bought. That is the reason that all of the Fox News "experts" agree that it would be a good thing to assassinate him -- although they won't come right out and state that reason. Instead they give us the standard, mealy-mouthed party line about Iraq and Saddam Hussein being a potential terrorist threat that we need to neutralize.

Of course, if we do wage war against Iraq or against Iran, then we will have to worry about terrorist reprisals. When they have nothing else to lose, then they will strike at us with whatever means they have. But if we mind our own business and look out for our own interests, neither Iran nor Iraq has any reason for provoking us. If we had been looking out for our own interests before September 11, instead of for Israel's interests, then 3,000 Americans who lost their lives on that day would still be alive.

Sometimes the Fox News "experts" use a more abstract justification for killing people in other countries who haven't done anything to us: they might do something to us in the future, so we'd better kill them now. The notion that they put forward in a roundabout fashion is that the only way for America to be safe is to kill off everyone who has the potential for hurting us in the future: which is to say, everyone who has the resources for developing weapons of mass destruction and who also refuses to take orders from us. That's a rather interesting way of looking at things, and some rather extreme conclusions can be drawn from it. But if our government actually did believe that is the best way to protect America, then we should launch an all-out nuclear attack on Israel immediately. Israel not only already has developed a very dangerous arsenal of weapons of mass destruction but also is a psychotic nest of murderous thugs posing a danger to the whole world. More than that, Israel has repeatedly shown itself willing to use terrorist tactics against anyone, including America, anytime it thinks it can get away with it.

A memorable example of that is Israel's murderous attack on the U.S.S. *Liberty* in 1967, which killed 34 American servicemen. The Israelis attacked our ship without warning, using jet aircraft and torpedo boats. Their plan was to sink the *Liberty*, kill all the survivors in the water by strafing, and then blame it on the Egyptians, in order to cause hostility between the United States

and Egypt. That was not the first time Israel had tried such a trick, but it was the most murderous. It failed only because the radio operator aboard the *Liberty* was able to get off a message identifying the attackers as Israelis before the attack had knocked out all of the *Liberty's* communications.

But of course, the Fox News "experts" who advocate going to war against Iraq and Iran, sending in occupation troops, and then placing them under puppet governments, because otherwise they might someday develop weapons of mass destruction and use them against America, would faint dead away if it were suggested to them that the same reasoning should be applied to Israel, but even more so. These same "experts" also pretend that the reason for the September 11 attack was that Osama bin Laden "hates our freedom" and had nothing at all to do with the U.S. government's support for Israel.

One might forgive this sort of behavior on the part of the yahoos. In a sense, they don't know any better. They've been raised with the new patriotism -- the government-patriotism -- and they really don't see anything wrong with cheering a government that attacks other countries that haven't attacked us. All that matters to the yahoos is that their team beats the other team: Yea! We're the greatest! Don't mess with us!

But people don't get to be generals by being so shallow in their sensibilities and understanding. The Fox News "experts" understand all the subtleties of the issues involved, but they're too crooked to speak the truth.

I'm sure that it didn't used to be so bad. I'm sure that the "experts" have become more crooked than they used to be, and that truth has become a scarcer commodity. This was brought to mind last week by the media uproar when a Baptist preacher's remarks to President Richard Nixon, made 30 years ago, came to light. Billy Graham, the high-profile celebrity preacher, media star, and adviser to presidents, was about as oily as other Baptist preachers most of the time, but occasionally he spoke frankly on sensitive subjects, as the Oval Office tapes from the first half of 1972, released to the public last week by the National Archives, reveal.

During a meeting with Nixon and others in the Oval Office on February 1, 1972, Graham complained about the total domination of the mass media of news and entertainment in America by Jews. This Jewish control of the media certainly was no secret. I had published the first edition of my exposé of Jewish media control, complete with names and mug shots, which I titled "Who Rules America?," in 1968. Every politician and other leading figure in Washington knew about the Jewish domination of the media; they were just afraid to talk about it for fear of reprisals from the Jews. The result of this timidity was that Sally Soccermom and Joe Sixpack didn't have a clue. The big shots all knew what the Jews were up to, but they were afraid to tell the public. Most of the big shots were even afraid to discuss the Jews among themselves.

In 1972, however, Billy Graham not only complained to Nixon and others in the Oval Office about the Jewish stranglehold on the media, he understood what this Jewish media control was doing to America, and he told those in the Oval Office, "This stranglehold has got to be broken, or the country's going down the drain."

President Nixon agreed with Billy Graham, but he was too cowardly to do anything about it. Nixon said, "I can't ever say that, but I believe it."

That's a poor commentary on the quality of leadership that we have in America. The President understands what Jewish media control is doing to the country, but he is afraid to take any action to protect the country. He prefers to stand aside and let the country go down the drain. And you know, he could have stopped it then. There were enough top military leaders then who still had some old-fashioned patriotism. With a little planning, every Jewish media figure from Hollywood to Madison Avenue could have been arrested and eliminated in a single day. The same thing could have been done with the courts, the Congress, and the Federal bureaucracy. A clean sweep could have been made. The country could have been pulled back from the brink and put on an entirely different course.

Think what an enormous difference that would have made during the past 30 years. We could have cut off all immigration from the Third World and from Asia. The whole hip-hop, rap, MTV culture being pushed by the Jewish entertainment media could have been nipped in the bud. All of the Jewish filth and poison and brainwashing that America has been saturated with during the past 30 years could have been flushed down the drain in 1972, and the country could have been put on an upward course again.

The flow of weapons and money from the United States to Israel could have been halted in 1972, and Israel would have ceased to exist the following year, during the 1973 war. There would be no belligerent Israel in the Middle East today with a nuclear, biological, and chemical arsenal threatening to spark the Third World War and providing the impetus behind the efforts of every other country in the region, Iraq and Iran included, to develop their own weapons of mass destruction in order to counter Israel. But the man with the power to change everything, the man who understood that it needed to be done, the President of the United States, was afraid to act, afraid even to talk about it except among his associates in the White House.

Things clearly are worse today. When Billy Graham's 1972 conversation with Richard Nixon was made public last week, Graham was afraid to acknowledge it. He said that he didn't remember the conversation, but he groveled and apologized anyway. And I cannot imagine anyone in the Bush government today having the courage or the honesty even to have a conversation in the White House about what the Jews are doing to America and to the world and what needs to be done to counter them. Richard Nixon was a crook and a coward, but George Bush is far worse. And the top military leaders today are far less patriotic than the ones of 30 years ago were. The top military leaders today are like the retired generals that one sees being interviewed on Fox News: a sorry lot indeed, who will not even acknowledge the reason for the September 11 attack on America. They are not patriots; they are prostitutes.

The men who control America's mass media are the men who really rule America today. They understand that, and the prostitutes do too. It is essential to both the rulers and the prostitutes that no real patriots gain the power to upset their applecart. The military system over the past 30 years has evolved in a way that weeds patriots out early and keeps them from reaching the top. Actually the military leadership system has been evolving that way over the past 50 years, with an Affirmative Action promotion policy that favors non-Whites and looks with suspicion on

White males who still have old-fashioned ideas about patriotism. But 30 years ago there were still a few patriots willing to speak out. General William Westmoreland was the last of these really to say much.

The political system is even worse. It ensures that only men like Bill Clinton and George Bush can reach the highest levels: totally corrupt men, with absolutely no sense of honor or responsibility or real patriotism. We are in real trouble, and it will take real patriots to get us out, but real patriots are in short supply these days. What we have today masquerading as patriots are crooks at the top and flag-waving yahoos at the bottom.

Nevertheless, there still are a few real patriots, a few old-fashioned patriots, here and there, and, as America continues down the drain, I will not be surprised to see one or two of them begin to take action of some sort, but it is unlikely that they will act through the conventional channels of electoral politics or the Armed Forces.

Espionage and Anthrax

Let's talk about the mass media again today. Specifically, let's discuss the consequences of the Jewish control of the media, the sort of thing that Billy Graham and Richard Nixon saw taking America "down the drain" 30 years ago.

I raise this subject with every journalist who comes to my office for an interview. It's clearly not something that they like to talk about, but I try to draw them out anyway. I've said this to you before, and I'll say it again now: journalists are the most lemming-like people whom I have met. They're not stupid, but they absolutely will not say anything Politically Incorrect, even when we're off camera. They always toe the party line. They believe that they're being quite candid with me when they say that Fox News is right wing compared to the other news channels and that perhaps that's because Rupert Murdoch, who runs Fox, isn't a Jew. They claim that these small differences in the way that the various media report the news prove that there's plenty of diversity and freedom of expression in the media.

I respond to them by saying that any differences in bias between Fox News and CNN are pretty small, and that I can learn what the Jewish party line is on any particular issue as well by listening to Fox as I can by listening to CNN. Rupert Murdoch himself may not be a Jew, but his operation is staffed from top to bottom with Jews, and his programming is about as Jewish as that on the other channels. When I say that, they pretend that they don't understand. Perhaps I shouldn't be surprised that they won't tell me anything, even in private, that would get them fired and blacklisted if their Jewish bosses found out about it.

Anyway, let's start today with a couple of very recent examples of media bias. Perhaps you heard about the case that made a few headlines last week in Fort Worth, Texas, and was very briefly reported by other media around the country. That's the case of the 25-year-old Black woman who, driving under the influence of drugs, hit a White pedestrian, 37-year-old Gregory Biggs, with her car on a Fort Worth street. The impact broke Biggs's legs and threw his body up onto the hood of the Black woman's car. His head and shoulders went through the windshield on the passenger side. He was cut by the windshield and because of his broken legs was unable to extricate himself, but otherwise he suffered no life-threatening injuries.

After hitting Biggs, the Black woman drove home with him stuck in her windshield and begging for help. She parked her car in her garage and closed the garage door so that neighbors could not hear Biggs's cries for help. Then she went into her house, had sex with her boyfriend and took some more drugs. From time to time during the next three days, as Biggs slowly bled to death and went into shock, the Black woman went into her garage to watch him wriggling, half on the hood of her car and half stuck through the broken windshield, and listen to him begging for help. When Biggs finally died, the Black woman and a boyfriend pulled his body out of the windshield, put him in the trunk of the boyfriend's car, and dumped his body in a vacant lot.

If you want to read more of the grisly details, you should be able to find them at the Web site of the *Fort Worth Star-Telegram.* To me, the most important detail is that no news medium mentioned the race of either the killer or the victim. That information wasn't even explicitly in

the *Star-Telegram,* but fortunately photographs of the killer and her victim were. Now, you know what the party line is: race wasn't mentioned because it's irrelevant. One person killed another person in an especially gruesome and callous manner, and race had nothing to do with it. That's the party line.

Now ask yourself this question: Suppose a White man had hit a Black woman with his car and then had driven home with her wriggling in his windshield and had watched her slowly die over the next three days while listening to her cries for help, taking time off occasionally to have sex with his girlfriend. After the Black woman was dead, the White man got a White friend to help him dump her corpse in a vacant lot. Do you believe that the media, in reporting the story after the White man's eventual arrest, would think that the race of the killer and that of the victim were irrelevant? Hey, you know the answer. Every major media outlet in the country would be screaming about White racism and the callous indifference of Whites to the suffering of Blacks. You know it!

And here's an update on a story about Jewish mega-swindlers we covered several weeks ago. This one came from New York two weeks ago. A bribery case involving New York City's real-estate tax assessors was uncovered that cost New Yorkers more than a billion dollars. A number of people were arrested, including 13 out of the 38 tax assessors in Manhattan's real-estate tax department. The interesting thing about this case, besides the fact that such a huge amount of money was stolen, is that everyone involved is a Jew: the real-estate owners, the assessors, and the go-betweens.

Here's the way it worked. The Jewish owner of a piece of Manhattan real estate would receive his property-tax bill from the tax assessor's office. That bill might be several million dollars on a large office building or hotel. The owner would take the bill to any one of several Jewish "tax consultants." Three of these "consultants" arrested on February 25 were Albert Schussler, Joel Edelstein, and Alan Edelstein, all of whom formerly had worked for the city as assessors. The "consultant" would then visit the Jewish tax assessor who had made the assessment at his office. The "consultant" would give the assessor a bribe -- perhaps $10,000 -- and then the assessor would discover that he had made an "error" in the assessment. A new tax bill would be issued, perhaps a million dollars less than the original one. The "consultant" would then collect his consulting fee -- perhaps $50,000 -- from the property owner. The property owner would have a net saving of $950,000 in this transaction, and the city would have a net loss of $1 million.

Investigators estimate that the swindle has cost the city $160 million in the past four years alone -- and the swindle has been going on since 1967. They got away with it for so long because everyone involved is a Jew, and they all were covering for each other. And I'll bet you didn't even hear about it.

Suppose that in Israel there lived a small but very cohesive Gentile minority -- just 21/2 per cent of the Israeli population, and this small Gentile minority somehow managed to be involved in every major swindle in Israel, costing the Israeli people tens of millions of dollars -- I guess I should say "tens of millions of shekels" -- every year. Do you believe that the Israeli newspapers would fail to mention the Gentile character of all this swindling, just as the newspapers over here

never -- and I mean never -- mention or draw any conclusions from the Jewishness of the biggest swindles in America?

Well, the most interesting current example of media bias in America is the thundering silence of the media in connection with the arrest and deportation during the past few months of approximately 200 Israelis engaged in espionage in this country. It was the largest espionage ring ever broken up in America. But there were no prosecutions and almost no media coverage. The Bush government simply hustled them back to Israel as quickly and quietly as possible, and most of the media kept quiet about it -- most of the media in this country, that is. In Europe, much more was revealed. The big French newspaper *Le Monde* reported last week, in its March 5 edition:

A vast Israeli espionage network operating on American territory has been broken up.

Le Monde went on to report the details, citing a confidential U.S. government report that had been obtained by a French group specializing in such acquisitions and posted on the Internet at intelligenceonline.com. This confidential report was prepared for the Justice Department by the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the FBI, and the Air Force, and the copy of the report used by *Le Monde* has been declared authentic by the Drug Enforcement Administration. The report details the suspicious activities of a number of young Israelis in the United States, some of them posing as art students and some as sidewalk vendors. They hung around outside sensitive government or military facilities and tried to strike up conversations with government employees. Some of them tried to talk their way past security guards and get into the facilities. Others actually showed up at the homes of government officials and tried to talk their way inside.

It was the Drug Enforcement Administration that first became suspicious of their activities, early last year, but when it became evident that something more serious was going on the FBI and other agencies also became involved in the investigation. Eventually 120 Israelis were arrested and questioned, and it looked as if a major spy scandal, surpassing that of the Jonathan Pollard case, was shaping up. The backgrounds of the arrested Israelis, most of them with military intelligence experience in Israel, just didn't match their claim to be art students or trinket vendors. Six of the arrested Israelis were found with cell phones that had been purchased for them by a former Israeli vice consul in the United States.

Then came September 11, and suddenly the whole government stance on these arrested Israeli agents changed. Instead of being charged with espionage, they were deported back to Israel for visa violations. After September 11 the FBI arrested approximately 80 more of the Israeli agents, but like the others they were quietly deported rather than being prosecuted for espionage. And the media for the most part remained silent.

One U.S. newspaper that has broken the ban on news about the arrested Israelis is the *South Florida Sun-Sentinel.* Last week, in its March 7 issue, the *Sun-Sentinel* pointed out that the concentration of deported Israeli "art students" had been especially heavy in precisely those areas where the September 11 hijackers had been living -- and in some cases learning to fly, without bothering to learn how to take off or land. More than a third of the Israeli spies in the United

States were operating in those communities in Florida where 10 of the 19 Arab hijackers had been living prior to September 11. At least five of the Israeli spies were in the community of Hollywood, Florida, where Mohammed Atta, who coordinated the hijacking operation, and four of his al-Qaeda associates had been living.

The *South Florida Sun-Sentinel* was not alone in noting the proximity of the deported Israeli spies to the al-Qaeda members. *Le Monde* noted that this coincidence of proximity greatly strengthens the suspicion of European intelligence services that the Israelis were shadowing the al-Qaeda agents and knew ahead of time what was up. And of course, they kept their own government informed, but Israel did not share its knowledge with the U.S. government. Some "allies!"

Now, if you ask the FBI why it let all of these Israeli spies go, all you will get is the reply that no espionage charges were filed against them. The real question is why weren't charges filed? You think maybe the FBI wasn't convinced the Israelis were espionage agents? Listen to this: the Israelis posing as "art students" in south Florida were all affiliated with an outfit named "Universal Art," which has an address listed in the town of Sunrise, Florida. Reporters from the *Sun-Sentinel* went to the address, and no one there had ever heard of Universal Art. The officers of Universal Art listed in Florida incorporation papers were two people with Israeli names, Yitzchak Shish and Chava Sagi. No one had ever heard of them either. Now, do you really believe that the FBI wasn't convinced that the deported Israelis were working for the government of Israel as spies?

I don't believe it. I am sure that the FBI knows that they were spies but received orders not to charge them. Why? I'll tell you: If these Israeli spies had been charged with espionage and put on trial, what almost certainly would have come out of the trials is that Israel knew about September 11 ahead of time and deliberately withheld the information from us so that the attacks could be carried out as planned. The media would not have been able to keep the lid on that, and an enormous degree of resentment by the American people against Israel would have been the consequence. So the spies were turned loose and sent home in order not to damage the sympathy of the American public for our "gallant, little, democratic ally, Israel" and so as not to jeopardize the flow of money from the U.S. Treasury to Israel. What do you call that sort of behavior on the part of the Bush government--and on the part of the media bosses who have kept the whole business as quiet as possible? I call it treason.

Well, this matter of the Israeli spies is quite clear. Another matter, on which fewer facts are currently available to the public, is that of the anthrax-infected letters that were mailed in this country a few weeks ago. There's a $21/2 million reward for information on the perpetrator, and the FBI has had thousands of agents on the case. Not only have there been no arrests, but there hasn't been much news about the search recently.

It certainly is possible that eventually someone will be arrested, but I will not be surprised if no one ever is, and if the government and the media just let the whole matter of anthrax mailings quietly fade away. Why would they do that? Well, perhaps because an arrest would be extremely embarrassing to the media bosses and to the whole tribe to which they belong.

It wasn't so long ago that the Jewish media were suggesting that the anthrax mailings probably were the work of right-wingers, of White supremacists, of neo-Nazis. I had reporters coming by my office and asking me questions about these accusations. And then there were headlines: "Pierce denies responsibility for anthrax mailings." Really. I said at the time that I believed this was a deliberate stratagem on the part of the media to misdirect suspicion. Now I am sure of it.

If the FBI knows who made the anthrax mailings but has been ordered not to arrest him, I am sure that it will be for the same reason that the Israeli spies were not prosecuted. Of course, the FBI may not be able to keep this secret that well. The FBI's hand may be forced, and it may have to arrest the perpetrator after all. Let us hope so. But with a government like we have now, nothing, no matter how treacherous or crooked, will surprise me.

I'll repeat what I've just said: Over the past year, the FBI rounded up 200 Jewish espionage agents in this country. The FBI knew that they were engaged in espionage for the state of Israel. If the FBI had wound up its investigation of this Israeli espionage ring before September 11, then the arrested Jews might have been charged with espionage and prosecuted. Maybe. After September 11, however, the Bush government was under great pressure not to do anything that might embarrass Israel. In the first place, the government and the media were desperate to maintain their pretense that the September 11 attack was not a response to the U.S. government's support of Israel: the attack came only because Osama bin Laden is "evil" and "hates our freedom," and it had nothing at all to do with Israel.

Getting the lemmings to swallow that lie was hard enough. If it were publicly revealed that Israel knew about the attack in advance and deliberately kept the information from us so that the attack could go ahead, even the lemmings would be muttering darkly about Jews and their treachery. It was essential to the media Jews to keep that from happening, and the Bush government obediently went along with the coverup.

Now I have a strong suspicion that for exactly the same reason the FBI has held off on arresting the person who mailed the anthrax letters. I believe that the FBI knows who it is but has been ordered not to arrest him because it would be very embarrassing to the Jews -- at least, don't arrest him yet, not until the Bush government has finished bombing Israel's enemies in the Middle East.

It's not just that I'm a cynical, suspicious bastard. I remember what happened in 1967, for example, when Israel deliberately tried to sink our electronic intelligence ship, the USS *Liberty*, killing 34 American crewmen in the process, so that they could blame it on Egypt. The government of Lyndon Johnson and the Jewish media collaborated in a massive coverup in order to avoid embarrassing Israel. That's what they're doing now in the case of the Israeli espionage ring that had advance knowledge of September 11 -- and also probably in the case of the anthrax letters. Circumstances beyond the control of the Jewish media and the Bush government may eventually force them to move against the anthrax mailer, however. We'll see.

What's interesting in connection with this business of the media always putting Israel's interests ahead of America's interests and forcing our corrupt and treasonous government to do the same is the public attitude taken by the Jews in this country. They never apologize or act the least bit

guilty or embarrassed. They always act as if they were the injured parties. Their arrogance and deceitfulness are simply beyond comprehension for the average Gentile. I'll give you just one example of that today by reading to you a few excerpts from a speech made last month by Abe Foxman, the national director of the country's most powerful Jewish pressure group, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. This was a speech to his fellow Jewish insiders, and you can read the whole thing for yourself at the ADL's Web site.

Foxman first said that he had hoped that the world would remember the special responsibility it has to the Jews because of the "Holocaust," and then he said:

My greatest nightmare is that one day I would wake up and something terrible would happen in America and we, the Jewish people, Jews and Israel, will be blamed. It happened.... Today you can travel the Arab world, Asia, and Europe, and read in newspapers and hear on radio and TV the big hideous lie that has become a truth -- that Jews bring about a situation in their interest in order to put the blame on somebody else. How classically anti-Semitic! Now ministers of Arab governments and even newspapers in Western Europe have bought into the big lie. It has become a fact, it is being taught in the schools, that perversion of recent and current history.

The reaction that they expect from the Gentiles -- and it is the reaction they usually have gotten -- is for the Gentiles to pull out their hankies and sniffle into them on behalf of the poor, innocent Jews, being blamed and persecuted once again through no fault of their own. Well, you can read for yourself all of Abe's speech at his ADL Web site, and I know that many of you will be much more inclined to gag than to sniffle. And the one encouraging aspect of this whole, sordid situation is that more and more of the perceptive minority of our people around the world also are gagging instead of sniffling. Abe does indeed have reason to have nightmares, although it's not quite the reason he wants us to think it is.

Senator Feinstein and Police Chief Parks

The subject about which I have spoken with you more than any other is the destructive effect on our people and on our civilization of the Jewish control of our mass media of news and entertainment. In nearly every broadcast, I've mentioned the damage done to us by Jewish media control. I don't talk about this subject so often because I want to bore you but because it is the single most important fact of life today: the single gravest danger threatening our people, our future, our very existence. Overcoming this danger -- breaking the Jewish stranglehold on our mass media -- is the single most urgent and demanding task facing us as a people. That's why I keep talking about it.

And I am sure that many people believe that I overdo it -- especially when I stress the fact that the destructive effects on our people and on our society by the media are deliberate. They think that I'm going overboard when I point out that the overwhelming domination of our mass media by Jews is not a coincidence: when I point out that it didn't just happen, when I point out that the Jews have taken over our media through a deliberate, concerted effort, and that the purpose of their takeover is our destruction. This accusation of mine against the Jews seems too farfetched to many people because they cannot imagine normal men behaving that way. They cannot imagine the sort of people they live with and work with and go to school with behaving like that or having those motivations; they cannot imagine their fellow Gentiles behaving that way.

And when I tell them that the Jews are not like their fellow Gentiles, that the Jews really are different, they take that with a grain of salt. Many of them still believe that the only difference between us and the Jews is a religious difference. In fact, most Americans believe that, but the Jews certainly don't. I don't have to time to get into this subject in depth today, but there are clues all around for the observant.

Here's one clue. Geraldo Rivera, who is himself part of the Jewish media apparatus, although perhaps not as discreet a part as his fellow media Jews would prefer, thinks of his people as a race apart. He's been touring the Middle East recently, propagandizing for the war against Afghanistan and Israel's other enemies and potential enemies and making comments. The *Washington Post* quoted him at length last week. He said, "I have been a Zionist my entire life. I would die for Israel."

He then went on to criticize his fellow Jews for their carelessness in letting the whole world witness the campaign of genocide they are waging against the Palestinians. It gives the Israelis a bad image. It makes it more difficult for the media Jews in America to portray the Israelis as the good guys. He said:

You can't round up Palestinian young men and put numbers on their arms to make it easier to identify them. That reminds the world ... of what Hitler and the Nazi pigs inflicted on the Jewish race during the Second World War.

Did you catch that: "the Jewish race." Those were Geraldo Rivera's words in the *Washington Post* of March 14. Just one little slip of the tongue, but still a clue. Now I'll tell you about a more

significant clue, which also was revealed last week. On March 13 a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, the Subcommittee on Technology and Terrorism, held public hearings on so-called "narco-terrorism": which is to say, on the support of international terrorism through the trade in illegal drugs. California Senator Diane Feinstein is the subcommittee chairman. She made the statement to the TV cameras and to the world, in her capacity as a U.S. senator and chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology and Terrorism, that Afghanistan's former Taliban government had financed international terrorism through the opium trade. They grew opium poppies, Feinstein said, in order to finance people like Osama bin Laden. Now, fortunately, we have stopped that particular branch of narco-terrorism.

Now, that is not only a lie, but it is the exact opposite of the truth, and Feinstein knew it. It was the Taliban government, destroyed by the Bush government at the insistence of Diane Feinstein and her fellow Jews, that outlawed the production of opium in Afghanistan and ordered the poppy fields plowed under. They did this for religious reasons, as Islamic fundamentalists. It is the new gangster government of Afghanistan, installed by the Bush government at the insistence of Diane Feinstein and her fellow Jews, that is replanting the poppy fields and starting up the opium trade again.

Why did Feinstein deliberately turn the truth on its head like this? Well, for one thing, it is simply part of the Jews' propaganda campaign aimed at demonizing their enemies and everyone who stands in their way. That's why the media, in every story they print about me, always call me a "hater." The Taliban government, despite all of its faults, was a government based on principles -- in this case the principles of the Koran -- and therefore was considered dangerous by the Jews. They tolerate only corrupt governments, governments that can be bribed and intimidated and manipulated -- like the present government in Washington, for example. Therefore, Feinstein accused the Taliban of producing opium in order to support international terrorism, when she knew that to be the opposite of the truth.

And the reason she made her false accusation so brazenly is that she knew her fellow Jews in the media would not contradict her. She knew that she could get away with it. And of course, the media Jews did let her get away with it. I saw and heard her make her accusation against the Taliban on CNN, and I am sure that the other networks also televised the Senate's narco-terrorism hearings. But no one in the media covering these hearings pointed out that the Jewess had lied brazenly in accusing the Taliban of being involved in the opium-poppy business.

Well, I guess that's pretty trivial stuff. The big lie at the moment remains the claim that the September 11 attack had nothing to do with the U.S. government's support for Israel's genocide and aggression in the Middle East, that the attack came only because Osama bin Laden "hates our freedom." But sometimes the little lies can be as revealing as the big lies.

I'll tell you about another clue as to the Jews' motivations. My organization, the National Alliance, is committed to building alternative media for communicating with the public and countering the lies of the Jews' media. We use books and magazines and video and the Internet and shortwave radio. We also use music produced by our Resistance Records affiliate. And just two months ago we began producing and distributing video games. Our first video game, called *Ethnic Cleansing,* is about urban warfare between Whites and non-Whites. The number-one bad

guy in the game is the Jewish prime minister and war criminal, Ariel Sharon. The player wins if he can find Sharon's secret hideout in the depths of the New York subway system and kill him without being killed by a non-White. The purpose of the game is to get White kids to think in racial terms, to think in terms of their White identity and develop a feeling of solidarity with other Whites; it is to help them overcome the sense of racial guilt and racial inferiority deliberately instilled in them by the propaganda of the Jewish media and to teach them that they can fight back.

Well, of course, all of that makes the game anathema to the Jewish media, and they have been screaming about it ever since we began distributing it in January. "It's violent!" they've been screaming. "It'll incite White kids to commit hate crimes!" You may have seen some of this commotion in the media yourself. The most powerful Jewish pressure group in America, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, issued a special press release last month denouncing our game and calling it a danger to children. Really!

If you play video games yourself and are familiar with some of the more popular games, then you immediately will recognize the hypocrisy in this Jewish response to our game. Nearly all video games are combat games. They're all violent. That is the nature of video games. One of the most popular video games now on the market is called *Grand Theft Auto.* It has sold more than 2 million copies since it came out four months ago. It's a cop-killer game. It's ultra-violent. It gives the player a chance to be an auto thief and to machine-gun policemen wholesale. It also gives the player a chance to have sex with prostitutes and then to kick them bloody afterward.

The Anti-Defamation League never has expressed any concern about *Grand Theft Auto.* The Jews aren't worried about what it teaches the kids who play it. Stealing cars, killing cops, and beating up prostitutes is good, clean fun as far as the Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish media are concerned: no outrage, no denunciations, despite the fact that *Grand Theft Auto* has sold more than a hundred times as many copies as our Ethnic Cleansing. Grand Theft Auto is available in video game stores all over the country. You have to order our game, *Ethnic Cleansing,* from Resistance Records, because the game stores are afraid of it. They are afraid of the Jewish media.

The Jews, in fact, have the video game business, like the other media, pretty much under their control. The trade association for video game makers is the Interactive Digital Software Association. The president of that trade association is a Mr. Lowenstein.

Amazing, isn't it? Lowenstein.

In response to the Anti-Defamation League's complaints about *Ethnic Cleansing,* Lowenstein issued a written statement. He wrote:

The Interactive Digital Software Association finds these games [and he means *Ethnic Cleansing]* abhorrent and condemns these kinds of sick efforts to abuse the wonderful technology of video games to peddle racist and anti-Semitic garbage.

To Mr. Lowenstein *Grand Theft Auto* is an example of "the wonderful technology of video games," and *Ethnic Cleansing* is "garbage."

My point here is that when Jewish organizations and the media say that they are concerned about exposing our kids to violence, they aren't. They're lying. When they say that they're concerned about teaching the wrong values to kids, they aren't. They're lying.

Well, let me refine that statement. The Jews are concerned about some types of violence: not about stealing cars, machine-gunning White policemen, and stomping women bloody; that sort of violence is all right. The sort of violence that sends them into a screaming frenzy is White people sticking up for themselves, White people fighting back: that's bad violence, so far as the Anti-Defamation League and the mass media and Mr. Lowenstein are concerned.

And as for values, *Grand Theft Auto* teaches kids the same sort of values that Murray Rothstein's MTV does. It teaches them anti-social values. It teaches them alienation. From the Jewish viewpoint that's good. *Ethnic Cleansing* teaches kids White solidarity, White community, White self-respect, White self-defense. That's not good. Oh, my goodness, no! The media do not approve of teaching kids those values.

My point is that the media are in fact destructive of our values and our society and our civilization. My point is that the media, because they are dominated by Jews, work to advance the Jews' interests, not our interests, and their interests are opposed to ours. That's supremely important. That's the most important thing of which our people should be aware.

And let me tell you something, the Jews are aware of it: not just the big-shot media Jews and the Jews at the Anti-Defamation League. They all understand that they thrive only when we have been demoralized, alienated, and atomized. It's a tribal instinct for them. The thing they all fear most is our racial solidarity, our sense of racial consciousness, our willingness to stand together for the things that are important to us. And basically that's why they prefer that young, White Americans play games like *Grand Theft Auto,* and we want them to play *Ethnic Cleansing* instead.

Their weapons against us are primarily their mass media of news and entertainment. At this time, our weapons for defending our people against them are primarily our own media. We in the National Alliance are working night and day to make our weapons more effective, to reach and move more of our people with our media, to counter the poison coming from their media. And I guess that we're having some success in that direction, judging by the uproar in the Jewish media about our new video game.

Unfortunately, our problem is not just to catch up with the Jews in using mass media to communicate effectively with the public. The Jews are moving against our people on other fronts as well. They can see the gains that we're making with our media, and their aim is to head us off by outlawing all opposition to their media. They began a decade ago with so-called "hate crimes." That was to get the public accustomed to the idea that people should be punished for what they think as well as for what they do when they commit an offense.

Now they're pushing hard for "speech crime" legislation, so that people can be punished whether they do anything or not. The general rationale they use is that as our society becomes more and more "diverse" and multicultural, we all have to be more careful what we say or write, lest we offend someone. If we offend someone there may be a public disturbance, perhaps even a riot. If we want our society to be peaceful and prosperous, then we all should be careful what we say; we all should be careful not to say something that may offend a homosexual or a feminist or a Jew or a Black or what have you. The real threats to a peaceful, prosperous society, they would have us believe, are the dissidents, the people who insist on expressing Politically Incorrect ideas or exposing Politically Inconvenient facts, the people who deliberately offend other people. They're as bad as terrorists. We need laws to protect society from them. We need "speech crime" laws, they tell us.

That's their rationale. They're pushing it slowly and carefully. Every time they complain about something I've said or something I've published, they are careful to say, "Well, there's nothing we can do to stop him, because of the First Amendment." And the implication is that it's ***too bad*** there's nothing that they can do to stop me. There ought to be a way to stop me. After all, this is the 21st century, and we need new laws. The First Amendment was written more than 200 years ago by a bunch of dead, White males who owned slaves. It's still around; it's still the law of the land, but it's about time to make some changes. At the very least, the police need to keep an eye on Pierce and other Politically Incorrect dissidents.

That's exactly what Jewish pressure groups like the Anti-Defamation League are saying, and they're receiving at least implicit support from the whole Jewish community, not just from the media Jews. And these Jewish groups are doing more than just propagandizing for "speech crime" laws. One thing they are doing is pushing for what they call "hate filters" to be installed on the computers used by students in public schools and by library patrons in public libraries. These "hate filters" are pieces of software that block access to all Web sites that are deemed Politically Incorrect. When such a piece of software has been installed on a computer, then the person using that computer cannot go to the National Alliance Web site and listen to one of my *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts or read the text of the broadcast. He can access only Politically Correct Web sites from the computer. And of course, it is the Anti-Defamation League that decides what is Politically Correct and what is not.

The Anti-Defamation League has been having a frightening degree of success in persuading librarians and school administrators all over the country to lobotomize their computers with these Jewish "hate filters." "It's to protect the children from being exposed to hate," the Anti-Defamation League claims. And of course, they get the politicians to back them up. What politician will dare to be against protecting children from hate? In fact, considering the terminal state of corruption of politics in America today, what politician will dare to stand up to the Anti-Defamation League on anything?

And, as I have warned in earlier broadcasts, Jewish groups are infiltrating and corrupting law-enforcement agencies all over America. They will tell you that it has nothing to do with corruption, of course, but it certainly does. The Anti-Defamation League, for example, has set up what it calls a "Law Enforcement Agency Resource Network." The Anti-Defamation League offers to provide training to police personnel on how to recognize and deal with "hate criminals"

and "speech criminals." And police departments, most of which these days are headed by men who are much more politicians than policemen, will go along with the Jews. Bernard Parks, who is chief of the Los Angeles Police Department, one of the largest law-enforcement agencies in the country, signed a formal agreement with the Anti-Defamation League last month. The Los Angeles Police Department and the Anti-Defamation League will share information in the effort to protect citizens from haters and terrorists.

In connection with this agreement the Los Angeles regional director of the Anti-Defamation League announced:

In the battle against haters, extremists, and those who seek to erode our democratic values and threaten our security, we are committed to providing law-enforcement agencies with the resources and tools to augment their ongoing efforts. We have extensive resources available to law enforcement, including current and archival information, analysis and programs.

You can read that statement for yourself right on the ADL's Web site, at adl.org. What the ADL doesn't mention is that much of its "archival information" was obtained illegally. I am sure that Los Angeles Police Chief Bernard Parks is fully aware that the Los Angeles office of the Anti-Defamation League was raided by police from his department with a search warrant in April 1993, and more than 12,000 stolen confidential police files on individuals were recovered. The impropriety of any sort of agreement for collaboration between the Los Angeles Police Department and the Anti-Defamation League is staggering.

Chief Parks, like all too many of his colleagues, unfortunately, is a politician. He understands the impropriety of what he is doing by exchanging confidential information on citizens with the Anti-Defamation League. But, like Diane Feinstein and her brazen claim that the Taliban was behind Afghanistan's opium trade, Chief Parks is sure that the news media will not call him to account for his arrangement with the Anti-Defamation League.

Well, I'm sure that you can see where all of this is headed, without my having to connect all of the dots for you. We all are in an extremely dangerous situation. Our freedom is being stolen from us. We'd better start doing something about it.

Bad News and Good News

Let's begin today by reminding ourselves of something we talked about on this program two weeks ago, and that is the increasing corruption and politicization of America's most important national security and law-enforcement organizations. We talked specifically about two glaring and shameful lapses on the part of the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The first of these was the refusal to prosecute some 200 Israeli espionage agents in the biggest spy ring ever broken up in this country. These Jewish espionage agents were arrested by the FBI last year, both before and after the September 11 attack. After September 11, however, when the Bush government realized that these Israeli agents not only had been spying on various U.S. military and government installations but also had been shadowing the al-Qaeda agents in this country and had advance information about the attack that it did not share with the U.S. government, they all were quietly sent back to Israel instead of being prosecuted. The Bush government's reason for simply letting all of these spies go was that prosecuting them for espionage would have been extremely embarrassing to Israel and would have thrown a spotlight on the whole issue of U.S.-Israeli relations at a time when the government was desperate to keep the public from thinking about why America was attacked on September 11.

Mr. Bush knew that the controlled news media also didn't want the public asking questions about this very delicate subject, and he knew that if he simply sent the spies quietly back to Israel no one in the media would criticize him for it. On the other hand, the prosecution of the 200 spies for espionage would have brought things to the surface that would have earned Mr. Bush the undying hatred of the media Jews and of all of Israel's other support groups in this country. They would have given him the Richard Nixon treatment. It would have been political suicide for him. So he ordered the FBI to turn them loose and send them home.

Well, the good news in this sorry episode is that, despite the silence of the mainstream media, this issue isn't just fading away. Many media in Europe are continuing to bring out new details, almost on a daily basis, and because of the Internet many of America's perceptive and thoughtful minority are learning about these things too and are discussing them. For example, a 60-page internal report on the Israeli espionage activity prepared by the Drug Enforcement Administration is now in general circulation. Two weeks ago, when we first talked about this Jewish espionage, only brief excerpts from this confidential DEA report were available on the Internet. I believe that it is likely that more and more information on this subject will continue to become public.

It's too late, of course, to prosecute the spies now, and Sally Soccermom and Joe Sixpack will continue to remain completely ignorant of the entire affair, but more and more members of the perceptive minority will learn about it, and that will cause at least some embarrassment in both the Bush administration and in the FBI. That embarrassment, especially among career FBI people, is a very good thing.

The other thing that we discussed two weeks ago is the FBI's failure so far to charge anyone for mailing anthrax-infected letters. I suggested that the FBI probably knows who the perpetrator is but that they may have been ordered by the Bush government not to arrest him because it would be embarrassing to the media, to Israel, and to Mr.Bush himself. I suggested that the anthrax case may be something that Mr. Bush and his Jewish handlers would like to see fade away quietly, as they hoped that the Israeli espionage matter would.

The more information that comes out on the espionage case, however, the more difficult it will be to avoid charging the guilty party in the anthrax case. I think that all of the people involved believed that they could just cover up the Jewish espionage arrests, and no one would notice. They certainly were once able to get away with that sort of thing.

Remember the USS *Liberty?* That was back in 1967, before the Internet, and the government of Lyndon Johnson, the Navy brass in the Pentagon, and the Jewish media all collaborated in a huge cover-up, in order to avoid embarrassing the Jews. The Israelis had attacked a U.S. Navy ship, trying to sink it so that they could blame it on Egypt and cause anti-Egyptian feeling in the United States. They killed 35 American crewmen in the attempt. That should have brought massive military retaliation against Israel, but it brought a cover-up instead, and the cover-up worked. The surviving crew members were ordered to keep their mouths shut, and most Americans never heard about the USS Liberty. I don't think that the Jews could get away with that sort of thing today.

So, the more information that leaks out on the Bush government's failure to prosecute the arrested Jewish spies, the more the Bush people and the FBI people must fear that if they continue to avoid arresting the anthrax mailer, the information will leak out anyway, and when it does it will make them look very bad indeed if it appears that they tried to cover it up. In the case of the FBI, they have to choose between following the politically motivated directives from the White House and maintaining a cover-up on the one hand, or defying the White House and risking career reprisals.

There is an internal shake-up and reorganization going on now in the FBI, and I believe the reason for this is not to increase the FBI's efficiency as a law-enforcement agency, but instead to adapt it better to its politicized role and allow it to do a better job of maintaining cover-ups without leaks. The bright side of this is that the more corrupt the government and its secret police agencies become, the easier it becomes to fight them. The most formidable enemy is an honest enemy, an enemy who believes in the rightness of his cause. A corrupt enemy, who cares only about his career, will be easier to defeat. And it should be painfully clear now to every perceptive patriot that there is no way to regain control of our destiny and secure our freedom -- or even our survival -- without fighting and defeating the present government.

Considerations of this sort have been on my mind not only in connection with the preparation of these weekly broadcasts but also in connection with my responsibility as chairman of the National Alliance. We have a *Membership Handbook* that is given to every member of the National Alliance. The National Alliance *Membership Handbook* covers such subjects as rules of behavior for members, but it also covers such things as the long-range goals of the National

Alliance: What sort of society do we want to have in the future, after the present mess has been cleaned up? What sort of educational system? What sort of economy? What sort of government?

I'm working on a new edition of our *Membership Handbook* at the moment, and so I've had to think about all of these things. In particular, I've had to deal with the problem of minimizing government corruption: of designing a government that is least likely to go astray, least likely to ignore its most fundamental responsibility of safeguarding the freedom and welfare of the citizenry and promoting their progress, least likely to be subverted and taken over by our enemies, least likely to become like our present government in Washington.

I'm not convinced that there is a perfect solution to this problem, but I do believe that we can do a much better job than we have done so far in America. Just having an ethnically clean citizenry, without 30 million descendants of our former African slaves wrecking our cities and our schools and wielding a growing bloc vote in elections, would be a huge step toward having a good government. Not having our mass media in the hands of the Jews would be an even bigger step forward. Eliminating the whole business of party politics, which has been a dirty business from the beginning, also would give our people a much better chance of having an honest government.

Many people in America will agree with one or more of these points. And I don't mean just the small, thoughtful minority of Americans -- I don't mean just the people who listen to *American Dissident Voices* every week -- I mean that many Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks also will agree that, yes, Blacks are a really worrisome problem, and it'll be hard ever to clean up the government when they make up such a big voting bloc. Or they will say, yeah, I agree with Billy Graham and Richard Nixon: the Jews have a stranglehold on the media, and that's not good for this country.

Well, each of these problems that many people agree ought to be dealt with -- the out-of-control Black problem, the Jewish stranglehold on the media, and the circus-like nature of our electoral system -- each of these problems grew out of the type of government that we have now: the same governmental structure, the same governmental institutions. The weaknesses were there from the beginning. The problems may not have been apparent at the beginning, but the potential was there. And we can't get rid of any of these problems with the government as it is now. That is, we can't eliminate the Black problem or the Jewish problem or the problem of party politics through the normal processes of the government that we have now under the conditions that exist now. For example, we can't expect Congress to enact legislation stripping the Jews of their media control, even if there were no constitutional conflicts, when every politician in Congress already has a string tied to him by the Jews who control the media.

The problems confronting our people can be solved only by extraordinary means: by making a radical break with our present way of doing things. And that radical break, of course, cannot come from the established procedures of the present government. This is the sticking point for most people. They want solutions. They want an honest government. But they are afraid to do what is required to bring about an honest government. They don't want a revolution. They want a solution that is safe and nice, safe and peaceful.

Blowing up buildings and destroying cities and killing a bunch of people with bombs and bullets is OK with them if it's on the other side of the world, in Afghanistan or Iraq. They can watch that on TV and still feel safe. But they definitely don't want that sort of thing happening close to home, in Washington or New York or Los Angeles, where it will interfere with their shopping-mall excursions and their ball-game viewing. Even most members of the perceptive minority, who think about our problems and worry about them much more than the Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks do, are afraid of the means necessary to eliminate the problems. Most of ***them*** also don't want a revolution.

A few more episodes like the Bush government's refusal to prosecute the huge Israeli spy ring that the FBI broke up last year, however, will help many members of the perceptive minority accept the fact that revolution is the only solution. And if the FBI's failure to make an arrest in the case of the anthrax letters turns out also to be the result of pressure from the Bush government trying to avoid embarrassing its Jewish friends, and if the facts leak out anyway, even more thoughtful people will understand that the time has passed when a nice solution could have ended our problems.

Well, the fact that things have to become even worse, before enough people to do the job will be convinced that the job must be done, shouldn't stop us from planning ahead and thinking about the sort of safeguards that we need to build into a new government to make it less likely that it will be corrupted. Of course, all we can do now, and all I'm trying to do in the National Alliance *Membership Handbook* is address our problems in a general sort of way. All I'm trying to do now is lay down the general principles that will guide us in building a new government. The details will involve much more work and also many decisions that simply cannot be made now.

Avoiding government corruption isn't the only thing of concern to the National Alliance, and in our *Membership Handbook* we look at the sort of social structure and the sort of economy and the sort of educational system that we want also. Just as in the case of government, however, our principles are quite at odds with the generally accepted notions today of how the economy and our educational system and our society should be run, and what goals are proper for them. One ruling notion today is that sexual equality should be promoted at any cost: equality between men and women in the workplace, equal roles in society, no distinction between men and women in education.

The application of this notion has had many consequences, but the one with which I am most concerned is that it has caused the White birthrate to drop far below the replacement level. Either the White birthrate comes up, or we become extinct. That consideration must take precedence over all others. To get the White birthrate up -- and not just the overall White birthrate, but especially the birthrate among the best White women, the ones with the best genes -- we must structure our society and our economy and our educational system so that many fewer of our best women choose careers outside the home. We must give them strong incentives to marry early and have several children. We must put an end to the destructive propaganda that makes so many of them believe that to be a wife and mother is to be a failure, that a woman can only find happiness by being like a man. We must make it economically possible for a man to support a family without his wife and the mother of his children having to work outside the home.

You know, we can quibble about many of the details, but we can't quibble about the fundamental fact that we must bring up our birthrate or we're finished.

And you see, it's all tied together: the type of government, the type of society, the way the economy works, the things we teach our children, and the way in which we teach them. They're all interdependent. If one becomes corrupted or subverted, eventually they all become corrupted. To become healthy again as a people, we need to do many things differently. How we need to do them differently is what I've been concerned with in preparing the new edition of the National Alliance *Membership Handbook.* And as I said a minute ago, I've been thinking about how we ought to do things only in broad outline, only in principle. And my touchstone in setting down the principles that must guide the building of a new government, a new society, a new economy, and a new educational system -- the touchstone is racial survival, racial health, racial progress. Everything that we do in the future must be guided by the single consideration: will it help our people to survive and to become healthy again?

And this consideration and the principles that follow from it are radically opposed to the principles governing things in America today. There can be no smooth transition from one set of principles to the other. The transition will be revolutionary and undoubtedly very disruptive for everyone concerned. And that's why the National Alliance is an educational organization at this time. We can't even begin to implement the changes now that we believe should be made, but we can get people to think and to plan now for the day when we can begin to implement changes. And that day comes closer every time the government in Washington does something like trying to cover for a huge Israeli espionage network and shows by its actions that it is more interested in protecting the Jewish spies than in protecting the American people. That day comes closer every time the government in Washington, through its Israel-first policy, brings down on America a disaster such as the September 11 attack, and then claims it doesn't know why we were attacked and continues with the same Israel-first policy as before.

Now, here's the good news: this sort of behavior by the government in Washington will continue. Some time ago the government started down a slippery slope, and it is too far down now to be able to start back up or even to slow its slide. Can you imagine that smirking, feckless nincompoop we have in the White House now even wanting to stop the slide? He and his predecessor have gotten away with everything so far. Why should they even want to have an honest government? There would be no place in it for them, except the end of a rope.

The people who go into politics in America today are not revolutionaries. They are not men of principle. They are lawyers and businessmen. They are men who have learned how to go with the flow: men who have learned to lie convincingly and to present a good image to the TV cameras. When they find themselves in a corrupt environment their instinct is to adapt. And the Jews who have a stranglehold on our mass media of news and entertainment certainly won't be inclined to do anything but tighten their grip even more. They know that they have a tiger by the tail and that they dare not let go. They will continue leading our government to pursue policies favoring their people at the expense of our people. And so my prediction is that America will continue down the slippery slope faster and faster.

America will experience embarrassment after embarrassment, disaster after disaster. The Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks may remain largely oblivious to what is happening, but more and more members of the perceptive minority, the minority whose participation is necessary to keep the gears of government and the economy turning, will understand that radical change is necessary and cannot be postponed much longer. The principles in the National Alliance's *Membership Handbook,* which a year or two ago seemed quite theoretical -- perhaps even irrelevant -- to most practical-minded people, because there was no obvious way in which they could be implemented, are becoming less theoretical and more relevant with each passing year: indeed, with each passing month.

Once again: The bad news is that America has gotten herself into a hell of a mess by not being careful enough about the principles by which she governed herself. The good news is that the mess is becoming more obvious, and the reaction is growing. And there is an organization, the National Alliance, that is concerned about matters of principle and is working to build itself into a force for putting its principles into practice. Perhaps you are one of those who should be working with us. Think about it.

A Fatal Influence

I've just finished watching the television news showing the latest round of bloodletting between Jews and Palestinians in the Middle East. It's certainly good to see that the Palestinians finally have learned how to improve the kill ratio. For a long time it seemed that for every Jew killed by a Palestinian, the Jews killed 100 or so Palestinians. Things are a bit better now.

But the bloodletting is not the most interesting aspect of the news about the Middle East. The most interesting aspect is the response of the politicians over here and of the media over here. All of us, of course, view the world through our own prejudices. Despite my prejudices, though, when I watch the news I do try to imagine how other people, with different prejudices, are reacting to what I am seeing. I see George Bush and the other politicians over here desperately sucking up to the Jews by demanding that Yasser Arafat "stop the violence," that Yasser Arafat "call off his terrorists." Whether it is a Palestinian blowing himself up at an Israeli military checkpoint and taking three Jews with him or one of Ariel Sharon's murder squads summarily shooting a group of young Palestinian men they have rounded up in Ramallah, the Bush crowd over here calls on Yasser Arafat to "stop the violence."

Now, on aesthetic grounds alone, I could never be an Arafat booster. He's about as aesthetically appealing as Ariel Sharon. But whenever I see George Bush, with that little smirk on his face, blaming every act of violence in occupied Palestine on the Palestinians and never on the Jewish occupiers -- whenever I hear him repeat his same old claim that "Arafat isn't doing enough to stop the violence," while Jewish soldiers are shooting more Palestinian children, I ask myself whether Bush's performance looks as grotesque to other viewers as it does to me. Doesn't it make other viewers squirm in embarrassment when they are reminded that this pathetic, smirking liar sucking up to the Jews is the President of the United States?

I've heard people who still are enamored of the democratic system of government that we have in the United States make excuses for the behavior of Bush and the other politicians: they have to behave that way, I've been told, because of the media bias. They couldn't get elected if they didn't pretend to be pro-Israel. And when I hear that all I can think is that no honorable man has to behave that way. No real American has to behave that way. No decent man has to stand for public office under the present system. George Bush and Dick Cheney and the rest got into politics knowing ahead of time that if elected they would have to play by Jewish rules.

Well, of course, Mr. Bush's apologists are right about the media bias. While Yasser Arafat was huddled in his office in Ramallah last week, without water or electricity or food, surrounded by Israeli tanks, and Jewish soldiers were trying to shoot their way in, American reporters managed to get Arafat on the telephone, and what they asked him was, "Mr. Arafat, why don't you stop the violence?"

Because of Jewish media bias, most Americans see only one side of the violence. When a Palestinian woman blows herself up in a Jewish restaurant and kills a dozen or so Jews, it's all over television here, and we get to hear Mr. Bush once again blaming the violence on Arafat. When the Jews round up Palestinians on the streets of Ramallah, handcuff them, march them

around a corner out of sight, and then shoot them, Americans never hear about it. In Europe at least, the public is getting a somewhat more balanced picture.

I have on my desk a stack of news reports from European newspapers from earlier this week. On top of the stack is a report from this Sunday's issue of the *Observer,* a major London newspaper. It's headed: "Without Mercy: Israelis Execute Arafat's Guards." The report itself is a first-hand account by Peter Beaumont, the *Observer's* foreign-affairs editor in Ramallah, as he goes into an office building near Arafat's headquarters and views the corpses of a group of Palestinian policemen who have been rounded up by Sharon's soldiers, disarmed, made to kneel in a hallway, and then shot to death. These aren't terrorists; they are Palestinian policemen who have been rounded up by the Jews and murdered in cold blood.

Beaumont describes the condition of the corpses in detail. He notes that the locations of the blood spatters on the walls show that the victims were shot while they were kneeling. After the Jews mowed down the policemen with assault rifles at point blank range, a Jew shot each one in the head to finish him off. It's disgusting. But what's even more disgusting is the fact that most Americans never have a chance to see this news because the media over here either suppress it or downplay it.

Since Ariel Sharon became Israel's prime minister, have you ever heard an American reporter or an American politician ask him why he doesn't stop the violence? Have you ever heard an American reporter ask him about his murderous activities as a war criminal before becoming prime minister? Have you ever heard an American reporter ask him about the recent assassinations of the principal witnesses who might be called to testify against him in a war crimes trial? These assassinations, almost certainly carried out on Sharon's orders by the Mossad, Israel's main organ of state terrorism, have been big news in Europe, but in the United States they have gone virtually unreported.

Well, no one has talked more about the need to end the Jewish control of our mass media than I have. But again I say, Jewish media control is no excuse for people like George Bush. Jewish control of our electoral system is no excuse for any politician to behave in the way that virtually all of ours do.

There are several ways one can look at our problems, and, as I said at the beginning, I try to look at them in every way. One could say that everything is the fault of White American men. We used to run this country. If the Jews have taken over our mass media, it's because we let them do it. If we have a bunch of lying crooks in Washington who ought to be hanged, it's because we let the system become what it is today. So we could blame ourselves instead of the politicians or the Jewish media.

We also could blame the changed social and economic environment in America for softening us up to the point that we let the Jews and the politicians get away with what they're doing. We certainly do need to toughen ourselves up. We do need to discipline ourselves better, both individually and collectively. We do need to be more vigilant. We do need to have a redesigned social and economic environment that keeps us tough and disciplined. We need to have values oriented toward strength and fitness and progress and survival instead of toward comfort and

luxury. And when we regain control of our situation, we do need to hang a great many politicians.

Well, it's good to think about all of these things. It's good to look at our problems from every viewpoint. One element that we encounter over and over, whether we look at media bias or at the crookedness of our politicians or at our own softness and decadence, is the role of the Jews. This role is pretty evident in the problem of media bias, although I still encounter people -- mostly conservatives -- who tell me that Jewish control of the media isn't a problem. They say to me, "What difference does it make that Jews are represented disproportionately in the mass media? They're good businessmen. The mass media are big business. It wouldn't be any different if Lutherans or atheists owned the media." That, I believe, can properly be called willful ignorance.

I encounter many more people who want to make a distinction between the media Jews and Zionist Jews on the one hand, and all the rest of the Jews -- that is, non-Zionist Jews and non-media Jews -- on the other hand. The media Jews, everyone agrees, are a sleazy bunch. And the Zionist Jews are not to be trusted because they are loyal to Israel, not to America, but those who aren't Zionists are just as trustworthy as non-Jews, I have been told. Perhaps the ignorance of many of these people is not willful, but it is ignorance nevertheless.

The truth of the matter is that our present misfortune is not just media Jews or Zionist Jews, but Jews: all of them.

Let me explain to you something that I've talked about in the past but that needs reiteration because many people just didn't get it. It's not terribly complicated, but it's quite at odds with the modern American way of viewing things. All of us White Americans -- or our ancestors at some time during the past 400 years -- came here from Europe, where we spent many thousands of years in isolation, developing into what we are. We developed as a race. We developed collectively. We not only developed our coloration and our facial features and other characteristics that distinguish us as a race, we also developed a general pattern of thinking and of behaving. We developed a way of living and of surviving, as a race.

We encountered other races on the southern and eastern borders of our area of development, but for the most part we developed on our own, and whether our ancestors for the last thousand years or so were in Scotland or Latvia or Ukraine, we developed similarly. There was a lot less difference between our ancestors in Ireland and those in Greece or Poland than between all of us and any of the non-European races. And as I said, the characteristics that distinguished us as Europeans were psychological as well as physical. We had our way of looking at the world and of relating to the world, and other races had theirs.

The fact that some racial differences are invisible makes things a little tricky. It's easy for us to look at a Black and understand that he and we belong to different races. When we look at a Jew the difference is not as apparent, but it is just as real. One difference between us and the Jews is that they have a far stronger collective consciousness, a far stronger consciousness of who they are and how they differ from us, than we do. We can spend a lot of time talking about how much of this difference in collective consciousness is genetic and how much is the result of cultural

conditioning, but the essential thing for now is that the difference is real, and it's very important. And there are other important differences.

Until about 2,000 years ago we didn't have to worry about these differences, because we had no contact with the Jews, for all practical purposes. In fact, it's been only during about the past 200 years that we've had much interaction with them. They followed the Roman legions into Gaul and into Germany and into other parts of Europe to sell trinkets and to buy prisoners of war as slaves, but during the Middle Ages they were kept pretty much confined to ghettos. Even so, they caused enough problems that they were expelled *en masse* from every country in Europe at one time or another. But from about the time of the Napoleonic Wars they really began infiltrating our society and having a major influence.

When the barriers came down, the Jews saw a whole new world opened up to them. But they saw that world with their eyes, and of course, it was not their type of world. It was our world, our society, which we had created to suit our own nature, and it was quite different from the sort of world that would suit them. And so they set about remaking our world to suit themselves. And the result of that endeavor on their part is what we see all around us today.

Like every other race, we have our weaknesses, our flaws, which we tried to cope with as best we could when we had the advantage of isolation: that is, when we could deal with our own problems in our own ways. When the Jews came into our society they displayed an uncanny knack for sniffing out our weaknesses and exploiting them.

What I will say now is, like many other things I say, an oversimplification, but it is my way of getting at the truth. When the Jews surveyed our world and made their plans for changing it to suit themselves, they had two goals: first, to remake our society so that it would be more agreeable to them; and second, to disable us so that we would not be able to defend ourselves. With these two goals in mind they made a beeline for our mass media. It's not just happenstance that they set about monopolizing our mass media instead of, say, our railroads or our steel industry. They knew exactly what they were doing.

And it wasn't just the media Jews. While some of them were elbowing the Gentiles out of the way and consolidating their stranglehold on Hollywood, others were quietly taking over whole departments at our universities, building up their numbers in various professional societies, infiltrating themselves into the management of labor unions, working their way into positions of influence in our political parties, organizing so-called "interfaith" groups and persuading Christian leaders to enter into a one-way "dialogue" with them, setting themselves up as cultural arbiters: as "experts" on our art and our music and our literature.

And none of this was done blindly or simply as a matter of chance. They worked together like the various units of an invading army.

As I said a moment ago, I'm oversimplifying, but I'm happy to refer you to places where you can dig out a lot of the details for yourselves. I'll mention now just two books that are available from the sponsor of this broadcast, National Vanguard Books. One is *You Gentiles,* by the Jewish publicist, Maurice Samuel. The other is *Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin,* by the German

playwright and publisher, Dietrich Eckart. Both books were written back in the 1920s, and both approach the Jewish problem in a fairly comprehensive way, but from opposite sides of the conflict. If you read them, I think you'll find them enlightening. And these two books will lead you to others.

I told you that the Jews have two goals. They're not just taking over our society and remaking it to suit themselves; they're also working to cripple us morally so that we can't fight back. That's why you see them doing many things in America that they aren't doing because they like those things for themselves, but because those things weaken us. Consider their promotion of feminism, for example: feminism certainly isn't something they want for themselves; it's contrary to their whole tradition. And their position in favor of open borders for America certainly isn't something they favor for Israel.

Well, an understanding of what the Jews have done and are doing to our society, and why they're doing it, isn't something that I expect everyone to develop the first time they hear about these things. That's why I talk about them over and over again and go at them from so many different angles. This understanding is important. It's a matter of survival or extinction for us, and we'd better grasp it, even if we have to read a few books and do some hard thinking.

One angle I've talked about a lot recently, especially since September 11, is the consequence for America of letting the Jews control our foreign policy. Another consequence of Jewish influence, which for me is far more important than anything Osama bin Laden could do to us even if he had 100 nuclear bombs, is what the Jews have done to America racially. I've recommended this before, and I'll recommend it again: go to a library or to your parents' or grandparents' attic and take a close look at the popular magazines that were published in America before the Second World War. Dig out 60-year-old issues of *Look* and *Life* and *Time* and the *Saturday Evening Post.* Look at the advertisements. Look at the photographs. Look at the image of America those magazines presented. It was a White America: an entirely White America. White children playing together or going to school together; White adults working together, partying together, celebrating together, relaxing together. It was a world that young White people could identify with. It was their world, and they could plan their future in it.

That world has been destroyed. Our future has been destroyed, and I don't have to tell you who destroyed it. How can a White kid today identify with the multicultural world portrayed in today's advertisements? It's not just that there are so many more non-Whites in America today; it's that the Jews have deliberately changed the image of what America should look like. They have re-made the image to suit themselves, and now it doesn't suit us.

I know that there are many White Americans, some on the Jews' payroll and some merely lemmings saying what they think is expected of them, who will tell you that the multicultural image of the world presented to us today by the Jews is a much better image than the "racist" image of a White America we had before the Second World War. These are the idiots who will parrot whatever slogans the Jews have taught them: "There's only one race, and that's the human race." "Diversity is our strength." And all the other Jewish poison.

But I know and you know that this Jewish multicultural image is not a better or healthier or more natural image. I know and you know that it is an image with which most White kids cannot identify, despite all of the Politically Correct chatter from the lemmings. That's why we have so many problems today with alienation and drug abuse and alcohol abuse and aimlessness on the part of our young people. They don't see a future for themselves in the new world designed by the Jews, because it's not our kind of world. And this is a deliberate consequence of Jewish activity.

Every perceptive person who examines the evidence objectively will understand that this is so. He will understand that it is not just America's foreign policy that has been perverted by the Jews; it is all of America's domestic policies as well. Jewish influence has not only led America to embrace an obscene creature like Ariel Sharon. Jewish influence also has White kids shuffling along the sidewalks of our cities in hip-hop attire, with safety pins stuck through their lips, listening to rap music. Jewish influence has White women walking along the sidewalks holding hands with Black males or pushing baby carriages with mongrel abominations in them.

And it is not just the Jewish moguls in Hollywood or on Madison Avenue who are exerting this influence. It is the Jewish presence as a whole. It is the entire Jewish tribe.

Most of our people are still hypnotized by the "Holocaust" propaganda that the Jews have been spewing at us for the past 50 years. Most of us still feel guilty if we even question what the Jews are doing or why they're doing it. We need to break the grip of this propaganda so that we can defend ourselves.

We need to understand why there was a "Holocaust" and what its true nature was. We need to look at the holocausts perpetrated against our people by the Jews and their helpers before, during, and after the Second World War. We need to wake up and defend ourselves, and we need to do it now.

Tiptoeing around Our Problems

We've been talking about the very dangerous situation in the Middle East recently, just because so much is happening there, and undoubtedly we'll be talking about it much more in the future. For that reason, I want to make very clear what my motives and sympathies are, lest I lead anyone astray and be thought a hypocrite for doing so.

First, regarding Palestine, although my sympathies definitely lie with the Palestinians rather than with the Jews, it is not horror at what the Jews are doing to the Palestinians that motivates me. What motivates me is horror that my country is being used by the Jews in their war against the Palestinians. If America were not involved at all in the Middle East, I still would sympathize with the Palestinians, and I would wish that they could be successful in driving the Jews into the sea and annihilating the abomination that is Israel, but that conflict between Jews and Palestinians would not be a major concern for me. At least, my concern there would be dwarfed by my concern for problems more directly involving my own people in America and in Europe and in southern Africa.

Even now, with money and weapons being supplied by America and used to slaughter Palestinians, my concern is much less with monsters like Ariel Sharon who are doing the slaughtering than it is with the filthy creatures among my own people in America who are collaborating with Jews here to keep the weapons and money flowing to Sharon -- and are ready to do whatever else the Jews require of them here or abroad.

So when I tell you about Jews in occupied Palestine shooting Palestinian children, and disapproval and anger are evident in my voice, what I really am angry about is that the American people, my people, are being used for this murderous activity. I am angry that America's whole foreign policy has been perverted to serve Jewish interests at the expense of American interests. I am angry that America's political system has been perverted to ensure that we always have so-called "leaders," whether Democrat or Republican, who are dependent on the Jewish media or Jewish money or both for their election and consequently will do the bidding of the Jews. I am angry that our whole government is riddled with Jews -- Jews in our Defense Department, Jews in our State Department, Jews in our Immigration and Naturalization Service, Jews in our Justice Department, Jews in the President's speech-writing staff -- who really set the policies of our government behind the scenes, while the politicians are out front in the spotlight making speeches and kissing babies -- and doing as they're told by the Jews behind the scenes.

Did you know that it was a Jewish speech writer, David Frum, who put the phrase "axis of evil" in George Bush's mouth to justify America's ongoing war against Israel's enemies? Did you know that a clique of Jews in the Defense Department and among George Bush's foreign policy advisers are the people actually running the so-called "war on terror" in Afghanistan: a war that they intend to expand to Iraq and to any other Middle Eastern country that gets uppity, in order to make that part of the world safe for Israel at American expense? Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld is a front man for his nominal subordinates, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith; and George Bush's official foreign policy adviser, Condoleezza Rice, helps him meet his Black quota for the

Cabinet, but it is the Jew Richard Perle, chairman of Bush's Defense Policy Board, who gives him his foreign policy directives.

As I've said on more than one occasion, George Bush is a feckless nincompoop who couldn't come up with a defense policy or a foreign policy on his own if he had to -- which is why he's President. The real policy makers behind the scenes certainly don't want a man in the White House who has ideas of his own, because those ideas might conflict with theirs.

And it is nothing but empty sophistry to make a distinction between Jews in Israel, such as Ariel Sharon and Simon Peres, and the Jews in Mr. Bush's administration formulating his policies or the Jews controlling our mass media. They all are Jews, and that's what really matters.

There are many knowledgeable Americans besides me who think that it's not a good thing to have Jews using America to advance Israel's interests at the expense of America's interests. They know how the system works: how the Jews exert their control through money and media and a well-entrenched network of Jewish operatives, such as Wolfowitz and Feith and Perle. And many of these knowledgeable Americans also understand how Jewish subterfuge and deceit work: they understand that the Jews throw up a lot of smoke to conceal their control and make it appear that they have much less influence than they actually do.

Despite this degree of understanding that many knowledgeable Americans have, there seem to be very few who are willing or able to draw the necessary conclusions. What I keep seeing are comments about the need to get the so-called "peace process" going again in the Middle East, and how there are hard-line supporters of Israel who are obstructing the "peace process" because they think that it will give too much to the Palestinians or will compromise Israel's security, or whatever. These knowledgeable Americans seem to believe that if we could just get around the Jewish hardliners somehow -- if we could just neutralize Jews such as Wolfowitz and Feith and Perle; if Ariel Sharon could be replaced by a "moderate" Jewish prime minister -- then the "peace process" could proceed, America could gradually reduce its involvement in helping the Jews keep the Palestinians repressed, and eventually Israel no longer would be using America, and everything would be rosy. And so these knowledgeable Americans expend all of their wit and energy in these trivial pursuits.

Listen! Do you know what the most hopeful aspect of the conflict between Jews and Palestinians is now? It is the ongoing radicalization of the Muslim masses throughout the whole Middle East. The collaborator governments in Pakistan, in Egypt, in Saudi Arabia are terrified of the reaction they see among their own people to what Ariel Sharon is doing to the Palestinians. When Sharon's Jewish troops shoot Palestinian children, Muslim mobs riot, and governments that now collaborate with the United States quake. Ariel Sharon is the best thing that has happened in the Middle East in the last 54 years.

The Palestinian tactic of suicide bombing is being denounced by every politician and every media spokesman over here now. It's nothing but terrorism, they all say. There's no justification at all for suicide bombing, they tell us. Of course, whenever you hear that sort of unanimity from the politicians and the media people you should be suspicious. In fact, suicide bombing is the best tactic for the Palestinians to use now, because it provokes the Jews to step up reprisals. And

the reprisals radicalize the masses in every country in the Middle East. If just one of the collaborator governments falls, the spines of all the rest will be stiffened, and the Bush government will be far less likely to find collaborators for building its so-called "coalition" to do the will of the Jews in the Middle East.

Suicide bombers now hardly put a dent in the population of five million Jews in occupied Palestine, and Sharon's bloody reprisals hardly put a dent in the overall Palestinian population. But if conflict of this sort continues until just one collaborator government is overthrown, that ultimately will be worth more than ten thousand successful suicide bombings in which only 20 or so Jews are killed each time. In the long run there can be no real peace in the Middle East and no end to America's shameful role there -- and no future for the Palestinian people -- as long as there is an Israel. There seems to be a better understanding of these things among knowledgeable Palestinians than among knowledgeable Americans.

Shallow thinking and the pursuit of trivial goals is even worse among knowledgeable Americans when it comes to domestic problems. They really do not want to grasp these problems with both hands and deal with them in a forthright way. Look, for example, at what uncontrolled immigration has done and is doing to America. And what do knowledgeable Americans propose to do about that? Very little, really. They make much of the fact that several of the al-Qaeda hijackers who carried out the September 11 attack were in the United States only because of very lax immigration policies, and so that's a good reason for tightening up the policies.

How about simply rounding up all illegal aliens immediately -- all 12 million of them -- and booting them and all of their offspring out of the country without further ado?

Oh, no, no, no! We can't do that! Why not? Well, the media never would stand for it. The media would be all over anyone who even proposed a mass expulsion of illegal aliens. They would denounce any political leader who tried to do that as a "racist" and a "neo-Nazi." And so knowledgeable Americans, who understand the immigration disaster quite well, continue tiptoeing around it, afraid to do or even say anything really significant about it: terrified even to think about really radical solutions that might actually end the problem. And it's the same with the rest of our domestic problems. Lots of people understand these problems and are worried about them, but they won't tackle them in any significant way. They let the Jews -- the Jewish media and Jewish money and the entrenched Jewish network -- have their way, for all practical purposes.

Why? Why are the Jews permitted to get away with all of their destructive policies and activities without being challenged or opposed in any significant way? Part of the reason is that the Jews are very powerful, and therefore many people are afraid to cross them. They're afraid of the sort of media reaction that I just mentioned in connection with immigration. Everyone understands that the Jews stick together and will viciously attack anyone who opposes them. It's the old story, so aptly expressed by the late-16th century writer, Sir John Harington. Harington wrote: "Treason doth never prosper: what's the reason? For if it prosper, none dare call it treason." Today the Jewish power structure is prospering, and none dare oppose it or even call it what it is.

Well, that's only part of the reason Jews are permitted to get away with so much. There's more to it than that. There's a mystique the Jews have built very carefully around themselves and nurtured diligently. It is a mystique of piety and injured innocence. It is a mystique that says to the Gentile world: "We are a gentle and inoffensive race, and because of this everyone hates us. We're smart and we work hard and achieve success, and because of this everyone hates us. We are a highly moral and ethical race, and because of this everyone hates us. We are a very talented race, with many gifted members, many geniuses, and because of this everyone hates us. We are a very altruistic race, a race of philanthropists who only want to make a better world for everyone, and because of this everyone hates us."

Many simpletons among the lemmings simply accept these claims at face value. Many knowledgeable people, however, who can see through these claims to the real Jews hiding behind them, still hesitate to challenge them. Part of the Jewish mystique is the so-called "Holocaust." In its most simpleminded form the "Holocaust" story is the claim that the Germans hated the Jews for the reasons I just mentioned -- for their gentleness and their success and their morality and their talent and their altruism -- and because of this hatred roasted six million of them during the Second World War in "gas ovens," to use one of the Jews' favorite "Holocaust" phrases.

Actually, the "Holocaust" is a very powerful part of the Jewish mystique. The Jews crafted the "Holocaust" story with great care and great effort -- well, actually not with as much care as they might have used: it's as full of holes as a Swiss cheese, but still it is sufficient to make most people, even those who understand what Jews are really like, hesitate to attack them. People don't want to be seen as bullies. They don't want to be seen as so insensitive that they would criticize the Jews, who already have suffered so much, poor dears, at the hands of anti-Semites.

In several past broadcasts, we've looked at some of the lies, exaggerations, and distortions that make up the "Holocaust" story. There are a number of good books available on the subject from the sponsor of this broadcast, National Vanguard Books, including Norman Finklestein's excellent book *The Holocaust Industry,* which I discussed in an earlier broadcast. The point is that despite the lies, despite the fact that many knowledgeable Americans are aware of the lies, the "Holocaust" still serves its purpose for the Jews. People are afraid of the image conjured up by the "Holocaust."

Perhaps it's that American life is too soft. Perhaps it is that too many people still are influenced by Christian sentiments. Whatever the reason, many otherwise knowledgeable and hardheaded Americans just can't entertain the idea of rounding up the Jews and getting rid of them, even when the situation is as urgent as it is in America today. And really, in the long run that is the only way to solve the Jewish problem.

The Germans understood that, back in the 1930s, and they had the courage and the foresight to act on their understanding. Unlike Americans today, they had an honest government concerned above all with the survival, welfare, and progress of the German people, and they began doing what was necessary, forcing the Jews to emigrate wholesale from Germany, beginning in 1933. And because of that the Jewish propaganda machine has attacked the Germans so viciously, has so blackened and demonized their image, that today even knowledgeable people are afraid to be

associated with that image. They are afraid to say that the Germans were right, that the Germans were justified, and that we need to do the same if we are to survive. So, as I said, the "Holocaust" story, despite its glaring discrepancies and lies, still serves as a shield for the Jews; it still protects them from criticism.

Well, mostly. In parts of Europe not quite as poisoned by Jewish propaganda as America is, the shield has slipped a bit. A large British department store chain, Selfridges, has yielded to demands from anti-Israel demonstrators and has removed from its shelves products marked "Made in Israel." Last week, the second largest supermarket chain in Norway, Coop Norge -- which is to say, Norway Coop, announced its decision to boycott all Israeli imports. That decision was not the result of pressure from anti-Israel demonstrators but was based on the feeling by Coop Norge management that it would be immoral to continue supporting the Israeli economy by selling Israeli imports under the present circumstances. That is a step forward, though it is a long way from what is needed.

The Jews, of course, immediately began waving their "Holocaust" story around, and now, as the boycott movement catches hold in Scandinavia, they are trying to portray themselves as injured innocents being attacked once more by "anti-Semites." They are comparing the growing Scandinavian boycott of Israeli products to the German boycott of Jewish merchants in the late 1930s. Certainly, a boycott of Israeli products is a good thing, and the fact that such a boycott is even thinkable by big businessmen today is a sign that the Jewish mystique -- and in particular the Jewish "Holocaust" story -- is becoming a bit shopworn. It no longer has the hypnotic power that it once had -- at least, in some parts of the world.

And I suppose that we should be happy about that. The unfortunate fact remains, however, that in America the Jews still have their money and their media and their entrenched network of bureaucrats, and even if the "Holocaust" story has lost some of its charm in Europe, it still keeps most knowledgeable Americans intimidated.

Knowledge isn't enough. Courage and boldness also are necessary. Honesty and forthrightness are necessary also. Tiptoeing around the critical issues of our time isn't enough. Tiny reforms in our disastrous foreign policy and in our disastrous immigration policy and in a dozen other disastrous policies aren't enough. We need to stop apologizing to the people who are destroying us and go full bore at destroying them instead.

Instead of being hypnotized by the "Holocaust" story we need to look with clear eyes at why there was a need for action against the Jews in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s. The Jews' claim today that the Germans were suffering from collective insanity and had no reason for trying to get the Jews off their backs is as phony as George Bush's claim that Osama bin Laden had no reason for attacking America on September 11.

Wherever Jews go, they corrupt and destroy. That is their nature, always and everywhere. Let us be thankful to the Palestinians who now are making such terrible sacrifices to help the world see what the Jews are like. And I suppose that we also should be thankful to Ariel Sharon for demonstrating so forthrightly to the world what Jews are like.

Let us hope that the conflict between Jews and Palestinians intensifies and lasts long enough to wake up many more of our people around the world and fill them with disgust at America's continuing support for the Jews. Let us hope that it lasts long enough to bring about the overthrow of every collaborationist regime in the Muslim world. Let us hope that it brings about an airtight oil embargo against the United States and shuts off the lights in every shopping mall and every sports stadium in America long enough for the lemmings to become restless and to begin asking questions. Let us hope that it makes the efforts of every fool and every traitor who is striving for a resumption of the so-called "peace process" so obviously futile that these efforts no longer have the power to deceive anyone.

Ultimately, of course, we must not depend on the Palestinian suicide bombers or on Ariel Sharon's murder squads to do for us what we should be doing for ourselves. Ultimately we must stop tiptoeing and begin marching boldly and forthrightly toward solving our own problems.

The Beginning of the End?

You know, it's certainly advantageous to be smart and to be well organized in this hard and unforgiving world in which we live. On the average, a group that is smart and well organized is more likely to survive and prosper than one that isn't. But even a smart, well organized group can make serious mistakes: life-threatening mistakes. Even a smart, well-organized group that thinks it has all the bases covered sometimes gets caught by surprise, simply because history is full of surprises. As the great Robert Burns said: "The best laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft a-gley." And when a smart, well-organized group has certain inherent pathological tendencies that it is unable to control, then no one should be surprised when the group comes to grief despite all of its cleverness and despite its apparent stranglehold on the course of events.

The Jews certainly are smart and well organized. But they also certainly do have certain inherent pathological tendencies that they seem utterly unable to keep under control. At controlling us, they're pretty good. At controlling their own lethal excesses, they're not very good at all. And now, just as some of them are bragging to each other that they never have had it better -- just as some of them are dancing a *hora* and gloating that with their control over the George Bush government they really have a stranglehold on the world -- other Jews have noticed some very ominous writing on the wall and are warning the Jews who are bragging and gloating that the long-range prospect for the Jews may not be as rosy as they think it is.

Jews are constantly taking polls, constantly sampling public opinion, so that they can estimate how much they can get away with at any given time. When they force some new policy on our government, they take polls to see how the public is reacting to the policy. If some policy is very unpopular, they want to know whether or not the public is blaming them for the policy. They always are ready to fine-tune the propaganda being fed to the public through their mass media in order to keep the Gentiles from becoming too restless. Or if the Gentiles already are restless, then the purpose of their media propaganda is to divert blame from themselves onto someone else.

I know that what I am saying about the Jews continually monitoring public opinion and then adjusting their propaganda line in order to move public opinion in one direction or another sounds very conspiratorial and farfetched to most Americans. Americans have been taught that they are free agents, that they are able to make up their own minds about things, that no one controls their thinking or manipulates their opinions. That, however, is merely a popular illusion. As far back as 1928, the Jew Edward Bernays wrote in his book *Propaganda:*

The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.... The important thing is that [propaganda] is universal and continuous; and in its sum total it is regimenting the public mind every bit as much as an army regiments the bodies of its soldiers.

The Gentile world paid little attention to Bernays' book in the pre-World War II period, but his fellow Jews, who had assimilated the book's message generations before Bernays had even

written it, were busy elbowing their way into positions of control in this "unseen mechanism of society."

The essential points here are that the Jews do monitor Gentile public opinion around the world on a continuous basis, they do control the "unseen mechanism of society" which consists of most if not all of the mass media of news and entertainment, and they do try to adjust their propaganda line in a way to keep the Gentiles from becoming restless and to protect themselves from blame and reprisals. The ominous writing on the wall that I mentioned a moment ago, which some Jews are warning the other Jews about, is to the effect that despite their manipulation of public opinion, it is shifting strongly against them: primarily in Europe, but also, to a lesser degree, in America.

Now, the Jews are well known for their hypersensitivity to any sort of criticism. You look at one of them sideways, and he begins screaming that it's another "Holocaust." But this time there may be something to their chattering that the rest of the world doesn't love them as much as they think we should. Their poll-takers are claiming now that anti-Jewish feeling is higher than it has been since the 1930s -- and that's something.

In the 1930s, there was a big reaction in Europe -- and to a lesser degree in America -- to what the Jews were doing as communist commissars in the Soviet Union, butchering millions of Russians and Ukrainians. There were still a few big newspapers in America in the hands of people who weren't afraid to criticize Jews. America's foremost industrialist, Henry Ford, published a newspaper, the *Dearborn Independent*, which exposed the Jews in communism, the Jews in pornography, the Jews in White slavery, and the Jews in every other filthy, subversive, or destructive activity. Many Christian preachers were not afraid to speak out against the Jews. Jews were only tolerated in polite society, but they generally weren't accepted. To a far greater extent than today, in the 1930s the Jews were recognized for what they are.

And so I must suspect that their claim that hatred of Jews today is as high as it was in the 1930s, is exaggerated. Still, appearances can be deceptive. In the 1930s if a prominent person -- a person with an audience, with influence -- didn't like what the Jews were doing, he wasn't afraid to speak out. He wasn't afraid to write a book, and there were publishers who would print it. Today, with the media and the politicians totally in the hands of the Jews, it's harder for the average citizen to hear an honest opinion on anything. And it's harder for me to know what the real results of an opinion poll about the Jews, a poll in which a person is able to give his answers privately, would show. I can only assume that the Jews have some basis for their claim that they are more unpopular than at any time since the 1930s.

In trying to explain to themselves why this feeling against them has arisen, they see a confluence of causal events. Part of the reason they see is the recognition by many Americans that despite what George Bush and the Jewish media say, September 11 was, in fact, a direct response to the U.S. government's support of Israeli aggression. Which is to say, many Americans understand that more than 3,000 of their fellow Americans lost their lives on September 11 because their government was looking after Israel's interests instead of America's interests.

The Jewish media, of course, use their typical deceit in deflecting blame from themselves in this regard, by setting up a straw man and then knocking it down. With disgust and incredulity in their voices they announce that anti-Semites are blaming Jews for the September 11 attacks, implying that what anti-Semites are saying is that Jews themselves staged the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and made it look like Muslims had done it in order to generate American hostility against Muslims. And then they shake their heads in pretended disbelief that anyone could be so stupid as to believe such an obviously incorrect explanation of September 11, all for the sake of blaming the poor, innocent Jews. And while they are knocking down this straw man, they are grinning up their sleeves. But the act is quite good enough to fool millions of Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks and to close their minds to any explanation except George Bush's "they did it because they hate our freedom" baloney.

But the fact remains that everyone except the Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks understands that the September 11 attack was a direct response by desperate people to the U.S. government's support of Israel's aggression in the Middle East, and those Americans who are capable of understanding also are capable of hating those who degrade and dishonor their country and cause the deaths of their fellow Americans.

Another part of the reason for the poll results that the Jews are getting is, they believe, a delayed backlash against Jewish efforts during the last three or four years to extort "Holocaust" reparations payments from everyone in sight. I mean, can you believe that there are Gentiles in Switzerland and in France and in Germany and in Poland and in Sweden and in other European countries who dare to resent the Jews coming around with their hands out and demanding reparations from the people who saved their hides during the war? I can believe it.

Part of the reason for the Jews' unpopularity is the Bush government's war against Afghanistan and its threat of war against Iraq and other countries, along with a general recognition -- at least, outside the United States -- that the U.S. government does whatever Israel tells it to do. Many people in Europe do not appreciate the destabilization of their world -- they do not appreciate the threat of another world war hanging over their heads -- just because the world's number-one superpower lets itself be used for dangerous errands by that "shitty little country" Israel, as France's ambassador to the United Kingdom, Daniel Bernard, put it recently.

And finally, there is the growing revulsion around the world at Israel's behavior in Palestine. Television viewers in the United States don't hear much except that the poor, innocent Israelis are trying to defend themselves from Palestinian suicide bombers, who are regularly referred to by everyone in the Bush government and by every media spokesman as "terrorists." But in Europe, where the news media are in not quite so tight a stranglehold as in the United States, the word is getting out about what the Jews are doing to the Palestinians. I'll read to you excerpts from a few British news reports about what the Jews did in the Palestinian refugee camp in Jenin. For more than a week after committing a massacre of Palestinian men, women, and children in Jenin, the Jews wouldn't permit ambulances, relief supplies, or journalists in, while they tried to hide the evidence of what they had done. Earlier this week, a few British journalists managed to evade Israeli tanks and snipers around the camp and get in. All the excerpts that I'll read now came from British newspapers published on April 16.

This first report is from *The Times* of London and was filed by reporter Janine Giovanni:

...we had to run through olive groves, dodging from tree to tree because of an Israeli sniper. I have seen demolished houses before. I have seen wells stuffed with bodies. I have seen civilians terrorised and living under siege. But what remains of Jenin camp is a wasteland of death that once housed 13,000 people.

Then Miss Giovanni describes the destruction and the horror, and she quotes a 30-year-old Palestinian who lived through the massacre:

I saw some children who were wounded take four days to die, bleeding to death because there was no one here to tend them.

Reporter David Blair wrote for the *Telegraph:*

All the paraphernalia of normal life littered the ground: toilet paper, shoe boxes, sanitary towels, buckets, crockery, chairs, and clothes. Hanging over everything was the sickly smell of rotting corpses, an unknown number of which lay under the rubble.... Dazed people gathered around what remained of their homes. Riad Hussain, 30, saw a house receive a direct hit from a rocket fired by an Apache attack helicopter. The woman and baby inside were killed. Sixteen-year-old Fahdi Jamir, who lives on the edge of the worst devastation, said he saw seven arms and legs among the rubble. Kamal Anis said he saw an Israeli bulldozer scooping up 30 bodies and dumping them beside a ruined house. It knocked down the building, covering the corpses with rubble. It then drove over the pile, leveling it into a crude mass grave. Standing at the point where Mr. Anis said this had occurred, the stench of death was overpowering.

Reporter Phil Reeves wrote for London's *The Independent:*

A monstrous war crime that Israel has tried to cover up for a fortnight has finally been exposed. Its troops have caused devastation in the centre of the Jenin refugee camp, reached yesterday by *The Independent,* where thousands of people are still living amid the ruins.... The sweet and ghastly smell of rotting human corpses is everywhere, evidence that it is a human tomb. The people who spent days hiding in basements crowded into single rooms as the rockets pounded in say there are hundreds of corpses entombed beneath the dust, under a field of debris, criss-crossed with tank and bulldozer treadmarks.... A quiet, sad-looking young man ... led us across the wasteland, littered now with the detritus of what were once households, foam rubber, torn clothes, shoes, tin cans, children's toys. He suddenly stopped. This was a mass grave, he said, pointing.... We could not see the bodies, but we could smell them.... Until two weeks ago there were several hundred tightly packed homes in this neighbourhood.... They no longer exist. Around the central ruins there are many hundreds of half-wrecked homes. Much of the camp -- once home to 15,000 Palestinian refugees from the 1948 war -- is falling down. Every wall is speckled and torn with bullet holes and shrapnel, testimony of the awesome, random firepower of Cobra and Apache helicopters that hovered over the camp. Building after building has been torn apart, their contents ... spewed out into the road. Every other building bears the giant, charred impact mark of a helicopter missile. Last night there were still many families and weeping children living amid the ruins, cut off from humanitarian aid. Ominously, we found no

wounded.... Israel was still trying to, conceal these scenes yesterday. It had refused entry to Red Cross ambulances for nearly a week, in violation of the Geneva Convention. Yesterday it continued to try to keep us out.... Hidden, whispering people directed us through narrow alleys they thought were clear. When there were soldiers about, a finger would raise in warning, or a hand waved us back. We were welcomed by people desperate to tell what had happened. They spoke of executions and bulldozers wrecking homes with people inside.... Rajib Ahmed, from the Palestinian Energy Authority, came to try to repair the power lines. He was trembling with fury and shock. "This is mass murder...." All had the same message: tell the world.

Yes, tell the world. That's easier to do when the Jews don't control every medium of mass communication, as they do in America. I've been sampling the news on CNN and Fox TV all week. All I learned about the Jewish assault on Jenin was that 13 Israeli soldiers were killed when a boobytrapped building collapsed on them. And of course, I heard over and over again about every suicide bombing, now officially known as "homicide bombing." But I have still to see any information about the mass murder of Palestinian civilians in Jenin or any of the other refugee camps invaded by the Jews during the past few weeks.

One other piece of information that was in the European media, but was not in the news over here, was the way in which the Jews were targeting their victims. I'll quote now from a story in the *Guardian* four days ago:

"The soldiers had a map with them of the houses they wanted bulldozed and outlined them with a blue marker," said Aisha Salah, whose house overlooks the field of destruction. "you could see the houses. You could see the trees. It was a very detailed map. I could even find my own home." Ms. Salah's home was occupied by Israeli soldiers who entered her living room by punching a hole through the neighbour's wall. Rumors abound that the homes marked for destruction were the homes of professionals: of doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers. The men who were rounded up and executed or marched away by the Israelis were not just Palestinian fighters: they were intellectuals, writers, political activists: anyone who might provide leadership to the Palestinians.

That sounds an awful lot like what the Jews did in the Baltic countries and in Poland in the early days of the Second World War. In Poland, for example, they rounded up 25,000 of Poland's leading citizens -- army officers, professors, writers -- and murdered them. When the Germans found some of the mass graves of these murdered Poles in Russia and called in the Red Cross and representatives from neutral countries to see what the communists had done, the newspapers over here ignored the evidence and blamed the murders on the Germans. Years after the war, these mass murders of the Polish elite still were being blamed on the Germans by the media here.

Anyway, in Europe the news about what the Jews are doing in Palestine is leaking out, and Europeans aren't buying the George Bush and Ariel Sharon explanation that the Jews are just defending themselves by going after terrorists in the refugee camps. The Jews are complaining that the news from Palestine, along with the other things that I mentioned, is leading many Europeans not to like them. One of the most worrisome aspects about the current rise in anti-Jewish feeling, according to the Jewish poll takers, is that it isn't just anti-Israeli or anti-Zionist feeling. It is a real hatred of Jews as Jews, not just as Israelis or Zionists. They cite mobs attacking Jews in the streets of Ukrainian and Russian cities and shouting, "Kill the Jews!" They

refer to attacks on synagogues in France and in Germany. They complain that all of the old anti-Semitic conspiracy theories about Jews wanting to dominate the world are being resurrected.

Now, what's really happening is this: the Israelis are irritated by Palestinian suicide bombers. They decided to punish the Palestinians by simply slaughtering a bunch of them and destroying the homes of a few thousand Palestinian families. It would be like the government over here becoming irritated by the high Black crime rate and deciding to teach Blacks to behave themselves by wiping out a few Black neighborhoods and shooting a few thousand Blacks at random. The media, of course, would immediately go ballistic and begin shrieking, "Genocide!" But when the Jews do something equivalent, the media in this country can be counted on to not say much about it and to keep the lemmings preoccupied with ball games or the pedophile scandal in the Catholic Church. And the Jews figured that they would simply ride out the criticism in Europe, as they always have in the past, counting on their bought politicians to cover for them.

As they have done so often in the past, however, the Jews overreached themselves. Their arrogance led them to miscalculate. They are whining now that the world hates them just for trying to defend themselves. And of course, a growing number of thinking people do hate them -- at least, in those places where thinking people are well informed. One of our responsibilities here in America is to compensate as much as we can for the lack of independent media. Our responsibility is to inform thinking people here, at least to the extent that they are informed in Europe, and then let their natural decency and sense of responsibility do the rest. Perhaps we can help make this the beginning of the end for the Jews.

Two Crucial Tasks

Last week, we ended our discussion of the rising tide of anti-Jewish feeling around the world with the optimistic thought that this may be the beginning of the end for the tribe that has caused so much misery and destruction for others. Some listeners have told me that I was being far too optimistic. They reminded me that the Jews don't really have to worry about the fact that many Europeans hate them. Every synagogue in France could be burned to the ground, and it wouldn't do much to shake Jewish power, which lies in the Jews' control of the U.S. government, which in turn depends on the Jews' control of the mass media of news and entertainment in America. The Jews always have been hated, by every people among whom they have lived, and they haven't let that worry them much or cause them to change their behavior. In fact, there have been times when Jewish leaders welcomed the hatred directed against Jews by gentiles, because this hatred hindered assimilation and generated a stronger Jewish hatred of the gentiles, along with a stronger Jewish feeling of solidarity.

So what is it about this new wave of anti-Jewish feeling that makes me think it really can lead to the end of Jewish domination of our society?

First, I am not predicting anything specific. I just have a feeling, an intuition, based on several things that are happening now. Back in the 1960s and 1970s, when the Jews were really trashing American society, turning everything upside down and rearranging it to suit themselves, I was mostly an observer, first from the university campus, where I was teaching, and later from Washington, DC, where I finally began to write and to speak out. For the most part, I just watched from the sidelines while the Jews organized huge, pro-Black, so-called "civil rights" demonstrations and equally huge, pro-Viet Cong, so called "peace" demonstrations. I could see some very bad trends, some very dangerous and destructive trends being established, but of course neither I nor anyone else could be certain where these trends would take us. Most of my colleagues at the university believed that we were merely going through a temporary social disruption, and that things would settle down later. They weren't willing to do anything or to take a stand. In fact, in my own case, it wasn't until 1975 that I began writing my first novel, *The Turner Diaries,* in which I extrapolated the trends that I had been observing for well over a decade and predicted that they would lead to a long-term degenerative change in American society, and that this degenerative change was a deliberate consequence, calculated by those promoting the trends.

Now other thinking Americans cannot evade the same conclusion that I reached in the 1970s. They can see what the Jewish push for uncontrolled immigration from the Third World has done to America. They know who it was that pushed through the big change in our immigration laws back in 1965. They can see what the Jewish promotion of feminism has done to the White birthrate in America, and they can understand that together these two things -- non-White immigration and the lowered White birthrate -- will lead very soon to the extinction of our race and to the end of the civilization that our ancestors spent thousands of years building for us. They can experience every day the insanity of the multiculturalism endlessly promoted by the Jews through every medium under their control, from Hollywood to Madison Avenue, and forcefully imposed on us by our government, and they can see what it is doing to our young people. They

can see the growing confusion and alienation and demoralization. They can smell the stench of the non-stop Jewish propaganda of equality and democracy and non-resistance and racial death being spewed onto us by the Jewish media during every hour of every day.

Now, all of these things that I've just mentioned have been with us for a while. They've been pushed and promoted and built up during the past 40 years. And, for most of that time, they have not resulted in any great degree of resolve among thinking Americans to put up any resistance to what the Jews are doing. In fact, for most of that time I kept hearing the same excuses for inaction: "you can't blame all of the Jews for what a few Jews are doing," or, "there are gentiles every bit as bad as the Jews, so don't try to blame it all on the Jews."

And of course, there are gentiles every bit as bad as the Jews -- worse, in fact, because on top of all their other crimes they are traitors, they are collaborators, and in my eyes there is no worse crime than collaboration with the Jews against our people. I am pleased to note that the Palestinians, at least, know how to deal with collaborators, and I can only hope that when the day of justice arrives in America, those gentiles who have collaborated with the Jews will get their dose of justice first.

So what's different now from, say, five years ago? Why do I believe that thinking Americans won't keep on making the same excuses and doing nothing as things continue to get worse and worse?

Well, first, historical processes that may appear to be continuous in nature sometimes reach a tipping point. A person who evaded action for years suddenly decides he's had enough. And if many of the people around him also have become exasperated, they may be influenced enough by his change of attitude to decide suddenly that they also have had enough. And when conditions are right, decisions of this sort can spread with explosive speed throughout a society -- or at least, throughout a stratum of society, because I'm still talking only about thinking Americans, not about the masses of Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks, who never think very deeply about anything.

Certainly, we cannot make an exact analogy between France and the United States -- there are many differences between the two societies -- but we certainly have seen an explosive change in public attitudes in France in recent days. In France's presidential election last Sunday, the surprising electoral success of Jean-Marie Le Pen, who had been completely written off by the mainstream media and by the French political establishment certainly is not unrelated to the role of the Jews in France. France has the largest and most obnoxious Jewish population in Western Europe, and Le Pen has been repeatedly denounced by the Jews as an anti-Semite. I hesitate to say at this time that the historical process in France has reached a tipping point, but Le Pen's explosive gain in popularity tells us something about the changing attitudes of the French toward the Jews in their country -- and these changes have been quite abrupt, suggesting a wave of exasperation spreading through the French public in the way that I just described.

Second, history always is full of surprises, surprises that not even the cleverest schemer could predict, and we've had a few of those recently. September 11 did a lot more than kill 3,000 Americans and wipe out some expensive real estate. It initiated a whole chain of unforeseen

events, and we're still a long way from the end of that chain. I've already talked about some of these events stemming from September 11. There was the very clumsy and transparent effort by the government and the media to deflect blame for the attack from the government's policy of unquestioning support of Israel. Every thinking American noticed and flinched when George Bush parroted the Jewish media line that he had no idea why America was attacked. It must have been because Osama bin Laden "hates our freedom." It certainly had nothing at all to do with the government's support of Israeli aggression in the Middle East.

Now, I already had been telling people for nearly two years that George Bush is a shameless liar, that he lies habitually, that he will say whatever the Jews tell him to say, without embarrassment or shame. But most people took that with a grain of salt. They thought that I was exaggerating, but after September 11 they understood that I wasn't exaggerating at all. They saw and heard the Jewish media telling the American public that the attack had nothing to do with U.S. support for Israel, that we would have been attacked even if the government weren't sending money and weapons to Israel, that the attack was based solely on the fact that Muslim fanatics "hate our freedom." And then they saw and heard George Bush and Dick Cheney and John Ashcroft and all the rest parrot this Jewish lie -- this obvious and unbelievable Jewish lie -- without even blushing.

They saw and heard various Jewish spokesmen announce that what the United States had to do now was wage war against Afghanistan and Iraq and Iran and any other country that didn't approve of what the Jews were doing to the Palestinians. The Jewish spokesmen announced that we were a bunch of wimps if we didn't take out these countries now; that punishing the people who perpetrated the September 11 attack wasn't enough, and that the only way to protect ourselves from future attacks was to go after everyone who didn't agree with our policy in the Middle East. And then they saw and heard George Bush and the rest chime in. There has never been a clearer demonstration of the degree of Jewish control over the U.S. government.

Thinking Americans -- and also thinking Europeans -- are much more inclined to believe me now when I tell them that the U.S. government will do whatever the Jews tell it to do, that the politicians in the White House and in the Congress are totally irresponsible people who really don't care about anything except pleasing the Jews so that they can be reelected.

The U.S. government will start another world war if the Jews demand it. It's not just the countries in the so-called "axis of evil," which Bush's Jewish speech writers have him raving against, that are in danger: it's everyone. We all are at risk when the world's greatest nuclear superpower is having its strings pulled by a bunch of arrogant megalomaniacs who believe that they are God's chosen people and can do whatever they want. That worries a lot of people -- especially in Europe, but also in America. And it's not the sort of worry that will fade quickly. Once a thinking person has digested the reality of Jewish control of the U.S. government, he understands that something radical must be done to break that control. And he begins thinking about the whole nature of Jews and the way they behave, the way they operate collectively, the way in which they exercise control of a society. And what gradually takes shape in his mind is a new attitude toward Jews as Jews, not just as Zionists or as Israelis. He begins to understand that it is the Jewish community working as a whole that is the problem, not just a few Zionist Jews or a few media Jews or a few Jewish bankers.

Well, this sort of thing has been going on, in a cyclical sort of way, for millennia. Always in the past, when public anger at what the Jews were doing reached the tipping point, the Jews were able to recover, regroup, and renew their assault against our people. In ancient times, the Egyptians ran them *en masse* out of Egypt. The Romans found them so troublesome that they were expelled *en masse* from the province of Palestine. And during the Middle Ages, at one time or another, they were expelled from every country in Europe, and from some countries several times. When they were run out of one country, they would bribe their way into another country that wasn't yet at the tipping point. Then after 25 or 30 years -- that is, after a generation -- the people in the country they had been run out of would have forgotten why they had run the Jews out a generation earlier, and the Jews would come sneaking back in.

Sometimes the cycle was much longer than a generation. King Edward the Great expelled all of the Jews from England in 1290 in order to calm the public unrest they were causing, and it was more than 350 years before they were able to get back in, under Oliver Cromwell. But they did get back in -- that was in the middle of the 17th century -- and they've been gnawing away at British society for another 350 years since then. They have done at least as much damage in the United Kingdom as in the United States, pushing for non-White immigration and for interracial marriage, promoting feminism and homosexuality, using the media to promote every sort of perversion and abnormality, but the Brits apparently are a demoralized bunch, willing to tolerate even more abuse than Americans are, and I doubt that they are close to the tipping point yet.

So, again, why do I hold out more hope for the present cycle than for earlier cycles? For one thing, in the past when the Jews got booted out of one country, there always was another country for them to go and to regroup. The world is a much smaller place today. We are likely to see the whole White world tip at the same time. For another thing, once the thinking people, the independent-minded minority, has come to a general understanding of what the Jews are, what they are trying to do, and how they operate, it will not be as easy for them to forget as it was in the past. With universal literacy, with the Internet and the laser printer, once the word is out, it will stay out.

The principal obstacle in the way of a final solution to the Jewish problem is the lack of radicalism on the part of the majority of the people who now oppose the Jews. The conservatives in most countries were emasculated long ago and are a total loss. They oppose, in their effete, limp-wristed way, the policies of the Jews -- or at least, some of those policies -- but they are so terrified of being denounced as anti-Semites or as racists that they will not take a more general stand against the Jews. In Britain, for example, the Conservative Party is part of the chorus of those denouncing the second-place electoral showing of Jean-Marie Le Pen last Sunday and expressing hope that the corrupt system politician, Jacques Chirac, will defeat Le Pen in the runoff -- as he almost certainly will.

Leftists are a very large part of the current opposition to the Jews, but a majority of them are basing their opposition on the atrocious policies of the Jews in the Middle East. Their opposition generally goes a bit beyond mere anti-Zionism and includes exasperation with the tolerance of Jews outside Israel for Israeli atrocities and with such things as Jewish media control and Jewish influence on governmental policies. But in most cases their opposition to the Jews would disappear if Israel would disappear.

And we should be realistic about people such as Jean-Marie Le Pen. He may be hated and even feared by most of France's 700,000 Jews because of his opposition to many Jewish policies, but he actually has a Jew in a position of authority in his political organization. If Le Pen actually gained power in France -- and that is unlikely -- he almost certainly would fight against many Jewish policies and might even slow somewhat the Jewish program for the destruction of the French people, but I doubt very much that he would make any radical moves against the Jews as Jews. He might even collaborate with the Jews in suppressing the very troublesome Muslim minority in France. He seems much more a conservative French nationalist than a farsighted White racist.

Our real hope for making this the final cycle lies with a minority of those who are now raising their voices against the Jews. This minority consists of those who really understand the Jews and have the correct motivation for opposing them: not as Christ-killers, not as Zionists, not as international bankers, but as incurable corrupters and destroyers. This radical minority always has been around, but it is larger now than it has been in a long time. As I mentioned last week, the Jewish poll-takers are saying that it is larger than it has been since the 1930s. I'm not sure about that, but it has been growing in recent decades as the destruction being wrought by the Jews on our society and on our civilization has become more evident.

The big, new element in all of this is the groundswell of opposition to Jewish policies among non-radical elements: primarily the elements opposing Jews because of what they are doing in the Middle East. What we have now is an opportunity for synergistic action on the part of radical and non-radical elements, which we have not had since the Second World War. We already may be seeing some of this now, as liberal opponents of Israel push for more radical measures against Israel than they have in the past. Did the liberals all by themselves institute the boycotts of Israeli imports that are spreading across Europe now? In Europe, there is an initiative among academics and scholars to boycott Israeli academics. Did the academic liberals all by themselves launch this initiative? Certainly, radical White nationalists have an unprecedented opportunity to radicalize at some of the non-radical opponents of Israel.

Finally, we have the grass-roots elements who are firebombing synagogues and beating up Jews in the streets. Many of these, especially in France, are Muslim immigrants angry at what the Jews are doing in the Middle East, but not all of them are Muslims: some are young White nationalists, and some are young Whites who are simply angry and alienated. And again we have synergy. The presence in Europe of large numbers of angry Muslim immigrants, who are there because of Jewish policies aimed at polluting Europe racially, makes it easier for angry young Whites also to express themselves on the Jewish question.

The real key to building this opposition to the Jews into something with long-term viability lies, as with so many other important issues, in the effective use of communications media. As long as they are able to keep their stranglehold on the mass media in America, they can ride out almost anything, because they can keep the lemmings deceived and therefore can continue to control the government, with its police and military powers. They can thumb their noses at Europe, so long as they have the United States under control.

There are two things that, together, can finish them. One of these things is the breaking of their media stranglehold in America, and with it the spell they have over the lemmings. The other thing is an independent-thinking elite that understands them and is morally and psychologically prepared to move against them when their media stranglehold is broken or weakened significantly. We are working now on both fronts. We are working to educate this elite, and the unforeseen upsurge of anti-Jewish feeling now sweeping the world is greatly facilitating this part of our task. We also are working as hard as we can to weaken the Jewish stranglehold on the mass media of news and entertainment by building alternative media and learning to use them effectively.

Your support can help us greatly with both of these tasks: these crucial tasks, at which we must not fail.

Democracy and Propaganda

I do appreciate the feedback I receive from listeners. They give me responses to my broadcasts and tell me about their own concerns and ideas, and they sometimes give me useful tips on news stories that I might not have learned about otherwise.

One thing that I'm reminded of over and over again by listener feedback is that many listeners still haven't assimilated a message I've included in nearly every broadcast, and that is the central importance of Jewish media control to all of our problems. Many listeners, perhaps even a majority, still believe that somehow, when the White public becomes sufficiently exasperated, we can vote ourselves out of our problems. When I have said that the whole democratic process is merely a sham, an illusion, in the age of television, they haven't believed me. They still cling to the notion that democracy is inherent in White life, that it is with us to stay, and that we must rely on it in order to overcome our problems. This notion seems to have been implanted so deeply in their consciousness that it will take a real trauma to uproot it. Well, you can be sure that the trauma is on its way, but meanwhile it behooves some of us to understand the situation.

A couple of weeks ago, I quoted a few sentences from a book published in 1928 titled Propaganda, by the Jew Edward Bernays. Today, I'll read to you an expanded set of excerpts from Bernays' book to give you a little more of the gist of his message:

The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.

We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes are formed, our ideas suggested largely by men we have never heard of. This is a logical result of the way in which our democratic society is organized. Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society....

Whatever attitude one chooses to take toward this condition, it remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons.... who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness old social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world....

Sometimes the effect on the public is created by a professional propagandist, sometimes by an amateur deputed for the job. The important thing is that it is universal and continuous; and in its sum total is regimenting the public mind every bit as much as an army regiments the bodies of its soldiers....

The systematic study of mass psychology revealed to students the potentialities of invisible government of society by manipulation of the motives which actuate man in the group.... So the

question naturally arose: If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing it?

The recent practice of propaganda has proved that it is possible, at least up to a certain point and within certain limits....

No serious sociologist believes any longer that the voice of the people expresses any divine or especially wise and lofty idea. The voice of the people expresses the mind of the people, and that mind is made up for it by the group leaders in whom it believes and by those persons who understand the manipulation of public opinion....

Whether in the problem of getting elected to office or in the problem of interpreting and popularizing new issues, or in the problem of making the day-to-day administration of public affairs a vital part of the community life, the use of propaganda, carefully adjusted to the mentality of the masses, is an essential adjunct of political life.

I should mention that Bernays' book is not profound or especially valuable in itself. It merely states a few self-evident facts about the way in which a modern society works. For the person interested in propaganda, far more useful books are available. The fact that Bernays was a Jew is not even especially relevant here except to emphasize that propaganda, the mass media, psychology, and the manipulation of others always have been subjects of special interest to the Jews. It is not for nothing that they are as thick in these fields today as they were in the time of Bernays and Freud. The reason I chose Bernays' book to quote is that it provides a more concise and clear summary, in a few quotable paragraphs, of the role of propaganda in modern life than most other books on the subject.

If I were you, I wouldn't even waste time trying to hunt down a copy of Bernays' book. Although it is available in larger libraries, it's long been out of print, and all it does is state the obvious: namely, that the whole concept of democracy is meaningless in an age where a few people have in their hands the mechanism for controlling the attitudes and opinions of a majority of the electorate. And Bernays also takes the disingenuous position that not only is this control a fact of life, but that it is a good thing; it is necessary to control and to regiment the thinking of the public in order to avoid chaos, and it can only lead us to greater progress and prosperity. He simply glosses over the question of who should exercise this control and what their motives should be.

If you really want to study the subject of propaganda, a good place to start is with the 1962 book, also titled *Propaganda*, by the Frenchman Jacques Ellul. That book is still in print and is available from the sponsor of this program, National Vanguard Books. Professor Ellul deals with the subject in much greater depth and with much greater honesty than Bernays does, but he agrees with Bernays on the most obvious and fundamental conclusions: on the irrelevance of the idea of democracy, for example. I quote from Professor Ellul's book:

If I am in favor of democracy, I can only regret that propaganda renders the true exercise of it almost impossible. But I think that it would be even worse to entertain any illusions about a coexistence of true democracy and propaganda.

To me, it is frustrating that a conclusion that seems so obvious is nevertheless resisted by so many otherwise intelligent people. Democracy has become almost a sacred concept to them, this idea that the policies guiding our nation should be decided by counting the votes of every featherless biped who has reached the age of 18. It's like motherhood: they're almost afraid to question it.

This seems to be as true of intellectuals in our society as it is of Joe Sixpacks. The fact is that intellectuals are no more likely to be independent-minded than people who work with their hands; most intellectuals, just like most Joe Sixpacks, are lemmings. In fact, as Ellul points out, it is precisely the intellectuals who are most strongly controlled by propaganda, because they are more open to every medium of propaganda.

And I must admit that it took me a long time to overcome the ideas drummed into me when I was in school that under a democracy people are more free than under any other political system, that under a democracy we are all free to think and to say whatever we want, and that we have a greater responsibility as citizens of a democracy to make up our own minds about things independently, and so on. Actually, we still have some degree of individual freedom in the United States today because, more than 200 years ago, men whose temperament was far more aristocratic than democratic in the modern sense of the word were willing to go to war against their legitimate government in order to secure that freedom for us, and people with a truly democratic temperament, who have been gnawing away at that freedom ever since, haven't yet succeeded in suppressing it completely.

Well, it should not be surprising to us that although books such as Professor Ellul's *Propaganda* -- and many others -- are readily available, almost no one has heard of them. Keeping the public believing in the myth of democracy is an important element in maintaining control over the thinking and behavior of the public. It is simply immoral and scandalous to question the reality of democracy. It's like questioning the truth of the "Holocaust" story. And for that reason we're not likely to be taught in our social studies classes in school or to read in the *New York Times* or the *Wall Street Journal* even the most obvious and self-evident conclusions presented by Bernays or Ellul. We're still taught how democracy safeguards our freedom, even while those who control the mechanism of propaganda in our democratic society are working day and night to eliminate that freedom.

Already "freedom" means to Sally Soccermom the right to buy either blue plastic hair curlers or pink plastic hair curlers or yellow plastic hair curlers or no hair curlers at all at the shopping mall. And to her husband it means the right to watch whatever ball game he chooses and to go to the refrigerator for another six-pack at halftime. And both Sally Soccermom and Joe Sixpack have pretty well been brought around by democrats to the opinion that the First Amendment doesn't really give anyone the right to say "hateful" things: things that offend other people. A majority of them already believe that racism is illegal -- or ought to be illegal.

And I hardly need to remind you that in most of democratic Europe the controllers of propaganda already have reduced freedom to a choice of hair curlers and ball games. Just last week, 59-year-old Tore Tvedt, a Norwegian member of my organization, the National Alliance, was convicted in an Oslo court and sent to prison for stating personal opinions on the Internet that the court

considered "racist" and "anti-Semitic." The liberal intelligentsia of Norway have applauded the conviction. The details are available in an April 23 Associated Press report from Oslo.

The reason that it is important for us not to let that sort of thing happen in America -- the reason why it is essential for us to preserve the freedom that we still have -- is that for us freedom is the right to fight against the controllers of the propaganda machinery, who not only are attempting to reduce freedom in America to the sort of hair-curler-and-ball-game freedom that exists in Norway and in most of the rest of Europe, but who also have as their goal the annihilation of our race. We still can fight against these enemies of our people by legal means, but they are working very hard to take that remaining freedom away from us.

It is unfortunate that we cannot use propaganda against them the way they use it against us. I'm certainly not a propaganda expert myself, but I understand enough about it to know that the use of propaganda on a large enough scale to be effective in changing the attitudes and the behavior of the public requires a much larger mechanism than anyone but the Jews possesses. I'm talking here about so-called "vertical propaganda," which simultaneously conditions large numbers of people through the use of television, magazine advertising, and other mass media. The Jews worked hard to seize control of that mechanism and to build it up throughout all of the last century.

There is, of course, what is called "horizontal propaganda," in which the attitudes and behavior of individuals in small groups are changed through suggestion by group leaders and guided group discussion. This is the sort of thing that was used in communist prison camps and in some religious cults and is used in "sensitivity training" in America to condition employees in government and in private business today. It also is used to a frighteningly large extent in America's schools to propagandize children. It doesn't require much in the way of mechanism, as "vertical propaganda" does, but it does require a large number of conditioning groups operating simultaneously in order to be effective on a significant portion of the population, and that in turn requires a large organizational infrastructure to get people into the groups and then to coordinate their conditioning.

I find all of this very interesting, but also a little depressing. I cannot help but agree with Bernays and Ellul that the governing role of propaganda is inevitable in a modern, centralized, technological society. Without propaganda as a coordinator for the lemmings, we would have chaos. The only way to avoid propaganda would be to return to the sort of decentralized society without mass media, based on the farm and the village, that we had during the Middle Ages and in ancient times, and we can't do that as long as we live in a world where we are surrounded by dangerous enemies: which is to say, we cannot afford decentralization and the giving up of our mass communications capabilities as long as we have Chinese or Jews waiting for us to lower our vigilance. The important thing is not to try to avoid propaganda -- we really can't do that -- but to ensure that the people who control the content and the direction of the propaganda are ***our*** people and that they have the ***right*** motivations. That is the essential thing. Beside this, everything else becomes insignificant.

An understanding of our present situation leads us to a conclusion that many otherwise intelligent people are afraid to confront. That frightening conclusion is that there is no peaceful

way out of this situation. The Jews never will voluntarily relinquish control of the mechanism of propaganda, and as long as they retain control America and our civilization and our people will continue down the slippery slope toward oblivion: non-White immigration will continue, the White birthrate will remain far below the replacement level, the media will continue pushing multiculturalism and race-mixing, and the Jews will continue their efforts to reduce our freedom to a choice of hair curlers and ball games, as they already have done in Norway. And as long as their television screens stay lit and the shelves at the shopping malls remain full of consumer goods, the lemmings will go along happily with everything.

We cannot vote our way out of our planned demise. Either we will let ourselves be led into extinction by the masters of propaganda like lambs to the slaughter, or we will fight back, and when we fight back there will be a period of bloody chaos. When I have said this in the past, I have been accused by people who otherwise agreed with me of having bloody-minded fantasies. They did not want to face the prospect of violence and bloodshed, and, when I said that we must face it, they accused me of wanting it.

Well, I don't want it -- except as an alternative that is infinitely preferable to extinction. I prefer a peaceful path to survival and to freedom and to progress, but I no longer believe that a peaceful path remains for us. The people who accused me of being bloody minded were people who were comfortable, who were living fairly high on the hog, and of course they didn't want their comfort to end. They didn't want their comfortable world to become chaotic and dangerous and bloody. I can't blame them for that. But they let their desire for a continuation of comfort hide the truth from them. They wanted to believe that we can vote our way out of the mess that we're in and that everything can be resolved peacefully, and so that's what they believed. I can only agree with Professor Ellul that the worst thing that we can do now is entertain any illusions about the efficacy of democracy in combating the destructive propaganda mechanism being used against us by the Jews.

In this regard, I should mention the current situation in France. Tomorrow is the runoff voting in the French presidential election. Many people in the United States are very excited by the fact that the conservative French nationalist Jean-Marie Le Pen came in second in the voting two weeks ago, and the Jews in France have been denouncing him as an "anti-Semite" and demonstrating in the streets against him ever since. Almost certainly the winner in tomorrow's voting will be the corrupt system politician Jacques Chirac. We must remember that France doesn't have the two-party system that we have in the United States. The vote is divided among a number of competing parties, and Le Pen won second place two weeks ago with less than 17 per cent of the vote, while the front-runner Chirac received less than 20 per cent. Tomorrow Chirac will win with something between 70 and 80 per cent of the vote.

But even if Le Pen were to beat Chirac tomorrow, it certainly wouldn't mean beating the Jews. For the Jews it's a win-win situation. If Chirac wins, he will continue taking money -- and orders -- from the Jews, as he has in the past. If Le Pen wins, it will be a setback for some Jewish policies, but probably the first thing Le Pen will do is begin kicking Arabs out of France -- and it is the Arabs in France, brought there by Jewish "anti-racist" immigration policies, who have been in the forefront of attacks on synagogues and on Jewish businesses in France in recent months. Le Pen certainly will not begin kicking Jews out of France. The man running his current electoral

campaign, Bruno Gollnisch, is a Jew, as are several other key members of Le Pen's National Front party. Le Pen's own son-in-law is a Jew. Jewish propaganda in France, as elsewhere, has set the limits for permissible political behavior, and Le Pen will act only within those limits.

There remains the fact that Le Pen did surprise most observers by winning second place two weeks ago, and people in America who desperately want to believe that we can vote our way out of our mess here are grasping at that fact like a drowning man grasping at a straw. But really, what Le Pen's surge in popularity proves is not that democracy has a chance, but that surprises do happen. That is what should give us hope: that even with their stranglehold on the propaganda media in America, the Jews can and do miscalculate, and unforeseen events do happen.

Our responsibility here is to continue building our capability for taking advantage of surprises when they do happen, and that means primarily to continue building our means for communicating effectively with every independent-minded White man and woman with a conscience and attempting to gain his or her participation in the effort to reach others. I don't expect that our communications capability will win any elections for us, but it certainly will enhance our ability to fight back -- and that is what I intend to do until my last breath.

Philadelphia and Kampala

I spend most of my time in rural, nearly all-White West Virginia, but last week I was in Philadelphia. While there, I spent some time late Friday night strolling the sidewalks of a commercial and tourist area in eastern Philadelphia, not far from the waterfront. It was an area full of cafes and bars and trendy clothing shops and tattoo parlors, and the sidewalks were jammed with pedestrians. It was a multiculturalist's dream, with people of every race and culture imaginable pushing past one another.

I had to walk around knots of a dozen or so Blacks blocking the sidewalk in places: ***real*** Blacks, so dark they looked as if they had just dropped out of a tree in equatorial Africa. More numerous were the mongrels of every shade: mestizos from Central America, Middle Easterners, mulattos and quadroons and octoroons, and God only knows what else. And there were Whites too: at least, they were genetically White, judging by their features and light skin and hair. But many of them wore hip-hop clothing: backward baseball caps and baggy trousers and rings in their ears. Some of the Whites affected dreadlocks or cornrows. And they seemed right at home in this multicultural stew. I didn't see on any of their faces the revulsion that I felt. And I thought of the fact that this used to be a fine, White city, a European city. This is in a sense America's birthplace: Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell, and all of that. What happened?

Well, of course, we know what happened. We've been talking every week on this program about various aspects of what happened to change our cities from civilized, White communities to the filthy, multicultural jungles they are today. My companion last Friday night, a long-time resident of the city, told me that Philadelphia is worse than most American cities, and perhaps it is, but I've seen enough of the others to know that they're all headed the same way.

Earlier in the day last Friday, I had read a Reuters dispatch from Kampala, the capital of Uganda, about an incident that had taken place a few days before. Ugandan rebels, members of a fundamentalist Christian sect led by a self-proclaimed "prophet," Joseph Kony, who wants to set up a state based on the Biblical Ten Commandments, had ambushed a funeral procession and taken the 60 mourners captive. The Christian rebels then forced the mourners to cook the corpse they had been carrying and eat it. After the corpse had been boiled in sorghum and eaten, all 60 of the mourners were slaughtered by the rebels.

A grisly story indeed, and one that embarrassed multiculturalists probably would blame on the unsettled conditions in Uganda at the moment. I don't think that this incident can be blamed entirely on unsettled conditions, however, nor do I think it fair to blame it on the fact that the rebels are Christian fundamentalists. In settled times as in unsettled times, Ugandans have had a proclivity for eating each other. In the 1970s, when Idi Amin was president of Uganda, he ruled with an iron hand and did not tolerate unsettled conditions. He also ate choice parts of people who displeased him. And Idi Amin was not a Christian like Joseph Kony, but a Muslim. Neither religion nor politics is the essential element in this little story from Uganda. The essential element is race.

And the fact is that year by year Philadelphia is becoming more like Kampala. And as I said a moment ago, we understand why that is so. If you don't mind though, I'll go ahead and explain it again. A century ago, when Philadelphia still was a White city, a huge wave of Jewish immigration to America from Eastern Europe was taking place. By 1900, there already were a million Jews in the United States, and more were arriving at a rate of 40,000 a year. Almost as soon as they got off the boat, these Jews began elbowing their way into the mass media of news and entertainment, buying up newspapers, theaters, magazines, and book publishing companies. A few years later, they were taking over Hollywood and buying up radio stations, then television stations and TV-production companies. They seemed to have an unerring instinct for what they needed to do in order to destroy the new country in which they had arrived.

We had, of course, plenty of destructive undesirables of our own already here. Even before the Civil War psychopaths such as John Brown murdered their fellow Whites on behalf of Blacks and attempted to "equalize" the races. After the Civil War, we had even more hate-crazed egalitarians attempting to punish Whites -- mostly White Southerners -- for being better than Blacks. Some, like John Brown, justified their murderous egalitarianism on Christian grounds, but after the Civil War and the shameful policies directed against Southerners during the Reconstruction period, there was no large-scale, systematic effort by Whites, Christian or otherwise, to mongrelize and to degrade America. We still had an abundance of crazies and haters around, but without an organizing force behind them they were a potential rather than an actual danger.

Such an organizing force appeared after the Jews had fastened their grip on America's mass media of news and entertainment and brought the lemmings under their influence. In fact, it really wasn't until after the Second World War that the Jews pulled out all the stops and made the destruction of White America their primary goal, enlisting our own worst elements for assistance in that purpose. Before that, they had needed America to beat Europe into submission. If they hadn't been able to use America against Europe during the Second World War, the Jewish problem would have been solved in a final way 60 years ago, at least in Europe.

But after the war, they no longer needed a powerful America, and so they employed every corrosive medium in their arsenal to subvert and to weaken us. They promoted homosexuality, first as an acceptable life-style and then as a fashionable life-style. They pushed feminism and the "liberation" of women: which is to say, they convinced our women that they were being "liberated" by choosing to be lawyers or financial consultants or business executives instead of mothers. They opened our borders to the Third World: which is to say, they used their media control and their bought politicians to scrap our pro-White immigration laws and replace them with laws favoring non-White immigration. They financed and led the so-called "civil rights" movement. They demanded and got the abolition of laws against miscegenation.

And they did all of this in typically Jewish fashion. They didn't try to strong-arm us. They didn't put guns to our heads and demand that we destroy our country, or else. Instead they sniffed out our weaknesses and then used those weaknesses against us, remaining behind the scenes as much as possible. These days, none of the major Jewish media will openly promote the use of illegal drugs, but back in the 1960s and the 1970s it was the Jews who were pushing the use of drugs by Whites, on university campuses and elsewhere. They made the use of so-called "recreational"

drugs -- marijuana and cocaine, for example -- fashionable among impressionable young Whites. When I was in school in the 1950s, White kids didn't smoke marijuana. And even today the newer recreational drugs, such as "ecstasy," are promoted almost exclusively by Jews. The world center for the "ecstasy" trade is Israel.

Body-piercing and virtually every other degenerate fashion among young Whites today is promoted by the Jewish media. I don't mean by this that the *New York Times* openly advocates that young White males should wear earrings or push safety pins through their lips, but the young White males that do this -- the young White males that one sees on the streets of Philadelphia -- have been persuaded that it is fashionable by some Jewish media aimed specifically at them, whether MTV or the slick, degenerate magazines for yuppies that have proliferated in recent decades.

Much more serious and directly destructive has been the Jewish effort to persuade young White women that it is fashionable to have a Black boyfriend, and in this effort the hand of the Jews is even more clearly visible. Not only do we see the increasingly brazen promotions of interracial sex in Hollywood films and in slick magazine advertising, but the promotions for miscegenation are backed up by pseudo-serious support in everything from the *New York Times* to U.S. Army recruiting posters to guided discussion groups in classrooms.

And so, here's the $64,000 question: Is the spread of the sort of multicultural filth that I saw in Philadelphia last week inevitable? We've seen it get worse decade by decade and year by year. Will it continue getting worse until all of America is nothing but a sewer like Philadelphia and until we all have drowned in the filth? Are the Jews, with their stranglehold on the media, on the politicians, and on the minds of the lemmings, unstoppable?

And the answer is "no." What is happening is not inevitable. It will only continue spreading and becoming worse to the extent that we permit it. The Jews, despite all of their power, both apparent and real, are indeed stoppable. Let me explain.

I have a huge stack of news reports from the Middle East and from Europe on my desk. Here is a typical headline. It's from an Associated Press report datelined this Sunday in Jerusalem: "Israeli Soldiers in West Bank Kill Palestinian Woman, Her Two Children, and a Young Boy." The report goes on to say that the Jews shot the Palestinian woman and children because they looked "suspicious." The shootings came immediately after an Israeli tank maneuvering in the area lost one of its treads. The Jews suspected sabotage, so they opened up on the unfortunate Palestinian woman and children with the tank's. 50-caliber machine gun. To the average reader it looks an awful lot like the Jewish soldiers were angry about the damage to their tank and simply decided to kill any Palestinians they saw. And this is all too typical of the news coming from Palestine these days. I have a hundred other reports in a similar vein.

So what's the reaction to this news? That depends on who's reacting. If you're one of Israel's bought politicians in the U.S. government, then your reaction is along the lines of George Bush or Attorney General John Ashcroft or the head Republican in the Congress, Dick Armey. House Majority Leader Dick Armey believes that it's just fine for Jews to shoot Palestinian women and children whenever they feel like it. He announced last week that he believes that the Jews should

ethnically cleanse Israel and the entire West Bank, expelling or killing all non-Jews and claiming the land for Israel. And his fellow political prostitutes agree with him, although most of them are not quite as bold as he is to call for ethnic cleansing. The fact is that they've all been bought, they're all traitors, and they all should be hanged, every one of them. And I'm dead serious when I say that, although I also should say that I am grateful to Congressman Armey for announcing his approval of ethnic cleansing, because that's what will have to be done in this country on a huge scale. And it will be done.

Anyway. I'm not the only thoughtful person who keeps up with the news. There are many thousands of other Americans who read the news reports about Jews venting their anger by shooting Palestinian women and children and then hear our government leaders respond with approval. Whatever the Jews want is all right with these politicians. And thoughtful people understand. They understand how the system works. They see that the lemmings aren't told about the murdered women and children. They know that the government is told but that it doesn't care. They see that the lemmings aren't told about Congressman Armey's approval of expelling all the Palestinians from Palestine so that the Jews can have their land. Almost no mass media reported Armey's statement. Thoughtful people realize that the lemmings wouldn't understand even if they were told. They note that Ariel Sharon, the repulsive mass murderer and war criminal who heads Israel, visited the United States this week and was hugged by Donald Rumsfeld and by George Bush and the other politicians as if he were Santa Claus.

Thoughtful people are forced to admit, after years of evading the truth, that I have been right. Thoughtful people are being forced to admit that the truths that I have been rubbing in their faces for years, which they didn't want to see, are in fact truths. Not all thoughtful people yet, of course, but many more now than a year ago. And let me assure you, more and more of them are admitting it to me. And when thoughtful people have been forced to admit the utter and total corruption and treason and irresponsibility of our government, when they have been forced to admit that the government will do whatever the Jews tell it to do where the Middle East is concerned, they also begin to pay attention when I tell them that what has happened to Philadelphia is also the result of Jewish corruption and subversion. And they begin to understand that if we do not want to sink to the level of Uganda then we must attack the corruption and the subversion at its source.

What's happening now in Palestine has broken the ice. For the past 50 years the Jews have used their "Holocaust" story as a shield to protect themselves from criticism: "You can't blame us for anything we do, because we suffered so much in the concentration camps under those awful Germans. If you say bad things about us, you're no better than those German doctors who performed medical experiments on us or those German concentration camp guards who shoved us into gas chambers."

And for 50 years, the Jews weren't blamed for anything. No matter what they did, they were portrayed as innocent and inoffensive. All of us were afraid of being considered "anti-Semitic." That has changed very recently to a remarkable degree among thoughtful people. We all owe to the Palestinian suicide bombers and other resistance fighters a great debt of gratitude for this. When thoughtful people see Jews behaving like Jews, killing Palestinian women and children just because they're angry, and when they see the media here -- at least, the mass media, the

media that influence the lemmings -- ignoring this atrocious behavior, and when they see our government expressing its implicit approval -- and in some cases explicit approval -- not only do they no longer feel an obligation not to criticize Jews, but they also begin seeing the bigger picture of Jewish influence and control and subversion.

And really, it goes far beyond a question of moral outrage at what the Jews are doing in Palestine. It even goes beyond a sense of alarm on the part of patriots about the Jews' corruption of our politicians through their control of the media. People who really don't care whether or not the Jews are massacring Palestinians and who already were pretty cynical about our politicians and their subservience to the Jews are quite concerned about the direction that world events have taken recently. A lot of thoughtful people simply don't want us pushed into a Third World War. They don't even want us pushed into another war that can be confined to the Middle East. They don't want us invading Iraq and in general being used as Israel's bullyboy and butcher in the Middle East. They see this sort of behavior as very, very dangerous and very, very destructive of American interests.

There are even thoughtful people who look into the future and think about things such as America's long-term status as a nation, about our future as a people, and about what will happen to our civilization. I consider myself one of these people, and I believe that I have much more company now than I did as recently as a year ago.

An important aspect of this growing awareness of the Jewish role in things is that it isn't confined to America. It's worldwide. In Europe, it has reached the grass-roots level. It's not just thoughtful people in Europe who are reacting to the Jews and to the politicians now. I'm not suggesting that there is any sort of general awakening among the lemmings. That simply won't happen until the Jewish stranglehold on the mass media is broken. But there are stirrings now by more ordinary people, whether they understand everything or not. The natives in Europe are becoming restless.

And in the Muslim world, restlessness has reached the thermonuclear level. If the present conflict between Jews and Palestinians continues at its present level of intensity for a few more months, governments will fall. And those who are governing know it. They are bracing themselves. They are preparing themselves to switch roles. Instead of their present role -- or their perceived present role -- of lackeys of Jew-controlled America, they will adopt the role of patriots. One sees this quite clearly in the content and tone of the government-controlled media in countries such as Egypt and Syria and Saudi Arabia.

These countries know that they're not strong enough to take on Israel and America. But the men in power also don't want to be lynched as traitors by their own people. For a long time they have had to play a balancing game, trying to remain friendly with the American bully and at the same time keep their own people from becoming too restless. But the balance is shifting now. Respect for America is lower than it ever has been, and fear of their own people is greater. And so the government-controlled media are saying things about the Jews that they haven't said in the past, when they were more concerned about not displeasing America.

In fact, when one reads some of the things being published in Muslim countries about Jews now, one sees more than merely an effort to show the public that the government isn't friendly with

Jews: one almost can see a preparation for some sort of final showdown, almost a recognition by the governments involved that a final showdown with the Jews is imminent.

All of this may seem far removed from the mess in Philadelphia, but it really isn't, because the same people responsible for what has happened to Philadelphia are responsible for what's happening in Palestine. Let me outline just the first part of a possible sequence of events. The Palestinian resistance continues, and the Jewish reprisals become even more atrocious. Public unrest in the Muslim countries continues to build. The Pakistani collaborator General Musharraf is assassinated, and the government of Pakistan is taken over by militant Muslims who immediately halt all collaboration with the United States. The leaders of other Muslim governments are terrified that they may suffer Musharraf's fate too, and so they also halt all collaboration with the United States. The Jews, increasingly desperate as they see their situation deteriorating, demand that the United States immediately bomb and invade Iraq. Without the permission of Iraq's neighbors, that can only be done by waging war against those neighbors as well. Thoughtful observers in Europe and in America, concerned now, will be vastly more concerned then. And you can imagine where things might go from there.

Well, all of this is extremely speculative, but it is clear that many things happening in different parts of the world are tied together. We are living in interesting times.

A Third World War?

It's interesting watching the government and the news media working together to condition the public to support a war against Iraq. This week's issue of *Time* magazine -- that's the May 13 issue -- has a painting of Saddam Hussein on the cover in which he looks like a sinister Colombian cocaine lord, with dark glasses, a straw hat, and a scowl. The story about him and his family inside gives us a pretty greasy image of the bunch: certainly not the sort of people you'd want living next door.

Is *Time's* image of Saddam accurate, or is it a deliberately distorted caricature? I've never met Saddam or even spoken with anyone who does know him personally, so I can't answer that question with certainty. But the same issue of *Time* magazine also presents a whitewash of Ariel Sharon's murderous incursion into the Jenin refugee camp. And, of course, the magazine is part of the Time-Warner-CNN Jewish media conglomerate. *Time's* editor-in-chief is Norman Pearlstine. And all of the Jewish media are beating the war drums against Iraq. And so is everyone in the Bush government, from the Jews behind the scenes, like Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle, on up through the top figureheads, such as Donald Rumsfeld and George Bush.

What's especially interesting to me about all of this is that it is a 180-degree change from the situation we had 30 years ago, during the Vietnam war. Then the media and the government, instead of being aligned as they are now, were directly opposed to each other, with the Jewish media making up what amounted to a cheering section for the Viet Cong. The equivalent today would be *Fox News* to interviewing former Taliban officials instead of Defense Department bureaucrats and Israeli diplomats and for *Time* magazine to depict on its cover Ariel Sharon with a sinister expression instead of Saddam Hussein. Well, that's another story. What's clear today is that where Jewish interests are concerned -- where the Middle East is concerned -- the news media and the government are in lockstep. Perhaps you remember how, before the U.S. bombing of Afghanistan began last fall, all of the Jewish media were pushing hate propaganda against the Afghans, trying hard to convince the American public that we ought to bomb them.

There were television specials about how mean the Afghans were to their women. In one Kabul street scene that was broadcast over and over again in various anti-Afghan news segments, an Afghan man was shown ineffectually swinging what looked like a fan belt at the legs of a woman, presumably his wife. The implication was that this was typical of the way Afghan men treated their women. Bush's wife announced on television that we needed to "liberate" the Afghan women. Then, after a few weeks of intense hate propaganda by the media, the bombing began. And it looks as if that's exactly what they have in mind for Iraq.

Well, we expect that from the media. As long as they are controlled by Jews they will support Jewish interests rather than American interests. Anyone who expects otherwise is living in a dream world. More disappointing is the behavior of the Gentile politicians and bureaucrats. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld seems to be trying to outdo George Bush as the government's champion liar. Rumsfeld has been raving all week about the need to "take out" Iraq as soon as possible, because Saddam Hussein is trying to develop weapons of mass destruction. We need to get rid of Saddam because he is a threat to the peace and security of the United

States, *et cetera.* Every time I turn on *Fox News,* they have Rumsfeld or some other government "expert" warning us about the danger of not invading Iraq and getting rid of Saddam before he develops nuclear or biological weapons.

And every time I see or hear such propaganda I must repress the urge to shout: "And what about Israel, you lying SOB? What about Ariel Sharon? You pretend to be concerned about nuclear and biological weapons being in unauthorized hands, but Israel is the only country in that part of the world that has an unauthorized arsenal full of nuclear and biological weapons. You never mention the danger of a homicidal maniac such as Ariel Sharon having his hands on nuclear and biological weapons. Iraq never has attacked the United States, but Israel has. Have you forgotten already about Israel's attempt to sink the USS *Liberty* and blame it on the Egyptians?"

Then, there is that pompous little bigot we have for an attorney general, John Ashcroft. He was on TV last Saturday giving a commencement speech at Catholic University in Washington, DC, and preaching a crusade against terrorism and terrorists. He was telling us how evil terrorists are, how different they are from us, how they hate everything we stand for, and how we must root them out and destroy them. Watching this grim, tight-lipped little religious fanatic rave against terrorists was an experience in surrealism. Does Ashcroft believe that Palestinians blow themselves up because they like to do that sort of thing? Does he believe they would be using suicide bombers if the Jews didn't have an occupation army in Palestine and weren't killing Palestinian women and children and bulldozing Palestinian homes? Does he believe that they would be strapping explosives on their own women and sending them into Jewish restaurants and discos if they had tanks and F-16s and Apache helicopters like the Jews are using against them?

And when Ashcroft rages self-righteously about waging war against state-sponsored terrorism, he never mentions the state that sponsors more terrorist activity than any other, and that is Israel. Perhaps Saddam Hussein would like to sponsor terrorism against other countries, but it is Israel, not Iraq, that actually sends teams of trained assassins into other countries to kill and to terrorize: into Jordan to squirt poison into the ear of a popular Muslim cleric or into Lebanon to use a car bomb to kill a potential witness against Ariel Sharon in a war-crimes trial.

Well, of course, Bush and Rumsfeld and Ashcroft and all the rest of that slippery crew understand these things. I never have said that they should be hanged for being stupid or ill-informed but for being liars and traitors; they should be hanged for letting American interests go to hell while they scramble to serve the Jews at America's expense. And now they're hell-bent on dragging us into another war because that's what the Jews want -- certainly not because it will benefit America.

And I have to tell you that I have mixed feelings about all of this. On the one hand, I am automatically, instinctively against anything that the Jews and their collaborators in Washington are for. If they want us to fight another war for them, I'm automatically against it. If they tell us that Saddam Hussein is an evil person and ought to be killed, my reaction is that there has to be something good about anyone they hate so much. But I also try to be cold-blooded and rational about these things. Anti-Jewish feeling is stronger now, all around the world, than it has been in a long time, and the basic reason for this very welcome development is the servile obedience of the Bush government to Jewish demands.

It's the U.S. government allowing itself to be used by Israel that caused the September 11 attack, that resulted in the war against Afghanistan, that has emboldened the Israelis to brutalize and repress the Palestinians even more than usual, that is leading us toward a war against Iraq, and that may yet lead us into a Third World War. All of these things in themselves are undesirable, and yet they are having an overall good effect by raising anti-Jewish feeling, and that in the long run may outweigh everything else.

It's like Affirmative Action. The forced integration of Blacks into our White society in America has had many evil effects. Easily the worst of these effects has been the increase in miscegenation, the increase in mongrelization. But Affirmative Action has been the most irritating aspect of racial integration for many White Americans: the most unpopular aspect. Many ordinary White Americans are willing to accept miscegenation, in some cases because their churches tell them that that's what Jesus wants, and in other cases because they don't feel personally threatened by it. But they do feel threatened by Affirmative Action. They feel that it's fundamentally unfair to take jobs or promotions away from Whites and give them to less-qualified Blacks just because they're Blacks. They feel that it might deprive them personally of employment or of a higher salary. And so my attitude toward Affirmative Action is, right on! The more the better! White Americans need to be irritated by the racial problem.

I feel the same way about the new campaign that Blacks are pushing to obtain reparations for slavery. It sounds like a really stupid idea with no merit at all. I mean, if anybody should pay reparations, Blacks should pay them to us for bringing their ancestors over here from the African jungle, teaching them the rudiments of personal hygiene, tripling their life expectancies, putting them on welfare, and tolerating their criminal behavior for the past 400 years. But Blacks want trillions of dollars -- and I mean ***trillions*** -- in reparations for the unpaid labor of their slave ancestors, and they figure that now that White men have become such a spineless bunch of wimps, this is a good time to push for it.

Of course, most Whites still don't feel threatened by the reparations campaign; it still seems to them more theoretical than real. But the campaign is gaining momentum, and I think that it'll have a really salutary effect on most White Americans when it finally dawns on them that they're being asked to cough up a sizable piece of change for Blacks who, they feel, already have gotten more than enough from them. So I'm hoping that the reparations campaign will continue growing and that it will cause a lot of irritation.

I believe that many racially conscious White Americans will agree with me that it's worth putting up with Affirmative Action and reparations, just so Blacks as a whole will be seen as a threat by Whites who might otherwise be tempted to tolerate them. I believe that many patriotic Americans can see the silver lining in the September 11 attack that served as a walk-up call for all Americans and convinced many who needed to be convinced that we must regain control of our government, that we must get the Jews off our back.

But a Third World War? Am I really willing to accept a Third World War just so more people will become conscious of the danger of permitting the Jews to control our government? Isn't that like throwing the baby out with the bath water?

If we back off a bit and look at our situation realistically and from a viewpoint that takes in the whole picture, one of the first things we realize is that we already are involved in a worldwide war -- or at least, a race-wide war. Up through the end of the 19th century, our people ruled the world unchallenged. And then came a century of self-destructive insanity. Two fratricidal world wars of unprecedented destructiveness and the rise of communism stand out in the 20th century. We killed off tens of millions of our own people in these wars, and Jewish communists killed tens of millions more in a selective way, deliberately butchering the best of our people in an effort to make us easier to rule. The 20th century was the century during which the mass media rose to dominate the thinking of the masses of our people -- and fell into Jewish hands.

The 20th century also was a century of unprecedented scientific and technological progress for our people. We made enormous strides forward in transportation, manufacturing, communications, agriculture, the eradication of disease, and weaponry. If in addition to our technological advances we had retained control of our mass media, not let ourselves be lied into two world wars, and nipped Jewish Marxism in the bud, we would be in an absolutely unassailable position now.

But we did let the Jews gain a stranglehold on our mass media of news and entertainment. We did let ourselves be lied into two world wars. We didn't stamp out communism before it had wreaked a dreadful toll. And we let all of our technology be turned against us. We gave it away to other races, foolishly thinking that we were being good Samaritans. We went into the Third World and helped the non-Whites there control the diseases that were keeping their populations in check. We showed them how to increase their agricultural production so that they could support vastly larger populations. We permitted them to replace their spears and sticks and stones with modern weapons that we had invented.

The result, of course, was a population explosion among the non-White races, so that they now outnumber us 12 to one around the world. And this non-White population explosion that we foolishly caused has resulted in the destruction of our planet's tropical rain forests and other natural habitats and the extinction of thousands of species of plants and animals. White Americans don't pay much attention to this because it is happening mostly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, but I find it distressing. Even if the explosion of Black and Brown races didn't pose a direct competitive threat to the White race for breeding and living space on the planet, I greatly prefer a world with more rain forest and more big cats and members of other non-human species, and fewer Black, Brown, and Yellow featherless bipeds.

Some of the cleverest of our own people now are making great efforts to find an AIDS vaccine that will halt the plague that otherwise might trim the Black population of Africa back to a more manageable size. Others are concerned about more efficient ways of getting relief supplies to parts of the Third World that are suffering from chronic famine. Microsoft chairman Bill Gates, certainly an otherwise intelligent man, has given hundreds of millions of dollars for medical aid to lower the death rate among African infants and children. All of this is suicidal insanity.

Of course, we have other problems that seem much more pressing, but the problems of habitat destruction and species extinction caused by the overpopulation in the non-White parts of the world will catch up with us very soon. We are sharing the dwindling resources of this planet with

far too many non-Whites. It's pretty clear that to deal effectively with these global problems we need to reorient the way in which most of our people look at the world. We all need to understand that we still are as much subject to Nature's laws as we ever were. We all need to understand that we are living in a finite world and are competing with other races for survival in this world. We need to root out the egalitarianism, the "we're all one species" nonsense, the whining "why can't we all just learn to get along with each other?" lunacy that has pervaded our policies toward other races and replace it with a hardheaded racial survivalism.

There are two ways to go about this. One way is for us to let ourselves be pushed into a Third World War. That might go something like this: The Jews continue their insistence that the United States use its military power to bomb and to invade Iraq and to set up a puppet government, more or less as we have done in Afghanistan. The ever-obedient Bush government goes along, using bases in Saudi Arabia. Outraged Muslim militants in Pakistan stage a coup there and lynch all of the politicians and bureaucrats who have been collaborating with the United States. U.S. military units that had been operating inside Pakistan in the hunt for Afghan patriots are ambushed by Pakistani military units and butchered. The Bush government retaliates by bombing Karachi. Frightened Saudi leaders demand that the U.S. military units stationed in Saudi Arabia for the assault on Iraq leave immediately. The Bush government, on orders from Ariel Sharon, refuses. OPEC imposes a total oil embargo on the United States and threatens similar embargoes on any countries in Europe that collaborate with the United States in the assault on Iraq. That includes Germany, which serves as a staging area for the U.S. military in its assault on countries in the Middle East. There is rioting in German cities as German citizens protest being dragged into the U.S. war against Israel's enemies, and at the same time a wave of Muslim suicide bombings takes place in the United States, mostly in crowded shopping malls, killing hundreds of Sally Soccermoms.

North Korea decides to take advantage of the U.S. problems at home, in Europe, and in the Middle East, and invades South Korea. The Bush government threatens a nuclear strike unless the North Koreans withdraw immediately. The Chinese government decides the time has come to take possession of Taiwan and does not believe that the United States will try to wage nuclear war against China and North Korea at the same time.

Well, you can use your imagination to complete the scenario. The good news that could come from a Third World War is that with an end to intervention by misguided White do-gooders, AIDS, famine, and cannibalism would be able to whittle the African population back down to pre-colonial levels pretty quickly. Some European governments certainly would be overthrown, and perhaps in a few cases patriotic governments would replace them. In the United States, just about anything might happen. At least, no more welfare checks would be going out, and the urban rabble would be eating each other.

No matter what developed, however, it hardly could lead to anything worse than leaving the present course of events on track, because that course leads to certain extinction for our people. A Third World War would at least reshuffle the cards.

There is, of course, a better way, and that is to break the Jewish stranglehold on our mass media, regain control of our government, and then follow a rational plan to do with surgical precision

and with much less destruction of our planet that for which a Third World War might or might not lay the groundwork. That's the way I have chosen. It's certainly not an easy way, but it is a way that becomes surer and surer as more and more decent and responsible White men and women join me along this path.

I have prepared a video presentation that outlines my path. If you find my *American Dissident Voices* broadcasts interesting, I think that you'll also find my 51-minute video presentation interesting too. I'd like to send you a copy to view for yourself and to share with your friends. Send $5 to National Vanguard Books for the compact-disk version of this presentation or $10 for the VHS cassette version. If you're outside the United States, make that $6 and $15 respectively. Ask for my 51-minute video presentation.

The Big Lie

In the eight months since the September 11 attack, I've had probably 50 interviews with people from the mass media. A standard question they nearly always ask me is how have I responded to the attack. Part of my answer to that question is that I have tried to use the reaction of the government and the mass media to the attack to show that the politicians and the media lie shamelessly and outrageously to the American people about matters of vital importance.

That is, everyone who pays attention to what is happening in the world -- which is to say, everyone except the lemmings -- understands that the attack was a retaliation for the U.S. government's arming and financing Israel's aggression in the Middle East. That is crystal clear. And yet everyone in the government and everyone in the mass media has denied it since September 11. Their standard response to the question, why were we attacked, is that there is no good reason for it. We were attacked only because Osama bin Laden "hates our freedom." The attack certainly had nothing at all to do with American policy in the Middle East or with Israel. We would have been attacked even if we never had supported Israel, they say. Not only did Mr. Bush and Mr. Cheney and Mr. Ashcroft and everyone else in the government -- and every media spokesman -- repeat this lie over and over again, but they tried hard to avoid the question. It became Politically Incorrect even to ask why we were attacked.

And it was all very obvious -- at least, to the perceptive portion of the population. Usually the politicians and the media bosses have time to prepare their lies more carefully and to rehearse them, but September 11 caught them by surprise, and their lies and their attempts at misdirection were clumsy and transparent: good enough for the lemmings, but certainly not good enough to fool anyone able to observe and think for himself. Usually a clever liar will leave enough ambiguity in his lies so that it's difficult for anyone to say with absolute certainty that he's lying. One can be pretty sure that he's lying, but there's usually a little doubt: maybe it's not really a deliberate lie; maybe it's just a difference of opinion, a difference in interpretation. But in the case of September 11, with the government and the media both claiming that the attack had nothing to do with the government's support for Jewish policy in the Middle East, there's no room for ambiguity: they're lying. And the things they're lying about are not trivial: not the sort of inconsequential lies that politicians always tell to get reelected. The lies about American foreign policy and its consequences are important lies, big lies, lies that impact heavily on America's security and survival.

And so nearly every time a reporter asks me about September 11, I use the opportunity to point out that George Bush is a liar: a conscious, deliberate, bald-faced, shameless liar. Of course, he's much worse than merely a liar: he's also a traitor. He has cynically and deliberately violated his oath of office and betrayed America, betrayed our people, and I use the September 11 attack to illustrate that, too. If George Bush claimed that the September 11 attack was not a response to the government's pro-Israel policy simply because he didn't want to be blamed for having a bad policy that got more than 3,000 Americans killed, then he could have set about changing that policy after September 11. He could at least have opened the policy up for discussion. He could have blamed the policy on Bill Clinton. He could have said that it was just one of many bad policies left over from the Clinton era that he hadn't gotten around to changing yet.

But there was no discussion, and there were no changes. Discussion of whether the United States should pursue America's interests in the Middle East, or Israel's interests instead, simply is not permitted. It is a taboo subject. And it is clear enough ***why*** it is a taboo subject.

When Osama bin Laden attacked the United States on September 11, he did much more than send us a message that Muslims are not happy about what the Jews, with the aid and support of the U.S. government, are doing to the Palestinians. He forced the American people -- at least, the two or three per cent of the American people able to think for themselves -- to pay attention to what their government is doing. He forced the whole subject of U.S. policy in the Middle East into the open: the subject of American interests versus Jewish interests, of Jewish media control and its influence on governmental policy. He broke the taboo. He exposed the treason. In the long run that may more than compensate for the 3,000 American lives that were lost.

And of course, the fact that his attack opened up for debate the subject of American interests versus Jewish interests, the fact that he exposed the treason, is the real reason that George Bush hates him enough to start a war to punish him.

To be sure, Bush is more popular than ever with the lemmings. They have accepted without question his explanation that we were attacked only because Osama bin Laden "hates our freedom." It is only the thinking minority who have seen his nakedness, and they don't have enough votes to make a difference. Nevertheless, it is the thinking minority, not the lemmings, that will one day judge him and condemn him and hang him. And behind that smirk of his, he knows it.

Let's get back again to the subject of lying to the American people. It's something that is continuous and massive. But as I said earlier, there's usually a certain degree of ambiguity to it, so that it's difficult to prove that any particular lie is a conscious and deliberate lie. And so when I encounter a lie that's easy to prove is a lie, I like to use it as an example. There's a Jewish outfit that calls itself "FLAME." That's an acronym for "Facts and Logic about the Middle East." FLAME buys full-page ads in various print media and instead of facts and logic publishes pretty outrageous lies about the Middle East that are proved fairly easily to be lies. I have one of FLAME's full-page ads in front of me now. It's titled "Arabian Fables," and the copy I have appeared in the February 11 issue of *U.S. News & World Report.*

According to the FLAME ad, "the fundamental myth" about the Middle East, is that there are any such people as "Palestinians." Before 1948, according to FLAME, the Palestinians were Jews, and now they are Israelis. But in 1948 Arabs who wanted to take the Jews' land away from them began calling themselves "Palestinians." The clear implication of the FLAME ad is that the people of Palestine always were Jews, and that the people calling themselves "Palestinians" today are Arab interlopers. That is the opposite of the truth.

Actually, there are hundreds of books available that were written before the current conflict between Jews and Palestinians began that provide demographic data on Palestine. Just before the First World War, in 1914, Palestine was a part of the Ottoman Empire. In that year the Turkish government took an official census. Of a total population of 689,000, just 84,660, or 12.3 per

cent, were Jews, and many of those were recent immigrants who had come to Palestine as part of the Zionist movement.

During the First World War, Britain took Palestine away from Turkey and after the war permitted large numbers of additional Jews to immigrate. According to the official British census of 1931, the Jewish population of Palestine had risen to 16.9 per cent: that's 174,606 Jews in a total population of 1,033,314. The influx of Jews into Palestine during the 1920s and 1930s was a source of continual provocation to the native Palestinians, and there were a number of riots and other disorders. Jewish pressure on the British government, however, prevented the British from making any permanent or effective halt to the immigration of Jews into Palestine.

After the Second World War, shortly before the United Nations partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and non-Jewish areas, Jews still made up less than one-third of the population of Palestine. The 1946 British census counted 608,000 Jews out of a total population of 1,845,000. The great majority of these Jews were recent immigrants, whereas nearly all of the Arabs were natives who had roots in Palestine going back many generations. What the Jews had that the Palestinians didn't have, however, was a very substantial degree of control of the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom, and these two countries exerted a decisive influence on the policies of the United Nations. The result of this influence was the partition of Palestine in 1948 into separate Jewish and non-Jewish areas, with the one-third of the population that was Jewish being awarded two-thirds of the land, including the most valuable areas.

The Jews immediately set about ethnically cleansing their areas, carrying out a number of horrifying massacres of non-Jewish Palestinians and terrorizing tens of thousands of others into fleeing from their homes, which immediately were seized and occupied by the Jews. In a series of wars since 1948, the Jews, backed by the United States, seized even more Palestinian land. The Palestinians who were driven from their land -- the real Palestinians, whose parents and grandparents and great-grandparents had owned the land -- were forced into crowded and dirty refugee camps, where they still live. And whenever one of these dispossessed Palestinians strikes back at the Jews who stole his country from him, everyone in the Bush government, from the chief liar on down, and everyone in the controlled media here denounces the Palestinian as a "terrorist" -- and all of the Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks nod in agreement.

I'll tell you about one of these Palestinian "terrorists" you've certainly heard mentioned by the media if you pay any attention at all to what's happening in the world. He's called Abu Nidal: the most feared Palestinian "terrorist" of them all. The name the man called Abu Nidal was born with is Sabri al-Banna. He was born in 1937 in the Palestinian coastal city of Jaffa. His family was one of the wealthiest and most distinguished families in Palestine and owned, among other things, more than 6,000 acres of orange orchards, which were the major source of income for the family. When Sabri al-Banna was an 11-year-old schoolboy, the Jews seized all of his family's orchards and other lands, all of their houses, and everything else his family owned, and he and his family ended up living in a tent in a refugee camp in the Gaza strip. Quite a shock for a quiet, introverted little boy.

The shock led him to dedicate his life to evening the score, to gaining justice for his people, to striking back at the Jews who had stolen all of his family's property and driven them into a

refugee camp. He built what was probably the most highly disciplined and ruthless fighting organization on the Palestinian side. He struck not only at Jews but also at Palestinians who collaborated or compromised with the Jews. Whenever Abu Nidal's troops would strike, machine-gunning Israeli tourists at an airport or bombing some Jewish facility in another country, the politicians and the media here always would go into hysterics about Arab "terrorism." I always cheered. Abu Nidal is not some crazed murderer who likes to kill people. He is a Palestinian patriot fighting for his people and for his country in the only way he can fight under the circumstances. He does not "hate America's freedom" as George Bush and the media would have you believe. There is no reason for him to be an enemy of America, except that we have made him an enemy by arming and financing the Jews who stole his family's orange groves and forced him into a refugee camp. Remember that whenever you buy an orange that came into America from Israel: one of those sweet Jaffa oranges that are so favored by New York Jews. That orange is stolen property. It belongs to Abu Nidal. It was stolen from him by the Jew who sold it to you.

By the way, a good source of information on Abu Nidal is a report published for the U.S. government in September 1999 by the Library of Congress. It's titled "The Sociology and Psychology of Terrorism: Who Becomes a Terrorist and Why?" It's available on the Internet now.

Nearly everything that the average American thinks he knows about the Middle East -- everything told to him by the government or the media about current events or history in Afghanistan, Iraq, Palestine, Israel, or about American involvement in that part of the world -- is part of a tissue of lies spun by the Jews to serve their interests at the expense of ours. The lie told by FLAME and published by *U.S. News & World Report* -- and that magazine, incidentally, is owned by Jewish real-estate speculator Mortimer Zuckerman -- the lie that the real Palestinians are Jews, and the Arabs claiming to be Palestinians are interlopers, is typical.

The lies told to the American people by the controlled media and the government and the schools certainly are not limited to lies about the Middle East, however. The same FLAME ad in *U.S. News & World Report* that we've just discussed begins with a lie that has nothing to do with the Middle East. It's a lie that Americans have been told so often that most of them accept it unquestioningly as the truth: even university-educated Americans who believe that they are sophisticated enough to distinguish Jewish propaganda lies from the truth. This is the way the FLAME ad begins:

Josef *[sic]* Goebbels, the infamous propaganda minister of the Nazis, had it right. Just tell people big lies often enough and they will believe them.

The message there is clear: the Nazis advocated fooling the people by telling them big lies and repeating those big lies frequently. Right? We've all been told that a thousand times, haven't we? We learned it in school. We heard it on television. Half the politicians in Mr. Bush's government undoubtedly have warned us at one time or another about the Nazi "big lie" propaganda technique. Usually, however, the principal Nazi advocate of the "big lie" is named as Adolf Hitler rather than Joseph Goebbels. We've all heard about Hitler's "big lie" technique. And so we

all should be grateful to the Jews for warning us about it. Right? I mean, no matter what we think about Jews otherwise, we at least owe them for warning us about Nazi lies, don't we?

You know, I used to believe that myself. But I was fortunate enough to know someone who told me that it wasn't so. This person told me that neither Hitler nor Goebbels had advocated the "big lie" technique for deceiving the public. He told me that the opposite was true: that in fact Hitler, far from advocating the use of the "big lie," had warned his people that the Jews use this "big lie" technique, and that the German people should be wary of it.

Well, when I hear something like that, my tendency is to check it out for myself. I don't accept many things on faith. And when my friend told me that Hitler had neither invented nor advocated the "big lie" after I had heard so many times in school and on TV that Hitler had done those things, at first I didn't believe him. I checked it out for myself, and that's what you should do. I got a copy of Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, from the library, and I read what Hitler wrote back in 1925 about propaganda and lying and about the Jews. You know, *Mein Kampf,* is still in print today. If you can't find an English translation of the book in your local library you can buy a copy from amazon.com or from Barnes & Noble. Or, better, you can buy a copy from the sponsors of this program, National Vanguard Books. They stock and sell both the original German edition and two different English translations.

Anyway, I'll read to you exactly what Hitler wrote about the "big lie." I'll read from the Ralph Manheim translation that is currently published in this country by the Houghton Mifflin Company. In Chapter 10 of the first volume of *Mein Kampf* Hitler writes about the role of Jewish-Marxist propaganda in bringing about the collapse of the German war effort during the First World War and then blaming that collapse on German General Erich Ludendorff:

It required the whole bottomless falsehood of the Jews and their Marxist fighting organization to lay the blame for the collapse on that very man who alone, with superhuman energy and will power, tried to prevent the catastrophe he foresaw and save the nation from its time of deepest humiliation and disgrace. By branding Ludendorff as guilty for the loss of the World War, they took the weapon of moral right from the one dangerous accuser who could have risen against the traitors to the fatherland. In this they proceeded on the sound principle that the magnitude of a lie always contains a certain factor of credibility, since the great masses of the people in the very bottom of their hearts tend to be corrupted rather than consciously and purposely evil, and that, therefore, in view of the primitive simplicity of their minds, they more easily fall victim to a big lie than to a little one, since they themselves lie in little things, but would be ashamed of lies that were too big. Such a falsehood will never enter their heads, and they will not be able to believe in the possibility of such monstrous effrontery and infamous misrepresentation in others; yes, even when enlightened on the subject, they will long doubt and waver and continue to accept at least one of these causes as true. Therefore, something of even the most insolent lie will always remain and stick -- a fact which all the great lie-virtuosi and lying-clubs in the world know only too well and also make the most treacherous use of.

The foremost connoisseurs of this truth regarding the possibilities in the use of falsehood and slander have always been the Jews; for after all, their whole existence is based on one single great lie, to wit, that they are a religious community while actually they are a race -- and what a

race! One of the greatest minds of humanity has nailed them forever as such in an eternally correct phrase of fundamental truth: he called them 'the great masters of the lie.' And anyone who does not recognize this or does not want to believe it will never in this world be able to help the truth to victory.

Now, I ask you: does that sound as if Hitler invented the "big lie" or was advocating its use -- or does it sound as if he were condemning this as a Jewish technique and warning his fellow Germans about it? What do you think?

It's too bad he didn't warn us Americans too, because over here the Jews have used the very technique of which Hitler warned in 1925 to put the blame on Hitler himself! I guess that all it takes is enough *chutzpah,* as they proudly call it. And it certainly took *chutzpah* on the part of the Jews who wrote that FLAME ad accusing the Palestinians of being interlopers in Palestine and furthermore accuses them of using the "big lie" technique when the Palestinians charge that it is the Jews, not they, who are the interlopers. The brazenness of the Jews really takes one's breath away.

Anyway, I apologize for reading such a long excerpt from *Mein Kampf,* but it does give us just one more really clear-cut and unambiguous example of the way in which the Jews in the media and their collaborators in the government lie to us with the utmost brazenness and arrogance.

The Importance of Leadership

Every time I fly somewhere for a meeting or a speaking engagement, I have to spend an hour or two in airports. That's a very democratic experience. One really sees the dregs of humanity in airports these days. It used to be that what bothered me most was seeing young White women with mongrel offspring in tow. What irritates me at least as much these days is the sight of young White males trying to look and act like Blacks. In every airport one sees these sorry specimens wearing hip-hop garb: backward baseball caps, baggy shorts or trousers, and clueless expressions on their faces. More and more one sees these slack-jawed cretins with their hair done in cornrows and pieces of metal through their lips or cheeks or nostrils.

I mentioned in a recent broadcast that I saw young Whites like this shuffling along the sidewalks of Philadelphia during one of my rare visits to that urban pesthole last month. The more White males I see garbed and groomed like Blacks, the less surprised I am to see White females leading by the hand the disgusting proof that they have been dabbling in bestiality. It's obvious that this sort of degeneracy is rapidly becoming much more widespread. When I did an interview with *Rolling Stone* magazine nearly two years ago, they sent along a German photographer who had his blond hair done in dreadlocks. I don't know why I should expect more of Germans than that. After all, they have had 57 years -- two generations -- of Judaeo-American forced education in democracy now. Turn on any TV receiver in Germany, and you will see much of the same poisonous, race-destroying filth from Hollywood that you see here. Young Germans watch Sumner Redstone's MTV just about as much as young Americans do. And in Germany as in America: monkey see, monkey do.

Last year the first-place photojournalism award for the best photograph by a newspaper photographer went to Mike Urban of the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* for a photograph he took during the Mardi Gras riot there. I talked about that riot on this program last year. Gangs of Blacks ran through the mostly White crowd of Mardi Gras revelers, snatching purses, punching White women in the face, throwing them to the ground, and kicking them senseless, while Seattle's cops stood on the sidelines and refused to interfere, lest they be accused of "racial profiling." One young White man who tried to help a young White woman who had been knocked down and was being kicked by Blacks, was smashed in the head by a Black wielding a bottle and was killed. I repeatedly watched the newsreel footage of the riot, and it clearly was a Black-on-White riot.

But not entirely. There were some Whites among the rioters: "wiggers" I call them. That means "White niggers." They're the ones with the backward baseball caps. Mike Urban's prize-winning photograph, which the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* did not have the courage to publish, is of a young White woman in the crowd who has been stripped naked by a gang of men and is being pawed and sexually abused by some of them while others constrain her. Most of the 20 or so men holding the naked girl down and pawing her are non-Whites: mestizos or Blacks. But in the photograph one can see clearly three or four White males -- wiggers -- grinning as they help the

Blacks hold the struggling girl: a shocking and sickening portrait of the reality of multiculturalism.

What should be done with wiggers? In my view they are a thousand times worse than Blacks, and when the time of cleansing for America comes, they certainly will be dealt with first.

And there's another class of White people we can do without. They don't wear hip-hop clothes or have their hair done in cornrows. On the socioeconomic ladder they're a rung or two above wiggers, but they're at least as bad as wiggers. They are the Whites who collaborate with the Jews. With the exception of the German photographer for *Rolling Stone*, who was a wigger, virtually all the other journalists with whom I've dealt are in the collaborator class. They don't help rioting Blacks tear the clothes off White girls and sexually abuse them, but they help the Jews generate the social climate in which that sort of thing can happen. They help the Jews disseminate their multicultural propaganda. They help the Jews teach young Whites that they shouldn't resist Blacks, that it's all right to mix with them. They help the Jews indoctrinate politicians and police officials with Political Correctness, so that White cops are less likely to intervene to protect Whites from Blacks. Sumner Redstone could not spread his poisonous, racially destructive, hip-hop filth through his MTV channel without the active collaboration of thousands of White helpers.

And its not just the Whites who help Redstone by buying advertising on MTV or working for him as announcers or scriptwriters who are collaborators. Here's an example: a month ago a small, nearly all-White South Dakota college town was turned upside down when it was discovered that a Black basketball player, whom the local college recently had imported from Chicago, was infected with HIV and was having sex with the White girls at the college: with lots of them. Nearly everybody at the college had to have an HIV test, and it turned out that several of the girls there already had become infected by the Black. It's likely that a few of the White boys will be testing positive for HIV pretty soon.

The only reason this story made the news is that the Black basketball player knew he was infected and was having sex with White girls without telling them of his infection. He had found out he was infected after a routine blood test, but he kept the news to himself so as not to interfere with his sex life. Well, there's a law against that sort of thing in South Dakota, and so now the Black is locked up and out of circulation. To me the shocking thing is not that the Black was deliberately infecting his sex partners; the shocking thing is that White college girls were willing to have sex with him, and that White college boys were willing to tolerate that sort of behavior and to have sex themselves with girls they knew had been having sex with a Black. So far as I am concerned, every White woman who has sex with any Black deserves to be infected with HIV and to die a horrible death from AIDS.

But the really reprehensible people in this story are the White college officials who imported this Black basketball player from Chicago. I imagine that before they found out that he was spreading HIV through the whole student body they were quite proud of themselves for having brought some "diversity" to this White college. I have a pretty strong suspicion that these academic idiots wouldn't have been bothered a bit about White girls having sex with the Black if it hadn't been

for the HIV. They would be proud that they had taught the girls to be so "tolerant." They would be happy that the White girls aren't "racists."

These South Dakota college officials almost certainly aren't Jews, but they are doing the Jews' work for them. Sumner Redstone and the other media Jews have been working for decades to create the moral and ideological climate where this sort of thing could happen -- they have been making racial mixing fashionable -- but without the active collaboration of White college officials and White journalists and White politicians and White Christian preachers, all of the Jews' racially destructive efforts would have been in vain.

I'm sure that everyone listening is familiar with situations similar to that at the South Dakota college, but without the HIV. There are Christians in small communities all across the Whiter areas of America who feel guilty that their communities are so White, and many of these guilt-stricken Christians have tried to remedy the situation by importing Blacks or other non-Whites into their churches or their communities. Some of them even bring in the Blacks from as far away as Africa. And again, the Jewish media people have been the biggest factor in generating the moral and ideological climate in which being White is something to feel guilty about, but it is local Gentile preachers and teachers and politicians and journalists who actually do the destructive work of making their communities more racially "diverse."

So what's to be done with all of these collaborators if we want one day to have a clean America again?

The reason we're discussing this subject today is that there is a difference of opinion among members in my own organization, the National Alliance, about what attitude we should have toward wiggers and collaborators. Some members believe that we should take the hardest possible line toward them. Whether they are wiggers or White women who consort with Blacks or White journalists who follow the Jewish party line or White politicians who do the Jews' bidding in order to get themselves elected or any other sort of collaborator, they should all be put up against a wall and given traitors' justice.

And some members of the National Alliance believe that we should be more understanding of the conditions, of the environment, that made these wiggers and collaborators opt for treason.

Now, all of this is pretty academic at this time, since we're still a long way from being able to punish anybody for anything. About all we can do now is try to understand what is happening in the world around us and communicate with others, help others understand. But I should tell you that until a few years ago I was pretty much in agreement with the hard liners. I was in favor of getting rid of all of the wiggers and all of the collaborators as a first step toward building a healthy society for our people.

But my views on this have changed as I have learned more about human motivation and human behavior. What I have come to understand about people -- our people, White people -- is that there are very few, probably only a fraction of a per cent, who are consciously evil: a fraction of a per cent who collaborate with the Jews knowing that they are helping the Jews destroy our people but who do it anyway for reasons of personal gain. These collaborators fit the clinical

definition of psychopath: people without conscience. I believe that most politicians are in this category.

And there are only a small minority of our people who have an innate moral sense, a minority of two or three or four per cent of the White population who are able to think independently and form their own views about what is good and what is evil, what is right and what is wrong.

And the remaining 95 per cent or so of the population simply don't have minds or consciences of their own. They may be bright or they may be dull, they may have good work habits or they may be lazy and careless, they may be well disciplined and have good character or they may be weak and self-indulgent slobs, but all of them conform their opinions about what is right and what is wrong, about what is proper behavior and what is unacceptable, to their perception of the opinions and behavior of their peers.

No matter how foolish we may think their opinions, no matter how perverse we may consider their behavior, they have no innate compass for judging these things; they can only conform their thinking and their behavior to the thinking and behavior they perceive in their peers. Sometimes -- that is, at most times in the past, prior to the last century -- what they perceived was real. They observed and listened to their neighbors at first hand. And especially they observed and listened to community leaders, to role models, to authority figures, including especially parents. So what we had in the past among this 95 per cent of our people were patterns of thinking and behavior that varied primarily with social class. But the patterns were based on perceptions of real behavior among peers.

Since the rise of the mass media during the past century, however -- and especially since the rise of television during the past half-century -- what has been perceived has been increasingly artificial. What has been perceived has to a large degree not been the thinking and behavior of their flesh-and-blood peers that have evolved naturally over the course of generations, but rather the artificially contrived behavior and pretended thinking of actors and actresses and commentators on movie screens and TV screens and of models in magazine advertising. Scriptwriters and film directors and spin doctors and advertising executives have to a very large degree taken the place of parents and of other natural role models in shaping the thinking and behavior of the masses. And of course, perception gradually becomes reality. Eventually we observe among our peers behavior that is very similar to that we see on our television screens. But the mass media -- especially the mass media of entertainment -- continue to lead and to move and to shape public thinking and public behavior.

That is a fact with profound implications. I'll recapitulate: Most people -- probably 95 per cent of the population -- are neither good nor evil. They are morally neutral. Their attitudes and opinions and aspirations -- their moral judgments and their behavior -- are determined not by any innate sense of right and wrong but rather are conformed to the attitudes and behavior they perceive in their peers, real or artificial, and especially to the attitudes and behavior they perceive in role models and authority figures. When those role models and authority figures incorporate and display what is best in a people, then the attitudes and behavior of the masses will be good and progressive and characteristic of the best tendencies in the race. If the leaders and role models display noble qualities and greatness, then the masses will strive toward nobility and greatness.

They won't all get there, of course, but they will strive for those qualities, and many will achieve them.

If their leaders show their racial consciousness and pride and their respect for the best traditions of their people, then the masses also will be racially conscious and will try to behave in a way that displays racial pride and respect for tradition. They will not even consider mixing with non-Whites or imitating their ways, and they will not tolerate such behavior in their peers. The concept of racial treason will be abhorrent to them.

But if their role models and authority figures display the worst and weakest traits in the people, then that behavior will be reflected in the behavior of the masses. And if their role models and authority figures are mere puppets controlled by aliens whose aim is the demoralization and destruction of the people, then the masses will behave in the way we can see them behaving on the streets of Philadelphia or in our airport terminals today. That is the consequence of permitting the Jews to gain a dominant influence over our mass media of news and entertainment.

And so what is the point in shooting wiggers or collaborators, except as an educational measure, to provide an example of behavior that will not be tolerated in a healthy society? Or perhaps, in the case of wiggers, we might consider shooting the most slack-jawed among them as a eugenic measure.

The point is that what we need to aim for is not eliminating the great mass of people who have bad behavior or bad attitudes, but rather changing their role models and authority figures. We should not even think about getting rid of the lemmings, just because they have been behaving badly. They make up the great majority of every society, and it is necessary that they do so. They provide the stability and cohesiveness necessary for a viable society. A society cannot tolerate too many independent thinkers, just as it cannot tolerate too many psychopaths.

Think about these things. I know that it took me a lot of thinking and a lot of observing to become quite sure that what I have just told you is, in fact, correct. Twenty years ago, I believed that people are born with all of the fundamental traits that they will display as adults. And at one level -- a very basic level -- that is true. Intelligence -- various types of intelligence -- is a group of fundamental traits that individuals are born with. And there certainly are inherited tendencies toward certain types of behavior as well. But these are underlying tendencies, and the ways in which these underlying tendencies are expressed in individuals -- the ways in which they manifest themselves as the individuals mature -- are very much subject to external influences.

The 15-year-old, slack-jawed White boy encountered on a Philadelphia sidewalk who wears a backward baseball cap and baggy trousers and collects basketball cards with pictures of Black players could have turned out to be a decent White teenager instead, with pride of race and aspirations to be a policeman or a soldier or a craftsman: perhaps not a brilliant member of White society, but at least a constructive member. The 20-year-old White woman encountered in an airport terminal with needle marks on her arms and three mulatto offspring trailing behind her could have turned out to be that White policeman or soldier or craftsman's wife, living a clean life and proudly bearing and caring for his children.

For the masses, everything depends on the examples that are set for them, on their role models and authority figures. Monkey see; monkey do.

That is why it does not behoove us to think of ourselves at war against wiggers and collaborators. When I see a White kid wearing hip-hop clothing, I still feel a strong urge to kick. And when I see a White woman with mongrel offspring, I wish that I could call in an air strike against New York or Washington or Philadelphia or Los Angeles; I really have an urge to lay waste to the whole society that tolerates such abominations.

But I understand that our task is not to kick and shoot and bomb; instead it is to communicate and to teach. We don't need to try to communicate with the wiggers and the collaborators now. But we do need to communicate with those of our people capable of being positive role models and authority figures, and we do need to continue to build our means -- our media -- for reaching ever larger numbers of ordinary White people: those who have not yet been completely corrupted by the aliens who have subverted our mass media into a weapon for waging genocide against our people.

When the time comes there will be enough punishment for those who need it. But what most of our people, who are behaving badly now, need is not punishment but good leadership, good examples. And that is what we must strive to give them.

The FBI, the ADL, and Christina Long

We need a government. Every civilized nation needs a government. Certainly, there are independent people who just want to live out in the woods by themselves and not be bothered. They don't need a government.

And there are weepy, wimpy, liberal types who whine, "Oh, why can't we all just get along with each other?" and who believe that governments wouldn't be necessary if we would just be nice and share everything. But believe me, these feminized, flower-power types don't know what they're whining about. Every civilized society does need a government.

The problem with governments -- even well-designed governments -- is that they tend to get out of control. They tend to become corrupt. The wrong sort of people tend to get their hands on the levers of power. That's the problem Americans have today: big time. The U.S. government has become a malignant monster that not only is gobbling up the remaining freedom of its citizens as fast as it can but also is threatening the very existence of our nation, the survival of our race.

I'll repeat that: the U.S. government is doing two very harmful things. On the one hand it is taking away our remaining freedom, using the excuse that only by taking away our freedom can it effectively fight against terrorism and thereby give us more security. And on the other hand the government is coming more than ever before under the influence of the most destructive elements in our society. We'll talk about both of these things in detail and look at some specific examples.

You know, this so-called "War Against Terror" that the Bush government and the controlled media claim to have been fighting ever since September 11 is an enormous fraud. The way to fight terrorism is to get rid of the un-American policies that cause terrorism in the first place.

Why was the Federal Building in Oklahoma City bombed in 1995? It was a direct response to the U.S. government's massacre of the members of the Branch Davidian church in Waco, Texas. Tim McVeigh explained that clearly enough. The U.S. government had no business laying siege to that church and then burning its members to death. Tim McVeigh wanted to send the government a message that such behavior would not be tolerated. He wanted to send a message that wouldn't be ignored. He wouldn't have had to send that message if the government hadn't committed the Waco massacre first and then refused to accept the blame for what it had done.

Why were the World Trade Center and the Pentagon attacked last year? The attack was a direct response to the U.S. government's complicity in Israeli aggression in the Middle East. Osama bin Laden has explained that clearly enough. There would have been no September 11 attack if the U.S. government had been backing American interests in the Middle East instead of Jewish interests.

The way to stop terrorism is to eliminate the causes of terrorism, especially when those causes are bad in themselves and should be eliminated even if they didn't cause terrorism. The arrogant and high-handed behavior by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and the FBI that led

to the Waco massacre are bad in themselves and should not be tolerated in a free country. It's not angry patriots like Tim McVeigh who are the cause of terrorism; he's just an agent. It's the arrogance and high-handed behavior by the government's secret-police agencies that are the cause.

The U.S. government's policy of supporting Israel at the expense of our own interests is bad in itself and should be eliminated. It's not Muslim fundamentalists like Osama bin Laden who are the cause of terrorism; he's just an agent. It's the un-American foreign policy of the U.S. government that is the cause.

But just as the government and the media after the Oklahoma City bombing refused to talk about the real cause of that bombing, since the September 11 attack they have refused to talk about the real cause of that disaster too. The government and the media don't want to make the secret police obey the law and respect the rights of citizens, and they certainly don't want U.S. foreign policy to put America's interests ahead of Israel's interests, and so instead of remedying the bad policies that were the causes of those catastrophes they have made the bad policies even worse. They started a war in Afghanistan and are hot to make it an even bigger war. And they have unleashed the FBI and other secret-police agencies, giving them free reign to rummage through the curbside trash or the e-mail of people who are not even suspected of criminal activity, just to see whether or not the secret police can find something Politically Incorrect.

They're able to get away with this because they have a constituency of lemmings who really believe that the government will allow them to consume in greater comfort and safety if they will just let the government do whatever it wants, including abolishing the Bill of Rights and bombing the hell out of everyone that Israel doesn't like.

Let's be sure that I've made myself absolutely clear: This whole "War Against Terror" is phony. It's unnecessary. It's counterproductive. The terrorism Americans have experienced in the past decade, whether in Oklahoma City or New York or Washington, has not been the irrational activity of madmen as the government and the media would have us believe. It has been the response to bad government policies from aggrieved men who had no other way of fighting back. The way to minimize terrorism in the future is to have better government policies, not to let tight-lipped little religious fanatics like Attorney General John Ashcroft have his secret police check library records to see what books we've been reading or to let irresponsible dimwits like George Bush play at war in the Middle East and risk taking us all back to the Stone Age.

And the reason for all of this -- the reason for both the government's assault on our freedom and the warmongering in the Middle East -- is the growing Jewish control over our government. Day by day America is moving closer and closer to a total Judeocracy.

If you've been paying attention to the news, you know that the FBI has been receiving a great deal of criticism recently for ignoring evidence of a coming terrorist attack prior to September 11 last year. There have been many insinuations from the media -- which is to say, from the Jews -- that the FBI has become too soft and careless and that it needs to be reorganized and needs to reorient its activities. Well, now we know one of the ways in which the FBI's activities are being reoriented: more snooping into the private lives of citizens. But there also are other ways. Last

month FBI Director Robert Mueller addressed a conference of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in Washington.

I've spoken with you on several of these broadcasts about the Anti-Defamation League: the ADL. It's a criminal organization that has been snuggling up to and infiltrating law-enforcement agencies at every level. I reported to you more than once that the ADL had its offices in Los Angeles and San Francisco raided by police and was caught redhanded with thousands of stolen confidential police files. I reported that the ADL has strong ties not only to the government of Israel but also to Jewish organized crime in this country. The head of the ADL, Abe Foxman, is one of the Jewish leaders who leaned on Bill Clinton to get a last-minute pardon for the billionaire Jewish master-criminal and fugitive Marc Rich last year.

None of this ADL involvement with Jewish criminals and criminal activity is a secret, except to the American public. It's all a matter of public record, but most people don't know about it because the Jewish media won't report it. The media always refer to the ADL as a "respected human rights organization." And so that's the way the politicians and the Federal bureaucrats treat the ADL. Certainly Robert Mueller, the FBI director, knows all about the ADL's criminal activity and criminal connections, but he still accepted an invitation to address the organization last month. Here's an excerpt from what FBI Director Mueller told the ADL:

We in the FBI tremendously value your perspectives and your partnership. Your insights and research into extremism are particularly helpful to us, shedding light on the changing nature of the terrorist threats facing America. Your support of hate crime and terrorist investigations, which are now front and center in the work of the FBI, is essential to us. And the training and education you provide for the FBI and for law enforcement have never been more relevant. That includes the conference on extremist and terrorist threats you are sponsoring later this month at the FBI Academy.... So thank you for all these efforts. And again, I look forward to working with you to strengthen our partnership.

That should scare the hell out of every patriotic American. The ADL -- the Jewish organization that helped Jewish master-criminal Marc Rich escape justice, the organization that gave an award to Jewish contract-murderer Moe Dalitz in 1985 in appreciation of all the money received from Dalitz's criminal enterprises, the organization that was caught redhanded with thousands of stolen police files -- now has a partnership with the FBI and is teaching the FBI about the changing nature of terrorism in America. Specifically, what the ADL is teaching the FBI is that the people the FBI needs to keep an eye on are the "hate criminals" and "speech criminals," the White racists and anti-Semites, the White "extremists," the White Americans who complain about the growing influx of non-White immigrants, about multiculturalism, about the government's Israel-first foreign policy, and about the Jewish control of the news and entertainment media. They are the new terrorists and potential terrorists, according to the ADL. And the FBI is going along for the ride. As Director Mueller announced in his speech last month, those new threats are now "front and center" in the work of the FBI.

Now I'll tell you what's not front and center in the FBI's work. I'll begin with an especially shocking bit of news that some of you already may have heard. In fact there's even a very brief item about it in the June 3 issue of *Newsweek* magazine. That's the sex-murder in Danbury,

Connecticut, on May 24 of 13-year-old Christina Long. Christina, a bright, pretty sixth-grader, was lured to a shopping mall in Danbury by 25-year-old Saul Dos Reis, a mestizo illegal alien from Brazil. Dos Reis had sex with the blonde, blue-eyed little *gringa* in his car, then killed her and threw her corpse into a nearby creek.

Well, you may think, that sort of thing happens all the time these days, but it's just a local police matter. What does it have to do with the FBI or the ADL? Let me tell you.

The murder of 13-year-old Christina Long didn't just happen. It wasn't just a fluke. It was the product of a process that has been developing for decades. This individual murder by itself may have been unpredictable, but the process leading to the murder was deliberate. It was planned. And the process has targeted not just Christina, but every young, White, Gentile girl in America.

Let's look at Christina a little more closely. She was a sixth-grade cheerleader at a private Catholic school, St. Peter's, in Danbury. A good student and described as "sweet" by those close to her, Christina had many of the interests common to other girls her age: fashion, dancing, popular music. Her friends did note, however, that recently Christina had begun using cosmetics heavily and dressing provocatively. To understand why one only needs to look at what she wrote about herself in her Internet postings. She wrote in Black "jive talk" she evidently had picked up from watching MTV. The music she listened to was rap. Christina's favorite group was the Black female trio called "Destiny's Child," which performs songs with titles like "Stimulate Me" and "Bootylicious." Here are just a couple of sentences from her private Web site:

i love to shopp but then again what girl doesnt. I like hot cars too. im like dress nice. im not hoe. I just dance a little sexyer then most girls.

For the uninitiated, "I'm not hoe" is Black talk for "I'm not a whore." But Christina dressed and talked like a whore. When she went to the shopping mall, she went with the intention of having sex with a 25-year-old illegal alien she had met on the Internet.

What led a White sixth-grader to behave like that? I'll tell you, and I'll also tell you that many, many other young White girls are behaving like Christina, and a lot of them are even younger than 13. Do you remember JonBenet Ramsey, the six-year-old girl who was murdered in Boulder, Colorado, in December 1996 by an unknown person? Like Christina she was a cute, blue-eyed blonde. Like Christina she used cosmetics heavily, wore sexy clothes, and danced provocatively -- at the age of six!

That seemed such a bizarre thing at the time that it received an enormous amount of media coverage. All of the media attention, however, focused on the murder-mystery aspects of the case: who had killed little JonBenet? Nobody asked why a six-year-old White girl from a well-to-do family was dressing and behaving like a 20-year-old strip-club dancer. That's really a taboo subject, but we'll talk about it anyway. The more general question is, why are young White girls, some as young as JonBenet Ramsey, others 12 or 13, like Christina Long, dressing and trying to behave like adult women? Why are they trying to be "sexy" at such an early age?

I wish we had a lot more time to answer this question. All I can do today is give you a few bare-bones answers and then let you dig into it yourself. The basic answer as to why very young White girls are trying to be "sexy" is that young girls are very fashion conscious, and the fashion being pushed by the media to which they are exposed is early-teen and pre-teen sexuality. And I hardly need to tell you that the people pushing this sexualizing of children are Jews, and that they are doing it deliberately and consciously. It's not a trend that just happened to develop by itself.

The media through which young White girls like JonBenet and Christina are receiving this message of premature sexuality are multicultural entertainment media and fashion advertising directed at children.

You know, it used to be that parents decided what their 11- and 12- and 13-year-old children should wear. Parents decided what fashions were appropriate and picked the clothes. But not any longer. Let me quote a spokesman, Kurt Barnard, for the children's garment industry: "In our sophisticated day and age," Mr. Barnard told a writer for the publication *Business First*, "a 10-year-old girl can be expected to try and exercise her own sense of fashion."

And guess who it is that manipulates that 10-year-old girl's sense of fashion. The dominant media influence on young teens comes from MTV, which is owned by the Jew Sumner Redstone. Says MTV's chairman of the board Bob Pittman:

At MTV we don't just shoot for the fourteen year olds -- we own them.

The man who decides on the content of the entertainment presented to 14-year-olds is MTV's president of programming, Brian Graden, a homosexual Jew.

Nickelodeon, a cable channel also owned by Sumner Redstone, shoots for the younger teens and pre-teens and is pushing the same trend as MTV. Bruce Friend, the vice-president of planning for Nickelodeon:

In the last ten years we've seen a rapid development of upper-age children. The 12- to 14-year-olds of yesterday are the ten to 12s of today." The rise of the pre-teen teen is "the biggest trend we've seen."

Friend is seconded by New York market researcher Michael Cohen, who says: "There's no question there's a deep trend, not a passing fad, toward kids getting older younger."

Redstone's child-poisoners take frequent polls to see what effect their poison is having. The Nickelodeon-Yankelovich Youth Monitor found in its polls that by the time they are 12, children describe themselves as "flirtatious, sexy, trendy, athletic, cool." And Nickelodeon's Bruce Friend reports that by age 11, children in focus groups say they no longer even think of themselves as children.

Well, that's the entertainment-media side of the coin. The other side of the coin is the children's fashion industry itself, which, as you may have guessed, is as heavily Jewish as the entertainment media. From the clothing chains Gap-Kids and Old Navy, which are run by Donald Fisher and

Millard Drexler, to The Wet Seal's Zutopia stores run by Irving Teitelbaum, and Limited Too, which is run by Michael Rayden, the Jewish influence on children's clothing is pervasive and pernicious.

You may have heard of the recent protest by outraged parents over the children's division of Abercrombie & Fitch introducing thong-style underwear for 7- to 14- year-old girls. Until 1988 Abercrombie & Fitch was well-known as a traditional American supplier of quality outdoor attire. Then it was acquired by the clothing chain The Limited, where, under the guidance of Leslie Wexner, a fervently Zionist Jew, it was transformed into a purveyor of trendy, provocative attire for young people, and then spun off as an independent company. Limited Too was another of Wexner's creations that followed a similar course.

The sexual exploitation of White children by Jewish fashion designers and executives can be traced back at least as far as the early 1980's when the bisexual Jew Calvin Klein hired Brooke Shields to model his line of jeans and later devised an ad campaign using children in seductive poses. Today's children are being morally and culturally abused by a fashion industry that receives its inspiration from a degenerate entertainment industry. Seven- to 14-year-old children who visit Limited Too stores have been encouraged to come to the mall dressed as their favorite female pop star, such as the bizarrely-attired and vulgar performer who calls herself "Pink." What could be more obvious proof of a deliberate attempt to corrupt our youth?

If the FBI really wanted to accomplish something useful for America, instead of collaborating with the ADL's program to abolish our Bill of Rights, it would investigate and terminate the constant flow of propaganda spewed out by the Jewish media and fashion industries which is subverting our youth. Instead, it is up to us to neutralize this assault on our children.

If you are the parent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt of young White children, you have a sacred obligation to help them develop a lifelong resistance to these Jewish attempts to destroy their racial and cultural identity. Don't wait until a policeman comes to your home bearing tragic news. Remember what happened to Christina Long.

The New Extremists

I've been thinking more about the things we discussed last week. I tried to tie several very important threads together, each of which could have used much more discussion than we devoted to all of them together. I'm afraid I didn't do a thorough enough job. In future broadcasts we'll discuss each of these extremely urgent subjects repeatedly. I want to begin today's broadcast, however, with a brief recap of what we talked about last week.

I pointed out that there is a major, long-term, concerted effort by the Jewish entertainment media and the Jewish fashion industry to sexualize our children prematurely, to cause little White girls 10 or 11 or 12 years old to behave sexually like 20-year-olds. I used as examples six-year-old JonBenet Ramsey, murdered by an unknown person more than five years ago, and 13-year-old Christina Long, murdered last month by an illegal alien from Brazil. Both of these little girls were dressing and behaving like women much older than they.

Those, of course, are exceptional cases. Most little girls don't get murdered. Most 13-year-old White girls don't meet non-Whites in shopping malls for sex. But virtually all little girls are subjected to a non-stop flood of Jewish propaganda through television entertainment and TV and magazine advertising designed to make them act older than their age, designed to confuse them about their own racial identity, designed to make them believe that it's cool to have sex with non-Whites, designed to steal their childhood from them -- and, of course, designed to get them and their parents to spend money on the fashions the Jews present to them.

And this flood of propaganda is having an effect -- a big effect -- on our little girls, and not just in getting them to spend money. It is changing their attitudes and behavior. It is persuading them to act older and more sophisticated than they really are and to become more sexually active. It is making them much more receptive to sexual approaches from non-Whites. It is stealing their childhood from them, and it is stealing them from their own people, from their own race. If you are the parent of a young girl you know this is true. You have seen it with your own eyes.

I told you last week that this is a two-pronged attack on our children, with the media and the children's fashion industry collaborating in the effort. If you've listened to many of my broadcasts, you've certainly heard me talk about the Jewish control of the mass media, naming names. When our children are the target of the media, it's the entertainment media that are important, since most children these days have no interest in news. The entertainment medium with the most influence on White teenagers is MTV, and for sub-teens it is Nickelodeon. Both are owned by the Jew Sumner Redstone, born Murray Rothstein, who also owns CBS. But Jews exercise a similar degree of control over every major entertainment medium, whether it's part of Michael Eisner's Disney empire or a Hollywood motion-picture studio or a popular music label.

And the same Jewish control is found in children's fashions. Jews have long held a dominant position in the garment industry in this country. The mass media and the garment industry were the first two industries they took over when they began arriving in this country in large numbers at the beginning of the 20th century. Last week I mentioned a few names of leading Jews in the children's garment industry -- Leslie Wexner, Donald Fisher, Irving Teitelbaum, Millard Drexler,

Michael Rayden, Calvin Klein -- but it's easy for you to explore this subject for yourself. The Jews are not so secretive and defensive about their control of the garment industry as they are about their control of the mass media.

This matter of the Jewish assault on our children, the concerted Jewish effort to prematurely sexualize and alienate our little girls, is an extremely important matter, but I should confess that my principal reason for bringing it up last week is that I wanted to catch the attention of many parents who need to be approached at a personal level, parents who just don't otherwise care much about what is happening to their government or other parts of their society but who have seen the effects of this Jewish assault on their children and are concerned about it.

As I said this assault on our children is extremely important, but the other things we discussed last week actually are much more urgent and need to be dealt with first. I pointed out last week that what the Jews are doing to our children should be a concern of any government agency with a responsibility for the security of our people -- and I mentioned the Federal Bureau of Investigation in particular. And I pointed out that not only is this deliberate assault on our children not likely to become an FBI concern, but that in fact the FBI is moving in the opposite direction. The new direction for the FBI is to be concerned with anyone -- like me -- who is opposed to this assault on our children, anyone who exposes to the public the Jewish nature of this assault, anyone who urges that something be done to counter this assault. I am -- we are -- the new extremists the FBI is becoming concerned with.

That's the extremely urgent subject I want to discuss with you today. If you've been keeping up with the news or listening to my earlier broadcasts, you are aware that the Jews are complaining about their precipitous loss of popularity around the world. Anti-Jewish feeling has risen 50 per cent in the United States in the past four years. That's certainly encouraging if it's really true. Of course, the Jews blame it all on "bigotry" and refuse even to consider that their own behavior might have something to do with it.

Well, they've always been that way, never accepting blame for anything they do. But 30 or 40 years ago, seeing the worldwide upsurge in hostility against them, they probably would have responded by deciding to keep a lower profile for a while. But not now. With their control of the Bush government and the mass media in the United States they are so confident that they can deal with any threat that instead of minimizing provocations for a while, they are moving aggressively ahead with their campaign to gain total control.

They already control the lemmings through the media, and their grip on the lemmings will remain secure as long as they retain their media control and keep the ball games coming -- and, of course, as long as the shopping malls stay full. And they already have controlled the politicians for a long time. They control them at least as much in the Bush government as they did in the Clinton government. As long as they can keep intelligent, courageous, and honest patriots out of the government -- and they've been pretty successful at that -- they can retain their control of the government too.

An especially worrisome aspect of this governmental control is the Jews' infiltration and subversion of our law-enforcement agencies. They are in the process now of completing their

subversion of the FBI, and the effects of that are evident. There's been much controversy in recent weeks about why the FBI didn't respond to warnings about a planned al-Qaeda attack before September 11. Conspiracy-minded people believe that the failure of the FBI to respond to the abundant evidence that something nasty was being planned was due to a decision in the Bush government to let the September 11 attack take place and then use it as an excuse to launch a war against the Jews' enemies in the Middle East.

Maybe. But I'm more inclined to believe that the FBI's failure to respond to warnings of a coming attack was due to bureaucratic inefficiency rather than to a deliberate decision to let the attack take place. Our bureaucrats these days just wouldn't take the risk of being blamed for something like that. What is beyond dispute, however, is that last year the FBI did break up a huge Israeli espionage operation against the United States and then deliberately let some 200 Israeli espionage agents quietly go home instead of prosecuting them. The decision to do that undoubtedly was made at the highest levels in the Bush government, but the FBI's willingness to go along with that decision is very disturbing. I can understand a nutcase religious fanatic like Attorney General John Ashcroft going along, because he believes that the Jews are "God's chosen people" and must not be opposed or criticized, but there should have been strong resistance inside the FBI itself.

And then there's the case of the anthrax terrorism. There's strong evidence that that was done by a Jew with Zionist connections in an attempt to cast suspicion on Muslims and generate public hostility against them. And almost certainly the FBI knows who it was. But there has been no arrest, and I'm beginning to suspect that there won't be an arrest, for the same reason that the Israeli espionage agents all were turned loose. That's an extremely worrisome matter, indicating a terminal degree of corruption in the FBI.

Last week I read you portions of an address FBI Director Robert Mueller gave to a meeting of leaders of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith on May 7. Mueller spoke of a growing "partnership" between the ADL and the FBI and of how much he appreciated the "training and education" the ADL had been providing for FBI agents. He spoke of how the ADL was helping the FBI understand "the changing nature of the terrorist threats facing America" and was providing information on "extremism" and "hate crime." Mueller's May 7 address to the ADL was phrased in the sort of bureaucratic doubletalk that is standard for government officials these days -- on the surface nothing very radical or alarming to a naïve listener -- but I explained to you the real meaning of his remarks.

The real meaning of a partnership between the ADL and the FBI and of the FBI's willingness to accept the ADL's judgment on the "changing nature" of terrorist threats is that the FBI will devote less of its resources to the investigation of actual criminal activity and more of its resources to helping the ADL counter the people the ADL considers "extremists": which is to say, people who have views the ADL labels "extreme."

Well, on May 31 a joint FBI-ADL conference was held at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. Last week, on June 6, the ADL issued a press release from its New York headquarters bragging about the May 31 conference and confirming my interpretation of Robert Mueller's May 7 address to the ADL. The press release stresses the need for the FBI to fight extremism and

terrorism, usually lumping the two "isms" together as if they're pretty much the same: as if having views the ADL considers "extreme" is tantamount to being a terrorist. Extremism, of course, is absolutely no business of the government in a free country. We're entitled to hold views as extreme as we want without being investigated or harassed.

I'll read to you from the press release the words of the ADL's national director, Abraham Foxman:

In order to assess threats against the United States, law enforcement must have credible information about domestic and foreign extremists whose rhetoric promotes violence. Through our network of regional offices and our experts in the field, ADL is uniquely suited to aid in the war against terrorism. This conference was an opportunity for law enforcement and extremism watchdogs to compare notes and forge alliances.

Did you catch that? The new threat to America comes from rhetoric: not from truck bombs or hijacked airliners or anthrax, but from rhetoric, from words. I'll interpret for you again. Abe Foxman is telling the FBI that the real danger to America is not from actual terrorists but from people whose views the ADL considers extreme and whose words might "promote violence." And through the ADL's "network of regional offices" and "experts in the field" the Jewish organization will keep the FBI informed about who's an extremist.

The ADL's network is a spy network. For years they've been sending out their "experts in the field" to steal people's curbside trash to see what information they could glean from it. When the ADL's "regional offices" in Los Angeles and San Francisco were raided by police armed with search warrants in 1993 and more than 12,000 stolen police files were found, there were reports in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *San Francisco Chronicle.* The *Los Angeles Times* carried a report on the raids in its April 9, 1993, issue that also gave information about some of the ADL's other spying operations, such as collecting the curbside trash of people it didn't like, people it would label "extremists."

What's surprising about that is that there were any news reports at all. No major news medium today ever refers to the ADL as a criminal organization or a spy organization but only as a "respected civil rights organization." Fortunately, among the stolen police files found in the ADL's offices in 1993 were those of some fairly prominent people, who had enough money to sue the ADL for invasion of their privacy. One of them was a former congressman. Jewish pressure on the prosecutor's office in California was able to kill the criminal charges against the ADL, but the civil suits kept the matter alive for years, and the ADL eventually had to pay out several hundred thousand dollars to the plaintiffs. The news on the suits and the payments always was scanty, but it's available to anyone who is really interested. Certainly the FBI and FBI Director Robert Mueller and Attorney General John Ashcroft know about it, and they also know about the ADL's involvement with Jewish organized crime figures, such as Moe Dalitz and Marc Rich.

I'll summarize again. The ADL always has wanted to silence people it considers "extremists": which is to say, people whose views it doesn't like. In the past the ADL would spy on these people and either blackmail them or apply economic or political pressure to shut them up. Now

it's enlisting the FBI to do its spying on "extremists" for it. That is horrifying and frightening, but we all should have seen it coming. We have had an Alice in Wonderland government in Washington for the last decade at least. When we have an FBI that catches Israeli espionage agents and then turns them loose because to prosecute them would embarrass Israel, we all should understand that we're in serious trouble. When the FBI won't arrest a Jewish fanatic sending out anthrax-infected letters because it might embarrass Israel, we're all in even worse trouble. And when the FBI begins investigating and harassing citizens for being "extremists," it's time for an armed uprising.

You know, I'm oversimplifying a little. It's not just that the people in the Bush government don't want to embarrass Israel: they also don't want to embarrass themselves. They've all compromised themselves so thoroughly by collaborating with the Jews against America's interests, against the freedom of American citizens, that they undoubtedly feel that they have a tiger by the tail now and dare not let go. And now they are taking the next step. Now the FBI is moving to do the anti-American things that the ADL used to have to do by itself. Now the ADL will tell the FBI who is an extremist whose rhetoric might promote violence, and the FBI will then use its own muscle against the offender.

Let me tell you something: the sort of rhetoric we've heard recently from FBI Director Robert Mueller and ADL National Director Abe Foxman, the rhetoric that I've quoted verbatim from their public statements today and last week, ought to promote violence, if there were any real patriots listening. Do you understand what I'm saying? These FBI and ADL people have been talking about taking our freedom away, and that sort of talk ought to be responded to in a forceful way. And I'll tell you something else: Just for saying what I've said to you today, they will label me an extremist whose rhetoric might promote violence. And I really don't care. I'm not trying to promote any specific sort of violence now, but there certainly will be violence before we've straightened things out in this country. Things have gone much too far already. The longer we wait, the more violent the straightening out will be.

You know, I've just been watching the news about this fellow Jose Padilla that they've accused of wanting to set off a so-called "dirty bomb" in Washington. He's being held now by the Army and almost certainly never will be turned over to a civilian court for trial because he hasn't actually done anything or even made a plan to do anything. The government is trying to force him to talk about his Muslim friends now, threatening him with a court martial and a summary execution, and the media are talking about his non-existent plan to bomb Washington in order to spook the lemmings and persuade them to give up a little more freedom.

One thing you certainly can count on is "dirty bombs" -- that is, radioactive bombs -- being used in this country in the future, because they're so easy to prepare and use and can cause such enormous damage. I wrote in detail about the use of "dirty bombs" in America way back in 1975 in my first novel, *The Turner Diaries*, and you may be sure that when the first "dirty bomb" actually is used here, the ADL will be saying that I promoted it and that my novel was a "blueprint" for it, just as they blamed the Oklahoma City bombing on me.

Well, one expects self-serving accusations of that sort from the ADL and other Jewish organizations. But now, with the FBI ready to take its direction from the ADL, such accusations

become really dangerous -- and not just for me: for everyone who refuses to live like a slave and keep his mouth shut lest he be labeled an "extremist."

Listen: I don't want any listener to go out and start shooting government officials now, because nothing that a single angry patriot can do by himself will help our situation. But I do want every serious and responsible listener to be absolutely sure that everything I've been telling you is true. I want you to be absolutely sure that the situation is as dangerous as I have told you it is. I want you to check the facts for yourself. Everything that I've told you today and last week is available from reliable sources on the Internet: the news reports about the 1993 raids on the ADL's offices and about other criminal activity by the ADL, the text of FBI Director Robert Mueller's May 7 address to the ADL, and the text of ADL National Director Abe Foxman's press release that I read to you a few minutes ago, not to mention the facts of the Jewish control of the mass media and of the children's fashion industry, and of Christine Long's murder.

And these things are just for starters. Every serious patriot needs to be informed. He needs to understand the situation we're in. He needs to know who America's enemies are and what they're doing. I'll continue doing everything I can to inform you every week, but I don't expect serious patriots to be like lemmings and simply believe whatever they're told. I expect them to be skeptical and to check things out for themselves, because only by being sure that we're right and that we know what we're talking about can we persuade others and gain the strength to rid our country and our race of this terrible threat to our freedom and to our very existence.

The Consequences of Corruption

Suppose Saddam Hussein sent a team of Iraqi agents into the United States to shoot down the presidential helicopter on the way to Camp David with George Bush aboard, or to plant a large bomb in the Capitol building, or to poison the water supply for Washington, DC, with the aim of bringing down the Bush administration....What would you call it? Terrorism, right?

Suppose George Bush ordered the CIA to send a team of American agents into Iraq to destabilize the government there, or to carry out economic sabotage and generate public unrest, or to assassinate Saddam Hussein. What would you call it? I'd call it embarrassing.

Has Saddam Hussein sent anyone into the United States to "take out" George Bush? Not that we know of. Has George Bush ordered anyone into Iraq to "take out" Saddam Hussein? Yes. Mr. Bush has made the order public, and the politicians in the Congress have fallen all over themselves in their rush to second him. So who are the terrorists: Iraqis or Americans?

You know, what's most embarrassing about this situation is not the hypocrisy -- the pretense of "fighting terrorism," the pretense of being opposed to terrorism on principle, while actually engaging in terrorism on a bigger scale than anyone else -- what's most embarrassing is that once again the head Jew has said "Jump!" and once again an American president has responded, "How high, sir?" It may not be obvious to the yahoos with the little flags on their cars who are sitting around in the American Legion halls and drinking beer, but destabilizing the government of Iraq or assassinating Saddam Hussein and setting up a puppet leader in his place is not something that serves America's interests. It's not something that's worth inviting more terrorist reprisals against Americans. It serves only Israel's interests, only the interests of the Jews.

George Bush understands that. Everyone in the Congress understands that. But they don't care. When the Jews say "Jump!" they jump. They all understand that that's the way to get good press and keep their places at the public trough, and that's all they care about. The Jews want the U.S. military to wage war against Iraq the way we waged war against Afghanistan, but among the American people there's not much enthusiasm for another war. So Mr. Bush launches a CIA terror campaign against Iraq in the hope of provoking Iraq to commit terrorist acts in the United States and help him drum up support for a new war.

We all thought the Clinton government was embarrassing, but really, what we have now is at least as bad -- and at least as dangerous. George Bush's personal style is different from Bill Clinton's -- so far as we know, Bush doesn't chase teenaged female interns around the Oval Office -- but Bush takes his orders from the same people Clinton did, and so do all of the politicians in the Congress.

I know that there are many, many people in America who have seen so much of this hypocrisy and lying and self-serving behavior from Washington that they have just washed their hands of the government altogether. "That's the way politicians and bureaucrats are," they think. "They're hopeless. I give up on them. I don't want anything to do with them."

We can see the growth of this attitude in the growing number of people who have stopped voting. They see that it doesn't make much difference which party is in power, and they're disgusted by the whole process. They don't want to have anything to do with the government. They just want to take care of themselves and their families, and they hope that the government will leave them alone.

Unfortunately, it's not that simple. Unfortunately, the government will not just leave us alone. We cannot afford simply to ignore what the government is doing. As I said a minute ago, what the government is doing is not just embarrassing; it's also dangerous for all of us. It's dangerous to our freedom and even to our survival. Let's look first at the danger to our freedom. I've talked about this before, but today I have a new example of what is going on in our government at all levels.

Last week my organization, the National Alliance, received a letter from a police official in Florida, and I want to read parts of that letter to you. The letter was attached to a copy of a National Alliance leaflet that our members have distributed widely around the country. The leaflet has a photograph of a little White girl about three years old and is headed, "Missing, a future for White children." Under that heading the text reads:

Description: blond, red, or brown hair; fair skin; innocent, inquisitive, intelligent, trusting personality. Corrupt politicians and minority special-interest groups have abducted her future. There will be no future for her in the Third World America that our nation's enemies are planning. Let's take back our country and make it great, clean, decent, and beautiful once again. For our children's sake. The men and women of the National Alliance want you to join in this great, patriotic effort.

That's the text, and it's followed by our address, so that people will be able to contact us.

Now here's what the letter that was attached to this leaflet says. It's on the official letterhead of the St. Pete Beach Police Department, and the letter is from the chief of police. The letter reads, in part:

The enclosed was distributed illegally in our area this past Friday night-Saturday morning.... I need to make it quite clear that hate mongering is not tolerated in our state, and any future distributions of this illegal nature will result in criminal prosecution of those distributing same.... Hatred is hatred -- no matter what color or religious preference you are (or hide behind) -- and it is illegal.
Sincerely,
R.F. Kaminskas, Chief of Police.

The letter is dated June 7, and I received it last week. Well, that's it. Hatred is illegal, says St. Pete Beach Police Chief Kaminskas, and it will be prosecuted. I don't know whether to laugh or to cry, but I'm more inclined to cry. Certainly, there are dumb cops, even dumb police chiefs, in this country, just as there are dumb people in every profession, and perhaps Chief Kaminskas is just an especially dumb cop. Or perhaps he's just trying to please his Jewish constituents in St. Pete Beach. St. Pete Beach, by the way, used to be St. Petersburg Beach, but I guess the locals

were having trouble spelling the name, so they shortened it. Anyway, I don't know whether Chief Kaminskas' problem is stupidity or corruption. I've never met the man. But letters like the one he sent me are symptomatic of a very widespread and very dangerous trend in this country.

Last week, we talked about the rapidly increasing Jewish infiltration and subversion of law-enforcement agencies in the United States. I gave as an example of this the developing relationship between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the most influential Jewish pressure group in America and a group with a long history of affiliation with Jewish organized crime. But this subversion is taking place at all levels, not just in the big Federal secret police agencies in Washington. State police agencies in every state and even uniformed police departments in little one-horse towns like St. Pete Beach also are being subverted.

As I just said, I don't know whether Police Chief Kaminskas is consciously corrupt like FBI Director Mueller, whether Kaminskas is consciously doing what the Jews tell him to do because he knows his job depends on it, or whether he's just dumb -- or maybe just an especially impressionable lemming, who has learned what he thinks he knows about the law from watching too many TV soap operas.

Certainly, there is a deplorable tendency in America these days toward touchy-feely law. It used to be that legislators, prosecutors, police officials, and others concerned with the law really were concerned with the letter of the law. Legislators were very careful to be clear and precise in the wording of laws, so that anyone with a reasonable command of English could read the laws and understand what was legal and what was not.

But, you know, that's sort of a male chauvinist way of doing things: far too analytical, far too coldly rigorous. In this increasingly feminized and democratic America, we have developed more of a warm, fuzzy, feel-good approach to law. The attitude today is that bad things ought to be against the law. And what's bad? Why, everybody knows that from watching television. Racism is bad. Hate is bad. Saying anything against the Jews or the media or the government is bad. If you do bad things or say bad things or have bad thoughts, then you're a bad person and should be locked up.

I know that sounds silly, but that's really the way a great many Sally Soccermoms and Joe Sixpacks think these days. I receive letters every week from people who really think that racism is illegal. And that may be the way St. Pete Beach Police Chief R.F. Kaminskas thinks: "Hatred is hatred ... and it is illegal."

And it's not really funny, because if that is Chief Kaminskas' understanding of the law, he's quite likely to arrest someone for exercising his constitutionally protected rights in St. Pete Beach, Florida. I'll guarantee you it won't be a Black arrested for wearing a Malcolm X T-shirt and handing out flyers demanding reparations for slavery from White people, and it won't be a Jew arrested for distributing flyers with unkind remarks about Muslims. But it could be a White man or a White woman arrested for distributing flyers expressing concern about a future for White children. People who have a touchy-feely understanding of the law also understand that just because hatred is illegal, not everyone who hates is breaking the law. It really depends on who

you are and whom it is that you don't like. If you watch enough TV you'll know when hatred is illegal and when it isn't. You can learn that just by noticing how the characters in the soaps respond to various situations.

Presumably, a judge or someone else in the system will have a clearer view of the law, although these days that's by no means certain. In any case you may end up spending several thousand dollars on lawyers getting out of jail and having the charges against you dismissed. If you have a police chief like R.F. Kaminskas in your community, you may decide that the smart thing to do is just to forget about your constitutional rights and keep your mouth shut.

And that is exactly what the folks who gave Chief Kaminskas his understanding of the law are hoping for. It's not yet illegal to express Politically Incorrect opinions. It's not yet illegal to hate a member of some officially favored minority or to express your concern for the future of White children. They're still working on that. But, meanwhile, having the lemmings ***believe*** that they're illegal, having people afraid to exercise their freedom, is almost as good as having laws that actually make those things illegal.

You know, I'm not a lawyer, but I have a fuzzy notion in the back of my mind that there is a Federal civil rights law somewhere on the books that specifies quite severe penalties for anyone who attempts to interfere with another person's exercise of a constitutionally protected right, and that threatening or attempting to intimidate is construed as interference. I suspect that if I were the chief of police in some one-horse town and I sent a letter to the head of a Jewish organization threatening to arrest any Jew who distributed Jewish leaflets in my town, the FBI would be all over me in about five minutes, and I would be in very serious trouble.

Chief Kaminskas' letter threatens anyone who tries to exercise his First Amendment rights in St. Pete Beach, Florida, by distributing leaflets expressing a concern for the future of White children. What do you think is the likelihood that the FBI will arrest Chief Kaminskas on a civil rights charge for sending me a threatening letter? I assure you, the likelihood of that is zero to none.

Why is that? Why does the FBI vigorously enforce civil rights laws in some cases but not in others? Why are the civil rights of Jews more important than my civil rights?

I answered that question last week, but now I'll answer it again. The same people who have convinced FBI Director Robert Mueller that the new focus of the FBI should be the investigation of "hate crimes" and "extremism" rather than kidnapping, bank robbery, espionage, and other old-fashioned crimes, have persuaded the FBI to be Politically Correct in its selective investigation of civil rights violations. Those people, if you remember, are the agents of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: the ADL. But the FBI isn't the only law-enforcement agency that has been subverted by the ADL. For many years the ADL has worked to politicize and corrupt law enforcement at every level. The ADL arranges expenses-paid trips to Israel for county sheriffs and big-city police chiefs, supposedly to study Israeli methods of law enforcement.

More than that, it was the ADL and other Jewish pressure groups that engineered the enactment of the various civil rights laws in the first place, back in the 1960s. Those laws were designed to provide special legal protections for Blacks and other non-Whites, but they were worded so as to appear to protect everyone equally, White and non-White. Most law-enforcement agencies, however, from the FBI all the way down to the St. Pete Beach Police Department, now have learned that the wording isn't important. What's important now is to ignore the actual wording and to enforce the laws in a Politically Correct manner.

This subversion of law enforcement in the United States -- actually the subversion of our whole legal system, including the courts -- has been carried out at two levels. At one level, the ADL and other powerful Jewish groups apply political pressure and bribes to establish "partnerships" of the sort they have established with the FBI. At another level they use subliminal persuasion through the mass media to convince the general public, including many lower-level law-enforcement people, to interpret the laws their way.

So at the top we have the FBI turning 200 Israeli espionage agents loose and still refusing to arrest the known anthrax terrorist who killed five people and terrorized much of the country with his anthrax-infected letters, and at the bottom we have the St. Pete Beach police chief threatening to arrest any White people who distribute Politically Incorrect leaflets in his town: which is to say, leaflets expressing a concern for the future of White children.

This subversion is becoming worse rapidly. The ADL and other Jewish organizations are continuing to infiltrate and corrupt police agencies, and the mass media are convincing more and more Americans, perhaps including Chief Kaminskas, that expressing Politically Incorrect ideas is illegal. After enough lemmings have been convinced, the next step will be new laws actually making the expression of Politically Incorrect ideas illegal.

And why is this happening to America? In various broadcasts I've answered that question in various ways. One answer is that it's happening because there are people in our country who want to rule us and exploit us, people who believe that they are God's Chosen People and have a god-given right to rule us and exploit us, and these people understand that in order to rule us they first must take away our freedom, and in order to take away our freedom they must further soften us and confuse us and corrupt us.

Another way of answering the question is to point out that life in America has been too easy for too long, and our people have ceased to be vigilant. We have lost our pioneering spirit and have become a nation of consumers and couch potatoes, of mall shoppers and sports fans. And having ceased to be vigilant, we have left ourselves wide open to exploitation by the worst elements among us: by politicians and Jews, and they simply are doing what comes naturally to them.

A more complete answer is a combination of these two answers. We let ourselves become soft, and we relaxed our vigilance, and our relaxation provided an opening for pathogenic elements, and then the pathogenic elements proceeded to do everything they could to reduce our vigilance even further and enlarge the opening. The most dangerous of these elements are the Jews: most dangerous because they are self-conscious and organized and intelligent, and they have seized the most powerful weapon in our society to use against us. They have seized our mass media of

news and entertainment. And they have enlisted the collaboration of all the other pathogenic elements in our society.

In many of my broadcasts, I've focused on this all-important fact of Jewish media control, and we can see its central role in what we've talked about today: in the corruption of our political leadership to the point that America is used like an errand boy to do the dirty work of the Jews in the Middle East, and in the corruption of our system of laws and law enforcement to the point that the FBI forms a partnership with a criminal organization such as the ADL, and local police officials try to prevent patriotic Americans from exercising their constitutional rights.

Listeners often ask me what an individual American can do about this corruption of our society and this theft of our freedom. "What you tell us is infuriating," they say to me, "but what can we do about it besides talk?"

Well, let me suggest something. Virtually everyone in government today is corrupt and doesn't really care about what is being done to America, but he does care about being blamed personally for it. The first concern of every bureaucrat is avoiding personal responsibility.

If enough people tell FBI Director Robert Mueller that they know why he refuses to arrest the Jewish anthrax terrorist and that they consider his conscious and deliberate decision to foster a partnership between the FBI and a criminal, anti-American Jewish pressure group to be treasonable, perhaps he'll lose a little sleep. If enough Americans tell him that they are outraged by his release of 200 Israeli espionage agents and that they intend to hold him accountable for his betrayal of America and his violation of his oath of office, perhaps he'll reflect a bit on his crimes.

And if enough people tell St. Pete Beach Police Chief R.F. Kaminskas that they are appalled and angered by his attempt to use his office to deny White Americans their First Amendment right of free speech, perhaps he'll rethink his position. Anyway, it doesn't hurt to try. You can write to FBI Director Robert Mueller at:

Federal Bureau of Investigation
935 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20535

E-mail: criminal.division@usdoj.gov

You can write to Police Chief R.F. Kaminskas at:

Police Chief R.F. Kaminskas
7701 Boca Ciega Drive
St. Pete Beach, Florida 33706

Fax: 727-363-9217
E-mail: policechief@stpetebeach.org.

Express yourself clearly and forcefully, but don't threaten and don't use intemperate language. Let me know how they respond.

Post note: A few weeks after this speech was broadcast, Chief Kaminskas resigned.

Mossad and the Jewish Problem

For several years, I have been warning in these broadcasts about the growing infiltration and subversion of American law-enforcement agencies by Jewish pressure groups. This process, which has been going on at a significant rate for more than two decades, accelerated during the Clinton administration, especially after the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, when Jewish groups put themselves forward as "experts on terrorism," based on their experience in repressing Palestinians and on their undercover snooping into dissident groups in the United States. They offered training seminars to the FBI and other Federal police agencies, to various military units, and to state and local police agencies.

"We will show you how to recognize terrorists and potential terrorists and how to deal with them. We will tell you about these dangerous dissident organizations, these 'hate' groups, and we will help you to prevent another terrorist bombing, such as the one carried out by Timothy McVeigh in Oklahoma City," the Jewish groups told the police and military agencies. The most visible of these groups was the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, but as we will see, there also were other, less visible Jewish groups at work.

Never mind that Timothy McVeigh had not belonged to any dissident group but had acted solely as an angry individual determined to send the government a message that its behavior in massacring the members of the Branch Davidian church in Waco, Texas, would not be tolerated. Never mind that the Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish groups offering their services really were pushing the military and law-enforcement agencies to shift their emphasis toward the investigation and repression of dissidents and the enforcement of a brand-new category of laws -- so-called "hate crime" and "speech crime" laws -- rather than toward the prevention of terrorism.

Never mind those things; it was the Clinton era, and Bill Clinton had brought more Jews into the government than any previous President. Jews were riding high in the Clinton administration, from Monica Lewinsky to Madaleine Albright. When the Jews wanted something, the Jews got it, and smart bureaucrats, including those in the military and law-enforcement agencies, knew better than to ask questions.

Bill Clinton's extraordinary partiality to Jews lasted right up to the moment he left office, with a vastly disproportionate number of the last-minute pardons and commutations of sentences that he issued on January 20 last year going to Jewish criminals. The most notorious of these was the international Jewish super-swindler Marc Rich, who was able to persuade the head Jew in the Anti-Defamation League, Abe Foxman, to intercede with Clinton on his behalf.

All of this partiality has served Mr. Clinton well. In his first year after leaving office, he received $9.2 million in speaking fees, most of it from Jewish organizations. He received $400,000 last year from one Jewish organization alone, the Jewish National Fund, for three speeches. More than nine million dollars for some 70 speeches during the course of a year. Fascinating, isn't it? You can find more information on Mr. Clinton's career as a speaker to Jewish groups for huge fees in the June 18 issue of the *New York Times*, if you look carefully enough.

Well, that was Bill Clinton, a Democrat and a flamboyantly crooked lawyer from Arkansas who appealed to the lowest elements in the electorate and had a love affair with the Jewish mass media. Most voters hoped for more from George Bush and the Republicans. Unfortunately, what we've gotten is more of the same. In fact, Jewish infiltration and subversion of our military and law-enforcement agencies has proceeded even faster since Mr. Bush took office. Bush certainly doesn't need the money from speaking fees, but he nevertheless has given virtual run of the government to Jews. Under Mr. Bush as under Mr. Clinton, what the Jews want the Jews get, and no one in the government has the courage or the integrity to challenge this situation.

We talked last week about the FBI turning loose 200 Israeli espionage agents that it arrested in the United States last year and about its refusal to arrest the anthrax terrorist, who killed five people and terrorized the whole country with his mailings of anthrax-infected letters. In the anthrax case, the FBI still is putting on a big show of trying to find the perpetrator. FBI spokesmen claim that more personnel and resources are allocated to catching the anthrax terrorist than to any other case except the 9/11 attack itself. I claim that this is all a fraud: that the FBI knows who the perpetrator is but has orders not to arrest him, because he is a Jew who carried out the anthrax mailings in an attempt to cast suspicion on Muslims and to generate public hostility against Israel's enemies. If this became public knowledge, there would be a substantial drop in support among ordinary Americans for Israel and for Mr. Bush's current war in the Middle East.

The big question is, why would the FBI go along with such a coverup? Even with orders directly from Attorney General John Ashcroft or from George Bush himself, any FBI official who went along with the coverup would be taking a huge risk. Why do that for the sake of Israel? Who would protect the FBI people involved if the coverup got blown? The "partnership" between the Anti-Defamation League and the FBI that both ADL National Director Abe Foxman and FBI Director Robert Mueller have been bragging about doesn't seem enough to account for such a flagrant dereliction of duty on the part of the FBI. Surely, someone in the FBI would blow the whistle.

Actually, someone has blown the whistle, but you'd hardly know it from reading the news. Of course, there's been much coverage of one recent FBI whistle-blower, Coleen Rowley, a special agent in the FBI's Minneapolis field office, in connection with FBI officials ignoring reports she sent to Washington headquarters last August -- that was before the September 11 attack -- about a suspected terrorist, Zacarias Moussaoui, who was attempting to learn to fly 747 jets. But there's been very little coverage of another FBI whistle-blower, Sibel Edmonds, and the coverage of her far more alarming revelations has been quite cryptic, to say the least.

There was a story in the *Washington Post* ten days ago, on June 19, about several FBI whistle-blowers, one of whom was Sibel Edmonds, who worked as a translator of wiretapped messages in the FBI's Washington, DC, office. Despite her name, Edmonds is, in fact, a Jewess. But she is a rare Jewess, without a very strong sense of loyalty to her tribe. Indeed, an alarmingly high percentage of the FBI's wiretap translators are Jews, and nearly all of them who translate Middle Eastern languages are Jews. Most of these have a much stronger sense of their Jewishness than does Edmonds, as Edmonds found out when they tried to recruit her into the Mossad, Israel's super-secret agency for espionage, terror, and assassination.

The *Washington Post* story relates her account of the recruitment attempts in cryptic language that clearly is intended to avoid mentioning the words "Jew," "Israel," or "Mossad," lest our gallant, little democratic ally in the Middle East or its partisans in this country be cast in a bad light. I'll now read to you the relevant portions of that June 19 story in the *Washington Post:*

That whistle-blower, Sibel Edmonds, 32, a former wiretap translator in the Washington field office, raised suspicions about a co-worker's connections to a group under surveillance. Under pressure, FBI officials have investigated and verified the veracity of parts of Edmonds' story, according to documents and people familiar with an FBI briefing of congressional staff.... The FBI confirmed that Edmonds' co-worker had been part of an organization that was a target of top-secret surveillance and that the same co-worker had "unreported contacts" with a foreign government official subject to the surveillance....

The FBI said it was unable to corroborate an allegation by Edmonds that she was approached to join the targeted group. Edmonds said she told Dennis Saccher, a special agent in the Washington field office who was conducting the surveillance, about the co-worker's actions and Saccher replied, "It looks like espionage to me." Saccher declined to comment when contacted by a reporter.

Edmonds was fired in March after she reported her concerns. Government officials said the FBI fired her because her "disruptiveness" hurt her on-the-job "performance." Edmonds says she believes she was fired in retaliation for reporting on her co-worker.

Edmonds began working at the FBI in late September [of last year]. In an interview she said she became particularly alarmed when she discovered that a recently hired FBI translator was saying that she belonged to the Middle Eastern organization whose taped conversations she had been translating for FBI counterintelligence agents. Officials asked that the name of the target group not be revealed for national security reasons....

Edmonds said that on several occasions the translator tried to recruit her to join the targeted foreign group. "This person told us she worked for our target organization," Edmonds said in an interview. "These are the people we are targeting, monitoring."

Edmonds would not identify the other translator, but the *Post* has learned from other sources that she is a 33-year-old U.S. citizen whose native country is home to the target group. Both Edmonds and the other translator are U.S. citizens who trace their ethnicity to the same Middle Eastern country. Reached by telephone last week, the woman, who works under contract for the FBI's Washington field office, declined to comment.

In December, Edmonds said the woman and her husband, a U.S. military officer, suggested during a hastily arranged visit to Edmonds' Northern Virginia home on a Sunday morning that Edmonds join the group. 'Are you a member of the particular organization?,' Edmonds recalled the woman's husband saying. 'It's a very good place to be a member. There are a lot of advantages of being with this organization and doing things together' -- this is our targeted organization -- 'and one of the greatest things about it is you can have an early, an unexpected, early retirement. And you will be totally set if you go to that specific country.'

Edmonds also said the woman's husband told her she would be admitted to the group, especially if she said she worked for the FBI. Later, Edmonds said, the woman approached her with a list dividing up individuals whose phone lines were being secretly tapped: Under the plan the woman would translate conversations of her former co-workers in the target organization, and Edmonds would handle other phone calls. Edmonds said she refused and that the woman told her that her lack of cooperation could put her family in danger.

Edmonds said she also brought her concerns to her supervisor and other FBI officials in the Washington field office. When no action was taken, she said, she reported her concerns to the FBI's Office of Professional Responsibility, then to Justice's inspector general.

"Investigations are being compromised," Edmonds wrote to the inspector general's office in March. "Incorrect or misleading translations are being sent to agents in the field. Translations are being blocked and circumvented."

Government officials familiar with the matter who asked not to be identified said that both Edmonds and the woman were given polygraph examinations by the FBI and that both passed.

I'm sorry that the cryptic language made that report more difficult to understand than it otherwise would have been: a certain unnamed "Middle Eastern country," an unnamed co-worker of Sibel Edmonds who is a native of that unnamed Middle Eastern country, an unnamed "target organization" in that unnamed Middle Eastern country, and so on. The *Washington Post* tells us that the cryptic language is necessary "for national security reasons." That's certainly a phony excuse. Do you really believe that the folks in the Israeli Embassy reading this article can't figure out who is being talked about? The real reason for not mentioning names is not to keep the Mossad from finding out that they're being investigated; it's to keep any Sally Soccermoms or Joe Sixpacks who might stumble across the story on their way to the comic strips or the sports pages from getting a clue as to who's really calling the shots at the FBI these days.

Let me just run over the scenario again. After the Oklahoma City bombing, during a time when the FBI was being criticized for letting the bombing happen, Jewish groups promoted themselves as "experts" on terrorism and offered to train FBI agents and other law-enforcement and military personnel. One of these Jewish groups was the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, a group heavily involved in illegal activity and with longstanding ties to Jewish organized crime figures, such as international super-swindler Marc Rich and Las Vegas gangster Moe Dalitz. Another of these Jewish groups was Israel's espionage and terror organization, Mossad, which specializes in the assassination of Israel's enemies in other countries, using letter bombs, car bombs, exotic poisons, and trained hit-men armed with silencer-equipped submachine guns.

The impropriety of FBI involvement with either of these Jewish organizations should have been obvious, but in the Clinton era, no bureaucrat in Washington dared say anything critical of Jews or Israel. George Bush has a different style, but no more scruples than Bill Clinton. By the time he became President, the corruption had proceeded so far that it was easy for him to decide to join it instead of trying to lick it. And early in his administration another major terrorist event -- that of September 11 -- gave Jewish groups another rationale for strengthening their "partnership" with U.S. law-enforcement agencies. With Anti-Defamation League agents

working on the outside and redefining the types of criminal activity with which the FBI should concern itself, and Mossad agents working inside and preempting for themselves all investigations of interest to Israel, including all investigations of Israeli espionage, it is no wonder that the FBI's efficiency, morale, and prestige have plummeted, and things that would have been unthinkable a decade ago -- such as refusing to prosecute the members of the largest espionage ring ever broken up in the United States and engaging in an internal coverup of the anthrax terrorism case -- could occur.

This is a depressing situation -- and as I have warned repeatedly, an extremely dangerous situation. We are in grave danger of losing all of our remaining liberty and soon thereafter becoming extinct as a people, as a race. There certainly is no hope at all of rectifying this situation from the top, through the elected politicians and the top bureaucrats. Did you hear George Bush make his pronouncement on Monday about the conflict between the Jews and the Palestinians? Yasser Arafat, the elected leader of the Palestinians, must go because he has been "tainted by terrorism." Anyone who, like Arafat, has condoned terrorism is unacceptable as a negotiating partner for the Israelis and must be replaced by someone who has clean hands. Really! I can imagine all of the Jewish leaders, including that "man of peace," as Bush calls him, Ariel Sharon, rolling on the floor with laughter during Bush's statement. I would not be surprised if it were Sharon himself, the Butcher of Beirut, the mass murderer of Palestinian women and children, the preeminent terrorist and war criminal in the Middle East, who wrote that statement for Bush.

George Bush is a man utterly without honor, without principles, without a shred of genuine patriotism or racial loyalty. As long as the Jewish media continue to give him good press, he is perfectly content to be Ariel Sharon's step'n'fetchit and to say and do whatever he is told to say and do. Underneath Bush is Attorney General John Ashcroft, a nutcase religious fanatic whose historical role model is Tomas de Torquemada and who believes that the Jews can do no wrong because that's what it says in the Bible. And then there is FBI Director Robert Mueller, a pitiful specimen of an unprincipled career bureaucrat indeed, a man who is completely unperturbed by the ongoing Jewish subversion and takeover of the FBI.

Our one basis for hope is the fact that the takeover is not yet complete. If it were complete, there would be no debate, no investigation by some FBI agents of the Mossad, no newspaper articles with cryptic language like the one I read to you from the *Washington Post.* The fact is there are many FBI special agents who are not happy about what is being done to the FBI. And there are hundreds of thousands of perceptive and intelligent White Americans who also are not happy. Unfortunately, very few of these people have the courage to do or even say anything about what is happening.

And there is one other factor besides a lack of courage, although it is a related factor, and that is the inability to address our problem in a truly fundamental way, a truly radical way. There are many patriotic Americans who would be alarmed to learn that a foreign espionage organization, the Mossad, has infiltrated the FBI and is able to subvert the FBI's operations, but there are fewer patriotic Americans willing and able to draw the necessary conclusions about the overall role of Jews in America. They see the problem as simply a problem with the Mossad. They resist tying the Mossad problem to the Anti-Defamation League problem and to the problem of Jewish

influence in the government generally. They resist seeing the connection between the problem of Jewish influence in the government and Jewish influence in the mass media of news and entertainment.

They resist seeing these things because to see them, to examine them, to think about them and draw conclusions from them, is to become anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic. And they have been so strongly conditioned against that for so long that they simply can't deal with it. Many who are brave enough and honest enough to speak out about a Mossad problem cannot even think about the much larger Jewish problem of which the Mossad problem is only a relatively small part. And as long as we refuse to think about the problem, as long as we are afraid to think about it, we cannot hope to solve it.

And really, we'd better begin thinking about this problem very soon. Time is running out for America and for our people.



William Luther Pierce III

(September 11, 1933 - July 23, 2002)