

VENTILATIONS



Wilmot Robertson

VENTILATIONS

Wilmot Robertson

HOWARD ALLEN
Box 76
Cape Canaveral, Florida

*To my IBM Selectric
and to the maestra
who plays it so beautifully.*

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter One</i>	
The Kremlin and the Jews	9
<i>Chapter Two</i>	
What About Christianity?	18
<i>Chapter Three</i>	
The Censorship of Silence	23
<i>Chapter Four</i>	
The Loony Bin or the Great Watergate Purge	33
<i>Chapter Five</i>	
The High-Grading of Henry Kissinger	43
<i>Chapter Six</i>	
Harsh Advice for Young Majority Activists	52
<i>Chapter Seven</i>	
Productive Activity for Majority Undergraduates	58
<i>Chapter Eight</i>	
A Search for Mental Coordinates	63
<i>Chapter Nine</i>	
Why, for the Time Being, Nothing Much Can Be Done	66
<i>Chapter Ten</i>	
Words Across the Sea	72

<i>Chapter Eleven</i>	
Homage to Kemal Ataturk	79
<i>Chapter Twelve</i>	
A Second Life for Women	84
<i>Chapter Thirteen</i>	
The Utopian States of America	93
<i>Chapter Fourteen</i>	
Morality as a Weapon	107

OF ALL THE CRITICISM HEAPED UPON *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY* – AND THERE HAS BEEN CONSIDERABLE – THE GREATER PART HAS BEEN CONCERNED WITH THE BOOK'S TREATMENT OF CHRISTIANITY AND WHAT IT SAYS ABOUT THE DECLINE OF JEWISH POWER IN RUSSIA.

THE FOLLOWING TWO ESSAYS WERE WRITTEN IN REBUTTAL AND, IN THE CASE OF RUSSIAN JEWRY, TO BRING THE STORY UP TO DATE.

IN REGARD TO MY COMMENTS ON RUSSIA I SHOULD STATE THAT, IN ADDITION TO NOT BEING BLESSED WITH INFALLIBILITY, I NEITHER SPEAK NOR READ RUSSIAN AND HAVE NEVER BEEN IN RUSSIA. MY VIEW OF RUSSIA, LIKE ALMOST EVERY VIEW EXPRESSED IN *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY*, IS NOT TO SELL A THEORY BUT TO BROADEN THE READER'S IDEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.

TO THOSE WHO HAVE SEVERE RESERVATIONS ABOUT MY PICTURE OF PRESENT-DAY RUSSIA, I WOULD FIRST ASK THEM TO REREAD CHAPTER 33 OF *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY* WITH THOUGHTFUL ATTENTION. SOME OF MY CRITICS HAVE VERY FIXED IDEAS ABOUT THE SUBJECT AND HAVE INTERPRETED SOME OF MY OWN INTERPRETATIONS IN AN ASTONISHINGLY LOOSE MANNER. ALL OF US READ WITH PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS. OUR MINDS CANNOT OPERATE OTHERWISE. BUT SOME OF US SEEM TO LET OUR PRECONCEPTIONS NOT ONLY DIM OUR REASON BUT STRAIN OUR SANITY.

Chapter One

THE KREMLIN AND THE JEWS

Throughout much of their history Jews have been able to live prosperously off their host populations, but only rarely have they had the opportunity to gain direct control of these populations. When they do, they come a cropper. As a group they have a magnificent talent for overthrowing states, but only a small talent for governing them. The Bolshevik revolution was one of the few times that Jews, instead of exerting great influence on domestic and foreign affairs from the sidelines, actually took over the helm of their country of residence. But as events showed, within a few years of assuming power in Russia, the Jewish Commissars were tearing at each other's throats and pushing Russia to the very brink of national suicide.

As one of the few non-Jewish Bolsheviks, but nevertheless a member of a Russian minority, Stalin, to save his own skin in the political scramble that followed the death of Lenin and to make his own desperate bid for power, managed to topple the leading Jew, Trotsky, and with him the all-too-Jewish dogma of permanent revolution. After this first victory, Stalin slowly and methodically liquidated nearly all the Old Bolsheviks until he was in a position to "swing" the Russo-German Nonaggression Pact of 1939 — a piece of cynical diplomacy that would have been unthinkable in Russia of the 1920s and is still unthinkable to the liberal-minority coalitions that control the destinies of the West. While the America First isolationists were losing out to the interventionists in the U.S. in the late 1930s, Stalin was instituting his Russia First policy in the Soviet Union.

Forced to rehabilitate the Russian Majority during Hitler's 1941 invasion; Stalin turned against Jewish cosmopolitanism

after the war, permitting Party newspapers to criticize Jews by their real, not their revolutionary names. Simultaneously he made Zionism a state crime and forbade the propagation of Yiddish-language newspapers and books. His anti-Semitism reached the paranoid state just before his death when he was preparing to execute the Jewish physicians involved in the so-called "Doctors' Plot."

Since Kaganovich was expelled in 1957, no Jew has been a member of the Politburo, the ruling body of the Soviet Union. When the present-day Soviet leadership goes through the ritual of denying Russian anti-Semitism the best it can do is to trot out an obscure deputy premier named Dimschitz, an aging ballerina, some musical virtuosi and a few top scientists and film directors. There is no question that Jews, as is the case almost everywhere, are better off economically than the average Soviet citizen, due to their concentration in the higher-paying occupations of the arts and sciences. But they quickly become worse off when they reveal themselves as Zionists or attack the party line in books and literary periodicals. That jails and insane asylums house a large contingent of Jewish intellectuals is shown by almost daily complaints in the news and letter columns of *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*.

It is hard for a veteran anti-Communist, who is often a veteran anti-Semite, to admit suddenly that a drastic change has taken place in his ancient bugaboo. The change, of course, may be just a passing fad or fancy or it may be the beginning of a permanent shift in policy. The question certainly deserves a second look when the foremost Jewish world organizations, which used to sing the praises of Russia openly or in secret, now issue frequent press releases accusing the Soviet government of anti-Semitism; when the bulk of the U.S. Senate has managed to sabotage most-favored nation treatment for Russian trade; when Jewish publishers or reviewers in America heavily promote books by Khrushchev, Stalin's daughter, Svetlana Alliluyeva, and the dissident Yugoslav Communist, Djilas, containing instance after instance

of Stalin's anti-Semitism; when Jews blow up Soviet installations in the U.S. and take potshots at the children of Russian diplomats; when Russian delegates to the UN make anti-Semitic speeches and cheer Yasser Arafat; when Russia gives billions in arms to Egypt, Syria and Iraq, Israel's bitterest enemies. Considering all this, it is difficult for anyone to say that Russia is presently a pro-Jewish country.

As proof that the Russian bear still displays the Jewish features attributed to it for so many years by so many amateur and professional anti-Communists, we are told that Brezhnev has a Jewish wife, which he probably has not, and that Andropov, the head of the Secret Police and a new appointee to the Politburo is Jewish, which he probably is not. The flimsy claims of the anti-Red hardliners are based on a passing reference in an obscure Canadian periodical known for its absurd distortions of the news and on the Semitic configuration of Andropov's physiognomy in the only official photograph of him released to the Western media. King Faisal of Saudi Arabia was far more Jewish looking than Andropov, but no one, not even the ghost of Julius Streicher, ever claimed that he was a Jew. In this connection it might be well to refer to an official booklet entitled "Soviet Anti-Semitism" published by the American Communist party in 1964. In order to placate U.S. Jewry's hostile opinion of Russia by proving that Jews still held important positions in the Soviet Union, the article, in addition to Dimschitz and the usual cast of scientists and artists, listed a few high military officers, the Chief of the Soviet Mission to the Geneva Disarmament Conference and the Secretary of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. If Andropov, who at that time was much higher in the Soviet hierarchy than most of the Jews mentioned, was really a Jew, his name would have been printed in capital letters, as would have been the case with Brezhnev's wife. As a footnote, it might be added that this official Communist party whitewash had to admit that the number of Jews among the deputies to Supreme and local Soviets was *less than one percent of the total*. In the

early 1920s it would have been over fifty percent. As a further footnote, it should be remembered that when Stalin was slaughtering almost the entire Jewish leadership of Russia the Western press kept repeating that he was married to the sister of Kaganovich, the one Jew kept in the dictator's retinue because, as Khrushchev relates, he was so adept at liquidating his fellow Jews. Later it turned out that the sister of Kaganovich was not only not married to Stalin, but had never existed.

All of us should be very careful about coming to any permanent conclusions about Russia. My conclusions are admittedly based on thin evidence. I doubt, however, if the theory that Russia is still part of a Jewish-directed international communist conspiracy is based on firmer ground.

All I propose is that we do everything we can to get at the truth. If Russia is becoming a nationalist and perhaps even a racial state, then this will have a profound effect on our foreign and domestic policy. Marxism, of course, is still Jewish, but if Russia is no longer the unchallenged leader of a monolithic, worldwide revolutionary network, then there is less reason to look, as the Birch Society still looks, for a Russian agent under every bed. If Russia is going through a re-nationalization process, it will lose its stewardship of international communism (in many areas it already has) and the present split between Russia and China, another up-and-coming national communist state, will become more and more exacerbated. The immediate results are the lessening of a Russian threat to Europe and America. The recent concessions of Russia to some Western nations and the new era of East-West trade inaugurated jointly by Nixon and Brezhnev are certainly due in part to the continuing failure of Russian agriculture. But they might also be due to the worsening relations between Russia and China which, in the myopic view of old-style anti-Communist dogmatists, are still firmly bound in a secret Red Plot to destroy the "Free World."

As I stated at the end of my Russian chapter, a nationalist Russian state may *ultimately* offer a greater threat to the

U.S. than the old Comintern state of the early 20s. After all, the Russian army could hardly penetrate 20 miles into Finland in the winter of 1939-40 under the banner of Marxism-Leninism. It was only in 1942, when Stalin unearthed and refurbished the old Russian patriotism of the Czars and Holy Russia, that the Red Army came to life.

If we want to protect ourselves from the Russians – and we should never close our eyes to the possibility of a sudden Russian assault on Western Europe—we should clean up our domestic chaos, which is an open invitation to Soviet aggression everywhere. Today, our principal oppressors and our greatest enemies are located on the hither not the thither side of the Atlantic. When millions of Americans cannot go out after dark without running the risk of being mugged, raped or murdered by bands of roving young blacks who haven't the faintest notion of what a communist is or what communism stands for, it hardly seems logical for the Birch Society, William Buckley and other assorted "patriots" to harp on the Red Menace while carefully avoiding the far greater menace of domestic minority racism. When the Jewish propaganda mills are cranking out anti-Russian hate articles day and night in order to involve us in a Middle East confrontation with Russia, it is somewhat confusing for the rock-ribbed anti-Semites to keep informing us that Jews and Russians are joined in a secret alliance. They cannot seem to understand that history does not stand still, that Jewish support for world revolution has now been withdrawn from the Russians and funneled into the New Left, the Maoists, the Zionists, militant liberalism and Kosher conservatism. Buckley, who used to be one of the Jews' arch villains, is now treated deferentially by the press. Why not? He recently advocated making Israel the 51st state! The alliance of liberalism, equalitarianism and social Christianity has done more to destroy America in the last twenty years than all the machinations of all the various communist spy rings since 1917. Yet the oldline anti-Communists continue to insist that Russia is the great fatherland of Jewish power and thought. If

they want to see something really Jewish, they should turn on their TV sets. Video "entertainment" and "news" are fabricated in Hollywood, New York and Washington, not in Moscow, and the fabricators are becoming more anti-Russian every day.

At present, if there were no threat of nuclear retaliation from America, the Russian armed forces could easily sweep through Western Europe to the Atlantic. Russia is the strongest military state in the world. Its strength is compounded by the fact that it is the one large white nation where there is no generation gap, no drug problem, no pornography plague, no labor problems, no Mafia, no Negro crime, no round-the-clock pro-minority propaganda, no runaway inflation and, most important, no state-subsidized program to insure that the colored races outbreed the white. The low standard of living in Russia has also prevented any fanatic emphasis on the "good life" and the soul-dampening materialism that automatically goes with such a philosophy.

In short, the Russians are the modern Barbarians at the Gate, and we are somewhat in the position of the Romans. Rome, it should be remembered, was not destroyed by Germanic incursions until the internal rot had made resistance all but impossible.

It is hard to tell at the present time whether the disease that now grips America is one of old age or is the type of curable malady that often strikes a man in his prime. Until we know the answer, we must assume or rather hope that our affliction is of the latter variety. Consequently, we must attempt to root out the infection before it spreads throughout the American social organism.

The disease we are suffering from is certainly not Russian communism, which, incidentally, exhibits a different set of symptoms. It is liberalism, environmentalism, equalitarianism and minority racism, which are dressed up and "sold" to the public in the form of Zionism, Marxism, Freudianism, civil rights, school desegregation, deficit spending and welfare. Why should Russia spend time, money and energy on

subverting the U.S. when our liberals and unassimilable minorities are doing a much better job — and all at no expense to the Kremlin?

We still have good reason to fear the ideological fallout of Marxist dogma. But the content of Marxism or any dogma is not important per se. We have seen what Medieval Christianity did to the teachings of Christ and what Iranian Sufism did to the preachings of Mohammed. What is important is the purpose which the dogma serves and how it is applied. A few months ago the conservative German magazine *Nation Europa* reported that Brezhnev has ordered Soviet geneticists to start a crash research program into the inherited factors of criminal behavior. This unnoticed ukase is by itself a revolutionary repudiation of one of the most fundamental rules in the Marxist book — namely, that environmental influences are the overriding cause of human behavior. Not so long ago Brezhnev would have been expelled from the Party and shot for even whispering about such a project. As Darwin rises in Russia, Marx is bound to fall, though a purely formal and abstract Marxist theology will probably be allowed to coast along for some time.

To sum up, the heirs of Stalin are not about to restore the Jews to the power Stalin took away from them. At the same time, the Soviet leadership, plagued with the insanities inherent in collectivist farm policies and at odds with an increasingly hostile nation of 800,000,000 Chinese, does not wish a showdown with world Jewry. Whenever Jewish propaganda gets too ruthless and overwhelming, Russia makes a few concessions. Whenever Jewish racial fury provokes some new outrage against Lebanon or other Middle Eastern countries, Russia lines up with the Arabs. Meanwhile, to prepare the Soviet hierarchy ideologically for a stronger line against the Israelis, the state-owned Publishing House for Political Literature published in 1969 a book entitled *Caution, Zionism!* The English translation, which toned down some of the more blatantly anti-Semitic passages of the original, accused Jews and Zionists of a whole series of crimes

against civilization and sounded almost like a modern edition of the *Protocols of Zion*. According to the *Jewish New York Review of Books*, the author of *Caution, Zionism!*, Yuri Ivanov, is the chief Russian expert on Israel.

All in all, the mechanics of history points to an ever-widening rift between Russian communism and Jewry. The Jews certainly will never cease their attacks on Russia until the Soviet Union abandons the Arab cause and allows massive Jewish emigration to Israel. At the same time Russia cannot permit this massive emigration, not only because it would be one more repudiation of Marxist theory, but because there are many other Russian minorities who would also like to leave. There is also the problem of offending Arab allies and of allowing the exit of Jewish scientists, some of whom would take with them Russian military secrets.

No one, except the people involved, knows what transpires within the walls of the Kremlin. All we can hope to do is make an intelligent estimate of the situation. In a dictatorship, foreign policy can undergo a radical change overnight, as in the 1939 Russo-German Pact. Nevertheless, no important shift in Russia's anti-Zionist stance can be foreseen unless and until either the confrontation with China or the internal economic situation becomes desperate. In either event Russia may be forced to abandon its present Middle Eastern policy and make some sort of temporary peace with Israel in order to protect its southern flank and to get the help of what Senator Fulbright has called the "subservient-to-Israel" U.S. Senate for greater amounts of American technological and agricultural aid.

As this article was being written, Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* was published in Paris. The Soviet Nobel laureate wrote that just before his death Stalin was actually planning to transport the entire Jewish population of Russia to Siberia. The Soviet leadership was obviously displeased with such allegations. Some Politburo members responded indirectly to Solzhenitsyn with veiled hints that the Brezhnev policy of detente was encouraging Russian dissidents.

Are we in for another tightening of the screws inside Russia and a more belligerent, more Stalinoid attitude toward the West? The answer will depend in part on Russian harvests and on relations with China. Having talked so much about a second front during World War II, the Russian high command is not anxious to get involved in a two-front war of its own. But if Americans can be persuaded to pour billions of dollars a year into armaments for Israel, to cut themselves off from American-owned oil fields in Arab countries by promoting Jewish racism in the Near East and to weaken or destroy NATO by trying to force Western Europe into an anti-Arab coalition, if Americans continue to act as the moral lepers of modern history by furnishing the weapons for the destruction of Egyptian cities and Lebanese and Syrian villages, then half of Russia's military problem will be solved. Then also Dostoyevsky's farfetched dreams of a Russian colossus astride the four corners of the earth will become less farfetched with every passing day.

Chapter Two

WHAT ABOUT CHRISTIANITY?

Our race, which is perhaps 10,000 years old, has passed through several religious phases. We began with animism, graduated to Odin and the Northern gods, exchanged them for Jehovah and his Christian Son, made the duality into the trinity by the addition of the Holy Ghost and the trinity into the Holy Family by adding the Virgin Mary. Came the Reformation and many of us reduced the size of our pantheon. More recently Christ, for many Christians, lost his godhead and became the human author of a Social Gospel. Other Christians deserted Jesus entirely for a collection of divinities known as the ism gods.

Where do we go next?

There are those who say we should go into reverse. To bring out the animal in man, the Freudians recommend a modernized thaumaturgy called psychoanalysis. Hardline pagans tell us that, being of Northern European descent, we should renew our faith in the one faith that grew spontaneously out of Northern Europe's *blut und boden*. On the ground that Christianity has had a greater hold on us than any other religion, certain Catholics and Protestants preach a Christian revival, the form and content of which depend on the denomination of the revivalists. Meanwhile, Marxists endeavor to lure us into their religion of irreligion, which is now old enough to have produced several heresies ranging from Russian communism, Trotskyism and Maoism to the mantic Marcusianism of the New Left.

There is no doubt that there is presently a lively turnover in religion. As the old gods lose face, people shop around for new ones. For better or worse, *Homo sapiens* seems to have an inborn religious compulsion. If he didn't, witch doctors

and gurus wouldn't do such a thriving business in "atheistic" eras.

The few religionists who have an honest interest in our spiritual welfare offer us a god who is a mirror of our best instincts. The religionists who have more concern for ideas than people or more concern for *their* people than *our* people offer us gods who are likely to be mirrors of our worst instincts.

It might be better for everyone — everyone, that is, except the religious professionals — if our faith came from the heart. But that isn't the way religion works. Most of us prefer to receive our religious instruction from without, not from within. When it comes to the moral law—that immensely important aspect of religion that makes it possible for us to be better human beings *before* not *after* we reach heaven—we prefer to lend our ear to otherworldly rather than worldly teachers.

Today in America the social sciences are hardly more than a farrago of religious sects operated by minority and liberal shamans for the purpose of imposing their own particular political, economic and social creeds on the Majority. Drugs, pornography, the soaring crime rate and corruption at all levels are clear proof of the near total failure of social scientists to spread anything more than moral nihilism, not only among their brainwashed student congregations, but among the population at large. If the best Majority minds could recapture the social sciences and apply them to the improvement instead of the lowering of human behavior, there might possibly be — for the first time in history — a chance of building a viable morality on empirical as well as metaphysical foundations.

But at the moment such a prospect is dim. At present the chance of accomplishing any genuine moral reform through the social sciences or religion is very doubtful. Which is to say that any endeavor to restore morality in America will be strongly opposed, not only by academia, but by the clergy.

Since no dangerous enemy can be ignored, we must not be

afraid to attack the gods arrayed against us. We should not, however, criticize Christianity as such, but only those Christian leaders who, from their churches and pulpits, ceaselessly promote the permissiveness, equalitarianism and environmentalism that is turning America into a moral barnyard.

Generally speaking the fundamentalist Protestants and the oldline Catholics should be let alone. Most of them have good instincts and haven't followed their ministers and priests too far into the mental miasma of obscurantism, millennialism and Armageddonism. The ecumenical Catholics and the liberal Protestants are another matter. We must react vigorously against their left-wing bigotry, while taking comfort from the knowledge that they will eventually be silenced by the spiritual desiccation which inevitably infects the prophets of materialism. But right now they represent a political and social force that splits the Majority down the middle and gives the warmest aid and comfort to minority racism. No effort should be spared to expose them for what they are — the fifth column of the liberal-minority coalition.

At the same time we should keep in mind that the less religious discord stirred up the better. The American Civil War, which was pushed so hard by warmongering preachers on both sides, should recall the danger of injecting Christianity into political and social issues. There is such a multitude of Christian denominations in America, there is such a strong tradition of Church-State separation, that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain Christian unity for any cause. For this reason any realistic political movement should leave religious matters strictly to the private conscience.

Animals are not capable of practicing or understanding religion. Man, because of his unique biological gifts, is. But there are higher and lower religions, just as there are higher and lower civilizations and higher and lower men. Historians tell us that Jews were the greatest religionists. But the historians are wrong. Jews were not great religionists. They

were great religious fanatics. Who else could have dreamed up such tribal deities as the genocidal Yahweh, the apocalyptic Marx and the totemistic Freud. Jews may or may not have founded the Christian sect – according to the Pharisees, Jesus was a Gentile from Galilee – but Indo-Europeans developed the higher religion known as Christianity. The composers of the greatest Christian music, the builders of the greatest Christian churches, the painters of the greatest Christian art, the expounders of the greatest Christian philosophy were not Jews. They were Indo-Europeans.

Christ may have preached to all men, but only men of the West gave him their minds as well as their hearts and remained true to him for more than fifteen hundred years. Jews anathematized him, Moslems unchurched him, Hindus ignored him, Chinese outlawed him, Mestizos indigenized him, blacks syncopated him and the Soviet Union in 1917 abandoned and ridiculed him.

The perceptive Majority Christian who wants to preserve his religion should have only one response to the question, What do we do about Christianity? He must join with other Majority members, believers and nonbelievers alike, who are trying to restore Western civilization in America. He must recognize that the West has provided the only biological framework in which Christianity has both prospered and endured. He must understand that, when a people's culture is teetering on the edge of a precipice, race must be put before religion in order to save race *and* religion.

Majority Christians would do well to ruminate about the racial prerequisites of Christianity. If they don't, they may soon find their places of worship transformed into psychiatric clinics, Marxist seminaries, miscegenation laboratories or headquarters for the local kibbutz.

NORMALLY A BOOK IS INTERESTING BECAUSE OF ITS CONTENT, BECAUSE OF WHAT IT HAS TO SAY. BUT THESE ARE NOT NORMAL TIMES. TODAY CERTAIN BOOKS, PARTICULARLY THOSE OF A CONTROVERSIAL NATURE, SEEM TO TRANSCEND THEIR SUBJECT MATTER AND ADOPT A PERSONALITY OF THEIR OWN. BY THEIR STRUGGLE TO GET READ THEY CREATE, SO TO SPEAK, THEIR OWN BIOGRAPHY.

THE AUTHOR GOES THROUGH HELL TO WRITE THE BOOK, AND THEN HIS BOOK GOES THROUGH HELL AS IT SLUGS IT OUT WITH THE INQUISITORS WHO WISH TO PUT THE QUIETUS ON IT.

THE PROGRESS OF *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY* FROM MANUSCRIPT TO PUBLISHER TO PRINTER TO READER HAS BEEN BEDEVILED BY SO MANY ROADBLOCKS AND PITFALLS IT IS A WONDER THAT 16,000 COPIES (AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1974) HAVE BEEN SOLD OR DISTRIBUTED. REVIEWERS HAVE NOT MENTIONED THE BOOK. BOOK STORES WOULD NOT STOCK IT. WHOLESALERS WOULD NOT TOUCH IT. NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES REJECTED ADS FOR IT. DIRECT-MAIL FIRMS WOULD NOT RENT THEIR MAILING LISTS FOR ITS PROMOTION.

IF ANYONE IS STILL SO NAIVE AS TO BELIEVE THAT A BOOK DEFENDING AMERICA'S LARGEST POPULATION GROUP CAN GET A FAIR HEARING IN THIS ONCE SWEET LAND OF LIBERTY, LET HIM READ THE FOLLOWING AND FOREVER HOLD HIS PEACE.

Chapter Three

THE CENSORSHIP OF SILENCE

In the past several decades the pro and con ratio of books written about minorities has been approximately 1,000 to 1. Two of the more recent and more prominent additions to the bulging pro-minority library, the heavily promoted *The Decline of the Wasp* by Peter Schrag and *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* by Michael Novak, have amounted to little more than book-length racial slurs against the Majority. Several bestsellers by Negro authors have advocated physical violence against Majority members and the destruction of Majority property, including churches. Books by Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin have publicly called for the overturning of all American institutions and have not hesitated to recommend theft and dynamite to speed up the process. In addition to the mile-high stacks of pro-minority books, there has been an incessant outpouring of anti-Majority plays, movies, and magazine and newspaper articles. The intellectual vendetta against the South must be considered a part of this campaign, since the South has the country's highest concentration of Anglo-Saxons.

In the spring of 1973, in an effort to raise one small voice against this deafening literary chorus, 483 copies of a new book entitled *The Dispossessed Majority* were mailed to every member of the American book reviewing establishment. By the end of summer exactly four reviews of the book had appeared. Three were relatively brief notices in three small newspapers. The only one that could be called a genuine review appeared in the *Charleston Evening Post*.

In the fall of 1973 a favorable review appeared in *Mankind Quarterly*, a Scottish anthropological journal of modest circulation. At the same time an ambivalent review

comparing the book unfavorably to *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* appeared in *Modern Age*, a highbrow conservative journal, which boasts a circulation of 5,000. Aside from a few glowing tributes from some esoteric ultraright publications in the U.S. and abroad, this was the sum total of the attention given the book. Not a single word about it could be found in any mass circulation magazine or newspaper. Not a single mention of it was heard in any national forum of public expression.

The silent treatment accorded the book cannot be blamed on a lack of professionalism in regard to style, format and appearance. The book is well designed and well printed, has a handsome four-color dust jacket and carries the written endorsements of many prominent Americans, including America's foremost living anthropologist, a former head of the American Bar Association, high-ranking army and navy officers, a few reputable statesmen and diplomats and several internationally known educators and scientists.

Fear is perhaps the principal reason the book was ignored by almost the entire book reviewing fraternity, including the critic of the *Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin* who, after the publication of *The Decline of the Wasp*, wrote the Majority should ask for equal time. Physical assaults and threats of violence against such prominent academicians as William Shockley and Arthur Jensen have been nationally publicized. Book reviewers apparently are not about to assume the risks which automatically flow from objective criticism of any phase of minority behavior. Even giving a small amount of publicity to a book that contains such criticism might make the reviewer suspect in the eyes of the liberal-minority publishing establishment.

Since reviews are the life blood of the book trade, there is little or no possibility at all of an unreviewed book coming to the attention of the general reading public without a long, laborious, year-in, year-out promotional campaign that would consume more money and time than any small publisher could possibly afford.

Having been blackballed by practically all the nation's book reviewers, the publisher of *The Dispossessed Majority* was forced to promote the book by other, more circuitous means. One method was to give free copies of the book to libraries, whose librarians were more often than not suspicious and uncooperative. Some libraries refused the book, while others accepted it, but did not catalog it. Only a few libraries placed it on their shelves and sent the publisher a note of thanks. Only a very few libraries ever bought the book, even in those areas where it was eventually advertised.

It is interesting to note that the Virginia State Library in Richmond refused the gift of the book in writing, although this same library had *purchased* the anti-Majority books of Novak and Schrag. When questioned about this, a library official refused to explain why a state institution bought books attacking the group whose taxes provide the great bulk of its financial support, while rejecting a gift of one of the very few books now in print that defends this group against attacks from minority racists.

As another means of getting around the literary blockade, attempts were made to place *The Dispossessed Majority* in bookstores on consignment. This is a standard arrangement whereby the store does not have to pay for the book until it is sold. Nevertheless, many large bookstores refused the offer, even though the same stores proudly displayed for sale many, if not all, of the anti-Majority books mentioned previously. In Charleston the John Huguley book store returned a consignment of six books, although it had previously ordered one copy at the request of a customer. Consequently, when the review appeared in the *Charleston Evening Post*, there was no book store in the city carrying *The Dispossessed Majority* and those who wanted to purchase the book had no means of obtaining it locally. Needless to say, the John Huguley store, the largest book store in the city, is ordinarily more than happy to stock a book which receives a prominent review in Charleston's only evening newspaper.

Rebuffed by reviewers, libraries and book stores, the

publisher had to turn to paid advertising to keep the book from dying on the vine. *The New York Times*, *Atlantic*, *Human Events* and the *Chicago Tribune* accepted a small, bland ad. But the Birch Society's *American Opinion*, the *Retired Officers Magazine* and the *American Rifleman* refused it — proving the so-called conservative organizations are more afraid of race than liberal publications. In October 1973, a full-page ad was prepared for *Human Events* at a cost of over \$600. The publisher rejected the ad on the basis that it was too "racial." It seems that Thomas Winter, who owns ninety-five percent of *Human Events*' stock, is gun-shy about race, though he is not averse to accepting an article glorifying Jewish racial exploits in the conquest of Palestine. The *National Review*, often considered the country's leading conservative journal of opinion, also turned down advertising for *The Dispossessed Majority*. The magazine of William Buckley, who prides himself as a foe of censorship, explained that the ad could not be accepted because of its "political nature." When asked to reconsider, the advertising director dropped the original objection and substituted a new one. He said he could not accept the ad because the publisher was not listed in *The Literary Market Place*.

The *National Review*'s use of *The Literary Market Place* as an excuse for refusing advertising erected a troublesome new roadblock in the promotion of *The Dispossessed Majority*. *The Literary Market Place* is one of several "Bibles" of the book trade. It contains what is considered a definitive list of all American publishers. The hitch is that, in order to qualify for listing, each publisher has to publish a minimum of five books annually. Since many of the great literary classics were first printed privately or by small, one-book publishers, the *National Review*, according to its own self-imposed rule, would have had to refuse advertising for the first edition of Emily Dickinson's poems and Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*, not to mention the Old and New Testaments.

Another book trade "Bible," owned by R. J. Bowker, a Xerox subsidiary and the same company that puts out *The*

Literary Market Place, is *Books in Print*. This publication lists the author, title, subject matter and publisher of all books currently in print in the U.S. Book stores lean heavily on *Books in Print* to fill the special orders of customers. *The Dispossessed Majority*, after having complied with all the necessary red tape required for inclusion in *Books in Print* (1972), was somehow omitted from this all-important sales directory. Consequently, in the unlikely event that a book dealer heard about the book, he would not have enough information to order it. If the retail book store owner should ask the book wholesaler for such information, the latter would be equally at a loss, because he, too, depends on *Books in Print*. While on the subject of wholesalers, it might be added that they offer another serious handicap to the promotion of the book. The wholesaler is mainly interested in selling quantities of books, which is the same as saying that he is primarily interested in books that not only get reviews, but get favorable reviews. There is not much place in his heart or in his business for a new, unreviewed book, particularly one which criticizes the minority to which he may belong. (Note: After an enthusiastic reader practically laid siege to the Bowker office in New York, *The Dispossessed Majority* was finally listed in the 1973 issue of *Books in Print*.)

In order to bypass the increasing difficulties of getting his advertising accepted by newspapers and magazines, the publisher of *The Dispossessed Majority* turned his attention to college publications, in the belief that there should be fewer acceptance problems where both professors and students proclaim their interest in the clash of ideas and in the preservation of our constitutional guarantees. Accordingly, four insertions were contracted for in the *Kent Stater*, the daily newspaper of Kent State University. But after the ad had appeared only twice, it was abruptly cancelled by the student editors on the ground of "questionable taste." It is extremely doubtful if the same editors would have disapproved the advertisements of such

books as *The Decline of the Wasp*, which presents the obverse point of view, and such racist tracts as Eldridge Cleaver's *Soul on Ice*, one segment of which contains a rhapsodic essay on the joys of raping white women. In the fall of 1973 advertisements were sent to other college newspapers. Several rejected the ad.

Experience has now shown that the one unrestricted promotional avenue for a book which presents the case for the Majority is direct-mail advertising. But due to spiraling mailing costs and the general deterioration and entropy of the U.S. Postal Service, this method is proving less profitable for all advertisers as time goes on. Also, there is the problem of lists. Many of the best lists were not available for promoting *The Dispossessed Majority*, just as many magazines were not available. The Young Americans for Freedom mailing list, for example, was especially sought after by the publisher because it presumably contains the names of many promising young conservatives. After looking over the book, the YAF refused to let its broker rent the list to Howard Allen. The same position was taken by the *National Review* with respect to its list of former subscribers. *Human Events*, however, was willing to rent its previous subscriber list at a cost of \$35 per thousand.

Deprived of the normal promotional channels of book reviews, magazine and mail-order advertising and trade listings, *The Dispossessed Majority* faced and continues to face almost insuperable sales and distribution problems.

The censorship of silence imposed by book critics, the book industry and the media on *The Dispossessed Majority* does not prove the abrogation of freedom of thought in this country. After all, the book did get published.

But in the final analysis, what good is the freedom to write, if there is very limited freedom to publicize what one has written? If America's largest population group is to be defended against a torrent of racist propoganda, it would seem the rights defined in the First Amendment should apply to the dissemination of ideas as well as their expression.

* * * * *

Follow-up: In October 1973, the *Charleston News and Courier's* editorial page contained a special report signed by editor T. R. Waring, summarizing the censorship encountered by *The Dispossessed Majority* since its publication. Within a few weeks a total of 202 paid orders were received for the book as a result of the article. The circulation of the *Charleston News* is 66,752 — approximately 0.0011 of the combined circulation of all English language daily newspapers in the U.S. If all these newspapers had carried the same editorial feature and the response had been in the same proportion to that produced by the *Charleston News*, a total of 925×202 or 186,850 orders for the book would have been received. Since these orders would have come from that fraction of Americans who would have read an editorial feature in their newspaper on a particular day, one is at a loss to estimate the number of readers the book would have attracted if it had received the nationwide promotion given books that support the minority viewpoint. (Note: After the Waring editorial appeared, the John Huguley Book Store finally capitulated and began to order books.)

The estimates given above, although severely hypothetical, bring out a very important point. There is a vast audience of Majority members who, sight unseen, will buy a book that discusses their predicament in forthright biological and racial terms. Convincing proof of this statement was furnished by running a reprint of the Waring editorial as an ad in a few Southern newspapers. A substantial number of orders were received, although at a somewhat prohibitive cost per order.

In this context it should be noted that the Waring editorial was simply an objective statement about the book's content and distribution problems. It was by no means a favorable review. It did not recommend or endorse the book. If the Waring editorial had praised the book, the number of orders would probably have doubled or tripled, and even the

advertising reprints might have proved profitable.

How is the large potential audience of *The Dispossessed Majority* to be reached? The difficulty is not one of scholarship, though most academicians still forlornly and fearfully cling to the liberal, equalitarian and minority racist position. *The Dispossessed Majority* is not the only book that comprehensively and constructively defends America's Northern European racial and cultural components. The difficulty is that the reader of serious books is unable to hear about such works because book reviewing and book distribution, indeed almost the entire publishing industry, is in the hands of those who are totally opposed to any manifestation of a Majority racial viewpoint and who will go to any length to prevent even the whisper of such a viewpoint from coming to the attention of the reading public.

For example, the only critical letter received as a result of the *Charleston News* editorial — there were several favorable communications — came from the wife of a Jewish department store owner. She had ordered the book, but almost before she had had a chance to read it, she returned it with the following typewritten comments:

“My pride in being an American Jew was never greater nor more profound than now, since I see where book stores and decent Americans refuse to put your *trashy* literature (???) on their shelves. When you crack up, which you must eventually, maybe a Jewish psychiatrist will take pity on you and help you deal with your insanity. Too bad you're so insanely jealous of those who have proven you less than adequate.”

It is interesting that at the very time the Jewish-oriented press in the U.S. is protesting the Russian habit of treating certain types of dissidence as insanity, a South Carolina Jewess proposes the “Russian cure” for the author of *The Dispossessed Majority*. Whatever else the letter connotes, it does help to prove that the censorship of silence has a racial

link and that at least some Jews take pride in the fact that this censorship is so effective. There are many sources of pride in the human spirit, but this is surely one of the strangest, particularly in a country that is supposed to be a democracy and in a member of a race which is so overwhelmingly "liberal." To drive her point home, incidentally, the Jewish lady stopped payment on her check.

Members of the Cosa Nostra get away with homicide by the traditional practice of *omerta*. They never talk, and they see to it that witnesses never talk. The same code of silence is used very effectively by members of the publishing Mafia to murder ideas.

Pindar wrote, "Every noble deed dieth, if suppressed in silence." He might easily have substituted "book" for "deed." The British poet, James Montgomery, came closer to the subject at hand when he put the following iambs in the mouth of the Press:

"In me all human knowledge dwells;
The oracle of oracles,
Past, present, future, I reveal,
Or in oblivion's silence seal;
What I preserve can perish never,
What I forego is lost forever."

WHO EXCEPT SOMEONE IN A CATATONIC TRANCE CAN DENY THAT REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN AMERICA HAS GIVEN WAY TO MEDIA GOVERNMENT? AT THE MERE BECK AND CALL OF TWO OR THREE NEWSPAPERS AND TWO OR THREE TELEVISION NETWORKS, PRESIDENTS CRUMBLE, BIG BUSINESS CRAWLS, CONGRESS DANCES, AND THIEVES ARE TURNED INTO HEROES.

WATERGATE SEEMED TO MARK THE HIGH TIDE OF THE MEDIA IMPERIUM, IF ONLY BECAUSE IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO FORESEE HOW THE TIDE COULD RISE ANY HIGHER. BUT THEN CAME THE YOM KIPPUR WAR, WHEN THE PRESS PERFORMED THE PRESTIDIGITATORIAL TASK OF BLAMING EVERY CULPRIT BUT THE LEADING ONE FOR THE GASOLINE SHORTAGE.

AND ALL THE WHILE AMERICA WAS SUBJECTED TO THAT UNIQUE EXERCISE IN PROPAGANDA KNOWN AS THE DEIFICATION OF HENRY KISSINGER.

Chapter Four

THE LOONY BIN OR THE GREAT WATERGATE PURGE

When I was young I used to visit the carnival that came to town every year in the late spring. One attraction was the Loony Bin, a ticket for which cost 25¢. You'd go into a dark, mildew-smelling tent and follow a creaking walkway past grotesque plastic figures which screamed and howled at you as you went by. It was a relief to get out into the sunlight again. The experience, which lasted only a few minutes, was not frightening, but sickening. It was all so badly staged, so patently counterfeit, so totally tasteless.

Now suppose some baleful spirit from outer space had suddenly materialized during one of my annual excursions into the Loony Bin and frozen me in my tracks, holding me immobilized for a year or more while the polyfoam ghosts and cardboard skeletons wailed without interruption.

Such a torture would be quite similar to that which I, and most Americans, have undergone since the beginning of the Watergate affair.

Four men, some with CIA employment records, and a private detective are caught with their electronics down one night in a Democratic party campaign office. A Negro watchman noticed that a piece of tape placed over the latch of a basement door, which he had carefully removed during a previous inspection round, had been replaced. He called the police.

When it was discovered that one of the intruders was on the payroll of the Committee to Reelect the President, it did not need the banshee moans of the media to make the point that some higher-ups in the Nixon administration were involved. Unsurprisingly, the tempest in the teapot was

blown up into a Teapot Dome. The media had been trying to "get" Nixon ever since he had led a Congressional investigation into the spying activities of Alger Hiss. They almost succeeded in 1952 when Nixon was running for vice-president and a so-called "slush fund" was exposed. But since Adlai Stevenson, who happened to be campaigning for the presidency at the same time, had exactly the same kind of fund, the project came to nothing. Years later, after Nixon had become president, they almost got him for the Cambodian invasion and the Christmas bombing of Hanoi. But again he turned out to be more right than wrong, and the North Vietnamese agreed to call off the war long enough for the Americans to pull out. It was a mortal blow to American prestige. In spite of Nixon's pious protestations, little honor could be attached to it. But at least it was no Dunkirk.

Over the past months many public servants, some innocent, some not so innocent, have watched their careers torn to bits and shreds in huge 24-point headlines. Hot-from-the-hearing-room secret grand jury testimony has appeared verbatim in the morning editions of the largest newspapers. Front-page trials have found many of the accused guilty long before they had their hour in court. Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives have fallen all over themselves in a Congressional inquisition of the very kind the media profess to deplore, and do deplore most vociferously when liberals or leftists are involved. One high dramatic moment was struck when Daniel Ellsberg, the unpunished thief who stole the Pentagon Papers, appeared on TV to accuse the White House of sneaking into the files of his \$50-an-hour psychiatrist.

The five who were originally arrested, together with a Nixon election worker, G. Gordon Liddy, and ex-CIA agent, E. Howard Hunt, were quickly sent to jail. Liddy was given six to twenty years. Murderers and heroin pushers get suspended sentences. A high-level proditor like Alger Hiss spent less than four years in prison. But Liddy gets six to twenty years for being a participant in a brief, foolish and

totally unsuccessful electronic eavesdropping operation.

The media denied Lyndon Johnson another crack at the presidency in 1968 because he would not pull out of Vietnam. The media brought down Nixon, who did pull out of Vietnam. Albeit with limp strides, he did what was expected of him. But he was rewarded with obloquy.

Nixon lost the 1960 election because of vote frauds in Chicago. But the *Washington Post*, which takes the credit for exposing the Watergate cover-up, was not interested. Senator Sam Ervin, who headed the Senate's probe of Watergate, voted against any further investigation of Bobby Baker, whom Lyndon Johnson had once called his "right hand." The *Washington Post* was not at all outraged at this earlier cover-up. In fact, the *Post's* reporters and editors proceeded to transform Ervin, a man previously treated as a typical Southern redneck, into a Lincolnesque folk figure, oozing with the juices of liberalism. They did not even complain when Senator Sam, who seemingly could never get through one complete sentence without a grammatical lapse, cashed in on the nationwide publicity by making a hit record of his pithy sayings. The other senators on Ervin's committee posed regally in the video limelight, though, in view of their own electioneering habits, most of them were no more fitted to look into campaign violations than the Russian judge in the Nuremberg trials was fitted to preside over the investigation of Nazi war crimes.

Former House Speaker John McCormack, when he was second in line for the presidency, ran a million-dollar influence peddling racket out of his own office with the help of two Jewish aides, one of whom was given a suspended sentence and the other a year in jail. The *Washington Post* was not interested in pursuing the cover-up which kept the venerable Speaker — he said he had had no idea what was going on — in his job and out of prison.

Then there was Chappaquiddick. Mary Jo's bones lie unautopsied and unavenged, and Mrs. Katherine Graham, who inherited the *Post* from her banker father, Eugene

Meyer, has no intention of exhuming this story, even though it would reveal the true character of the brawling, bumbling womanizer who stands a good chance of being the president of the United States in 1981. Kennedy got a suspended sentence of two months for running away from the scene of an accident in which he had driven a young woman off a bridge to her death, and then waiting ten hours before he could summon up enough courage to report it. Not too much imagination is needed to predict what could have emerged if the *Washington Post* had put its Watergate staff of Managing Editor Howard Simons, District of Columbia Editor Harry Sussman, Metropolitan Editor Harry Rosenfield, and reporters Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward to work on this story. How many blazing headlines would have appeared, how many juicy columns would have been written if the *Post's* reportorial task force with its unlimited expense accounts had spent six months grilling the office playgirls of the Chappaquiddick cook-out and Kennedy's lawyer factotum, Gargan, who admittedly suppressed evidence of his boss' crime, but was never even indicted. But speculation about these matters is a waste of time. Like the *New York Times*, the *Post* does not report the news. It selects it, slants it and manufactures it.

Barry Goldwater has announced his activities were continuously monitored by tapped telephones and even privately owned TV cameras during his 1964 presidential campaign, when a Democratic administration was in power in Washington. But somehow all this was not newsworthy, then or now. John Kennedy, when he was president, and his brother, Bobby, when head of the Justice Department, both had their bugs and tapes working twenty-four hours a day. Lyndon Johnson used the FBI to spy on rival presidential candidates at the 1964 Democratic convention.

L. Patrick Gray, the acting head of the FBI, was severely criticized for burning White House papers—an act which had led to his resignation. But when he publicly admitted he had ordered an illegal break-in of the offices of an anti-Jewish

group, he said he would do it again and there were no critical post-mortems in the press. In connection with the FBI it might also be noted that one of the reasons the White House created its own special investigation group was J. Edgar Hoover's refusal to conduct a full-scale probe of Daniel Ellsberg, due to Hoover's friendship with Ellsberg's father-in-law, Louis Marx, the multimillionaire toy manufacturer.

As they said again and again in the Watergate committee, two wrongs don't make a right. But one kind of wrong on the front page of the *Post* easily obliterates another kind of wrong that is on the back page or is not mentioned at all.

In sentencing Liddy, Judge Sirica deliberately imposed a long sentence in order to force him to talk. It is unfortunate that Judge Boyle didn't give Senator Kennedy fifty years to loosen his tongue about Mary Jo Kopechne. Mr. and Mrs. Kopechne, who have never been known for their wealth, recently moved into a summer house in the Poconos and a winter house in Florida. No *Washington Post* reporters visited these houses or hounded the occupants in order to pry the lid off the most beautiful coverup in the history of the American press. They preferred to expound on the Nixon houses in San Clemente and Key Biscayne.

Walter Jenkins, Lyndon Johnson's Haldeman, was arrested while committing an incredibly revolting sex crime in a YMCA dime toilet during the 1964 presidential contest. Abe Fortas and Clark Clifford, two of Johnson's closest cronies, immediately visited the *Washington Post* and got it to hush up the story. It might never have found its way into print at all if one of the wire services had not sent it out before the arrival of the two presidential censors. Nonetheless, the *Washington Post* now collects journalism prizes for fearless reporting. Vengeance is long, but memories short in the American press corps. When forced by the competition to print the Jenkins' scandal, the *Post* let it expire in about forty-eight hours. Jenkins, of course, never spent a day in jail, was never indicted and is now holding a cushy job somewhere

in the southwest. The press, naturally, is not revealing his whereabouts.

To rub a little salt on the wounds, the *Washington Post* indulged in the edifying pastime of making racial slurs against the Watergate suspects. Four of the five men who broke into the Democratic party headquarters were carefully described as Cubans. Haldeman and Ehrlichman were designated as Germans, even though the ancestors of Ehrlichman were as Jewish as the ancestors of those who run the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times* and the TV networks. When Justice Fortas was on the payroll of a convicted swindler, Louis Wolfson, and had to resign from the Supreme Court, which exercises a much greater influence on American life than the presidency and which, being the apex of the American judicial system, should be less tainted by corruption than any other branch of the government, there were no snide remarks from the *Washington Post* about the Jewish origins of both the giver of the payola and the receiver. Nixon happens to be of Irish descent on both sides, as is his wife, and as are many of the Watergate people. Yet there were no Irish identifications by the *Post*, perhaps in deference to the Kennedys. It is the unwritten law of the media that when an Irishman is good he is an Irishman, but when he is bad he is a Wasp. Cubans, of course, are bad because Bebe Robozo, a Cuban-American, is Nixon's best friend. Germans, needless to say, are always bad, almost as bad as Arabs.

The Secret Service increased the value of Nixon real estate with some rather extensive improvements. But no one ever seemed to care about the private jetport the government built for President Johnson on his Texas ranch. Johnson was on the government payroll almost all his life. Though he started out with nothing, he ended up with \$12 or \$13 million. Kennedy's father was one of the richest men in the world. Even such a tried and true Democrat as Hubert Humphrey had to admit that John Kennedy "bought" the West Virginia primary in 1960, which cost Humphrey the Democratic

nomination for the presidency. Despite the fact that Johnson and Kennedy were immeasurably richer than Nixon, their income taxes were never leaked to the press and they were never charged with any financial improprieties.

Johnson, Kennedy and practically every other president have always refused Congressional demands for information when such demands were considered violations of executive privilege. But Nixon has handed over almost everything in his possession except his love letters and some erased segments on a tape or two. The more information the Watergate committee and the federal prosecutor got, however, the more they wanted. And their voracity was more than appeased by the press. In the past when the investigations of Congressional committees had been too thorough-going, the media had criticized the proceedings as witch hunts.

Nixon took a sizable tax deduction on his vice-presidential papers and it became a national scandal. Hubert Humphrey did exactly the same thing and it was not a scandal. When Jack Benny was caught in the same act, he announced he had at least paid \$500,000 in income taxes in the same year Nixon had paid practically nothing, Benny, who was once convicted of diamond smuggling, did not add that he makes five to ten times as much as the president of the United States.

After Nixon had handed over his tapes to the government prosecutors, a Jewish lawyer played one of them at a cocktail party. The lawyer was not disbarred or arrested. He was hardly criticized. The press was just as forgiving to prosecutor Archibald Cox, who showed his impartiality and his own special brand of legal ethics by privately briefing Senator Kennedy about some highly confidential phases of the government's investigation. Nevertheless, when Cox was fired by Nixon, the media's campaign against the president became earsplitting. *Time*, which has previously attacked the president in its news columns, now came boldly forth with double-page editorials calling for Nixon's resignation.

And if all this were not enough, enter Spiro Agnew,

whose speeches were written by Cynthia Rosenwald, whose press relations were handled by Vic Gold and whose political activities were guided by Arthur Sohmer. Agnew must have thought he was well protected by his all-Jewish council of advisors and by his close association with Frank Sinatra, the Mafia's favorite songbird. He miscalculated woefully. A procession of Jewish witnesses suddenly appeared in a Maryland Grand Jury investigation and accused Agnew of taking kickbacks, not only while he was governor of Maryland, but even after he became vice-president. The people who gave the kickbacks were, as usual, granted immunity. Exit Agnew. Gerald Ford, an impeccably "safe" Republican, was summoned from the floor of Congress and installed as Agnew's successor. If, after his triumph at the polls, the president was to be removed from office, the media wanted no part of a vice-president they hated with equal venom. They would have preferred the bibulous Carl Albert, Speaker of the House and next in line for the presidency after Agnew's ouster. But even the *Washington Post* agreed it would be going too far, too fast, to engineer the installation of a Democratic president within a year and a half of a landslide election victory for a Republican.

At any rate, the stage was now set for the final battle. The tumbrel was brought out and hosed down for Nixon's ride to the Capitol. Madame Defarge-Graham began to think about her knitting. As a prelude, many of the president's closest friends and supporters were rounded up, and in the scorching light of network television they pleaded guilty to violating the campaign contribution law and committing sundry other crimes. John L. Loeb, one of the world's most influential international bankers, broke the campaign contribution law. But since he was a Democrat and had only given unlawfully to Hubert Humphrey, he paid his \$3,000 fine with hardly anyone being the wiser. Howard Hughes, a richer but not a wiser man, contributed to both parties, and for his dealings with the White House found himself the target of a criminal indictment. It was as dangerous to be a friend of Nixon's as it

was to have known Louis XVI, Kerensky or Hitler.

Nixon's fate was sealed with the release of the tapes. The banality of the presidential verbal give-and-take should have been no surprise. The present process of selecting political leaders, together with the inane charade they must put on while campaigning for office, practically guarantees that almost every successful politician will be the stereotype of the mediocre man. The tone and cultural level of the tapes, far more damaging to Nixon than the contents, not only helped destroy the president, but may have destroyed the mystique of the presidency for all time.

Americans were cheated out of the drama of a Senate trial when Nixon decided that a guilty verdict was inevitable. He left his office in a final blaze of mediocrity by boasting of his accomplishments, ignoring his vices and expressing no bitterness towards his enemies. It was the fall of a little man who felt he could beat the system by buying off his opponents. He founded the Kissinger cult. He betrayed his closest friends by broadcasting their confidences to the world. He gave more aid to Israel than any other president. With some reluctance but with steady subservience, he followed inch by inch the path of doom that the media had prepared for him. In the end he said he forgave his enemies, but his enemies never forgave him. They never forgive. Alger Hiss and Ellsberg had the last laugh – on him and on us.

Meanwhile, all of us remain trapped in the Loony Bin. For decades we were told that tapes of private conversations were an invasion of privacy and should not be accepted as evidence. For decades we were warned against Congressional witch hunts. For decades we were instructed by means of constant references to the machinations of Hitler and Stalin that the most heinous form of tyranny was the political purge. All that we were warned about we got – from the hands of the warners.

We remain prisoners in a dark tent and many of us still believe we can reason with the plastic phantoms who scream and howl at us in scratchy recordings. But we cannot speak

to automated indoctrination machines, to robots without ears. There is only one way to stop the cacophony, and that is to reach over and lift up the needle. Just one simple act, and all the hateful, vengeful, nation-shattering ululations would never be heard again.

How long will it take us to learn this simple lesson? One year? Five years? Fifty years? Never?

The phantoms go on screeching and howling in deafening exultation!

Chapter Five

THE HIGH-GRADING OF HENRY KISSINGER

Unhappy John Foster Dulles! When he was Secretary of State and helped bring the Korean War to an end, it was President Eisenhower who received most of the credit. All Dulles got was more of the same from the media — accusations of brinksmanship and innuendoes about secret fascistic leanings.

Happy Henry Kissinger! When he was foreign policy advisor to President Nixon (and not yet Secretary of State), he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for ending the Vietnam War. Adulation was heaped upon him by almost every “respectable” newspaper reporter and television commentator in the land. That 50,000 Vietnamese died in combat in the twelve months following Kissinger’s “peace” and that it was only a question of years until America’s one-time ally became an appendage of North Vietnam did nothing to dim his luster. For his part in the negotiations Nixon received nothing. Le Duc Tho, the North Vietnamese negotiator, was given a fifty percent interest in the prize, but he had the decency to refuse it. The Oriental Red was not as hypocritical as the Harvard liberal.

Unhappy John Foster Dulles! He almost singlehandedly put together the 1950 Japanese Peace Treaty, one of the great documents of American statesmanship. No Nobel Peace Prize! Indeed, President Truman had almost refused to give him the assignment, not because Dulles was a Republican — bipartisanship was then the style in American foreign policy — but because he had once committed heresy. A few years earlier while running for senator in New York, Dulles had said to an upstate Republican gathering, “If you

could see the kind of people in New York City making up this bloc that is voting for my opponent, if you could see them with your own eyes, I know you would be out, every last man and woman of you, on election day." Though he never mentioned the Jews by name, this remark was considered anti-Semitic and haunted him throughout the rest of his career.

Dulles was a devotee of NATO and the containment of Russia during the high-tension years of Soviet imperialism. Henry Kissinger does not have such a high opinion of NATO. As a matter of fact, he rocked this principal bulwark of American foreign policy to its very foundations after Egypt's Yom Kippur crossing of the Suez. Whether Henry knows it or not, Britain, France, West Germany and the rest of Western Europe (except Holland) do not want to risk economic chaos, not to mention nuclear obliteration, for siding with the U.S. and Israel against the Arabs. They feel their citizens have more constructive and more moral things to do than send arms and money to Zionists to destroy a few more Egyptian cities, conquer a few more square miles of desert, dispossess a few thousand more Palestinians (present count is 3,000,000) and set up a new Solomonic empire to memorialize Jewish racial exuberance. They did not take it lightly when the American armed forces went on a worldwide alert during the latest Arab-Israeli flareup. They were almost the last to be advised. Neither did they like it when American arms and supplies earmarked for the defense of Western Europe were siphoned off to Golda Meir.

Dulles could do no right and Kissinger no wrong. President Nixon descended on China with a retinue that would have widened the eyes of Kubla Khan. The American pundits who opposed this grandiose demarche blamed him for taking the road to Canossa. Those who thought it was worthwhile gave the glory to Kissinger. Nixon continued to push his detente with Russia up to the eve of his resignation. The pros described it as another diplomatic triumph for Henry the wonder worker. The cons blamed Nixon for accelerating inflation and creating food

shortages by selling grain to the Soviets at give-away prices.

There is nothing like a game where you win even when you lose.

Secretary of State Rogers had exactly the same plan for a Middle East settlement that Kissinger is now promoting. Yet Rogers in the heyday of his peacemongering remained a media nullity. John Foster Dulles stopped the 1956 Israeli-French-British blitz on the Suez Canal dead in its tracks by joining the Russians in a cease and desist ultimatum. But Dulles received more brickbats than compliments for forcing the invaders to go back home and give up their conquered Arab territory. For doing one-tenth as much as Dulles in a similar situation, Kissinger has been garlanded with two-inch headlines and is already being called America's greatest Secretary of State.

Dulles sternly refused to let America get militarily entangled in Vietnam. In fact he was the chief architect of the 1954 Geneva Conference which came closer than anything else to establishing a durable peace in Indochina. If the Vietnamese had lived up to the conference accord, the war might have stopped and 48,000 American service men would still be alive. A perfervid supporter of Kennedy's and Johnson's asinine and murderous intervention in an internecine war 10,000 miles from Washington, Kissinger actually helped intensify the war for which he was later made a Nobel laureate for "ending."

Dulles did his best to protect the strategic, American-owned oil reserves in Arab countries and would never have given the Israelis the wherewithal to bomb and napalm the world's most fanatic anti-communists. He knew the Arabs had been at peace with America since the time of the Barbary pirates. He saw no profit in the United States becoming the friend of the Arabs' bitterest enemy. He knew this would drive them straight into the wide-open paws of the Russian bear. Kissinger did not utter a word of objection in 1973 when Congress voted billions for Israel with hardly a

debate and the White House launched the most massive airlift in history to re-equip the Israeli army after its mauling by the Egyptian and Syrian attack force.

Dulles believed in hemispheric defense and would never have let the Russians take over Cuba. Kissinger, when a consultant to President Kennedy, supported the policy which did just that. Dulles believed America should keep its hold on the Panama Canal. Kissinger, in an orgy of television publicity, signed a treaty allowing Panama to take back control of the canal at a date to be arranged.

Kissinger is supposed to be a second Metternich, or at least the media would have us so believe. But until Henry made him his model, Metternich had generally been considered the soul of political and clerical reaction, an inveterate enemy of the U.S., a fierce anti-democrat and monarchist, and a throwback to the Holy Roman Empire. One word from Kissinger and this blighted ghost was speedily rehabilitated and moved from a right to a left pedestal in the pantheon of world diplomacy.

Henry Kissinger has created no grand design in American foreign policy. He has written a few books and magazine articles, which make stuffy reading and are full of clever categorizations of political regimes, diplomatic procedures and American options. His first book called for a much greater emphasis on the use of tactical nuclear weapons in future wars. Like any good liberal he would always allow the enemy to strike first (except, of course, in the Middle East). The best way to counter aggression he wrote, not too originally, was more aggression. If Russia unleashed a nuclear artillery barrage in an attack on West Germany, America, according to the Kissinger formula, would reply with a few short-range nuclear missiles. When the East Germans built the Berlin Wall, Kissinger advocated that American troops go in and tear down the wall. Such limited and hobbled responses, needless to say, would add up to exactly the kind of war the Russians want to fight. It would eliminate the one thing they fear most — massive retaliation against Russian cities and

factories by American intercontinental and submarine missiles. Kissinger's tactical nuclear weapons would only destroy the German cities and land where the battles would be raging. Eventually Kissinger himself came to realize the absurdity of these proposals and quietly shelved them. In spite of these wavering insights and ideological pirouettes, however, he remained in the very good graces of the myopic gnomes who direct the myopic Council on Foreign Relations.

As one of his biographers wrote, "Kissinger imagines, in his moments of greatest personal self-esteem, that he is one of Hegel's great men, one of those rare individuals, those carriers of mankind's historical spirit, about whom Kissinger's favorite philosopher once speculated so long ago." Dulles had a more modest opinion of himself, and preferred the empiricism of Locke and William James to the teleological gymnastics of Hegel, who also happened to be Marx' favorite philosopher.

A congenital Democrat, Kissinger had no use for Nixon, who he claimed was "unfit for the presidency." But he did warm up to Republican Nelson Rockefeller, joining Nelson's personal stable of omniscient experts who were preparing another of the Governor's perennial campaigns to win the presidency. When Nelson was unable to buy the Republican nomination in 1968, Henry swallowed his ego and began making overtures to his erstwhile bogeyman. At least Dulles liked Ike and did not have to go through the daily mummery of serving someone he thought little of.

Why did the press hate Dulles? Was it because he went to Princeton instead of Harvard? Because he was born in America? Because he kept the peace? Because he was willing to go to war to prevent war and consequently avoided war altogether? Because he had roots? Because he had a grandfather and an uncle who were Secretaries of State and was brought up in the great diplomatic tradition of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Polk and Theodore Roosevelt? Or was it possibly because of those loaded words he once spoke on the political stump?

Why does the press adore Kissinger? Because of his accent? Because he is a Democrat and not a Republican? Because he is a member of the country's liberal high command? Because he engineered a non-proliferation treaty with Russia that gave the latter a guaranteed preponderance of long-range, land-based ballistic missiles? Because he has no roots? Because he looks upon America not as a country, but as a stage?

Kissinger's friends make much of his early boyhood when he was beaten continuously by Nazi bullies as he walked to school. He managed to survive the bully boys for five long Hitler years. Then he left Germany in 1938 and he and his brother, Walter, now a millionaire business promoter, arrived safe and sound in the U.S. As a result of his experience in Germany, Kissinger is supposed to hate all forms of racism. We can test this proposition by examining his attitude to the three white racist states which now exist in the world—South Africa, Rhodesia, and Israel. He is in favor of billion-dollar subsidies and military grants to Israel. He is in favor of an arms boycott of South Africa and economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Consequently it seems only fair to say that he is not an anti-racist at all. He is a selective racist. At least he must be complimented for being selective in favor of his own race. He is not like Senator Henry Jackson and other jaded non-Jews who cater to every race but their own.

Kissinger was foursquare for the unconditional surrender of Germany, which handed over Eastern Europe to Russia. Now he labors to reduce the power of the monolithic imperium that he and his ideological confreres helped to create. Although he joined the U.S. Army in 1943, he did not get overseas until his homeland was in ruins. He came as a member of an American administrative team and for a time was put in charge of an entire German district. There was a surprising number of Jewish refugees in these groups and some of them, while wearing the American uniform, were known to have tortured German soldiers and civilians in retaliation for what Hitler had done to the Jews.

In 1946 Kissinger returned to the U.S. and took a \$10,000-a-year job as an instructor at an army training school. He then decided to go to Harvard, where he later obtained his Ph.D. and became a tenured professor. The rest of the story line has been up, up, up.

In a sense there is no such person as Kissinger. There is only a semi-abstract phantom who floats above the world scene. Printers' ink, not blood, flows in its veins. Its corpuscles are a loose manifold of photons, which never coalesce except on television screens.

Dulles had to contend with history. For Henry the media manufactured history. The energy shortage, for example, was caused by the secret maneuvers of big oil, by fumbling Nixon administration planners, by malevolent Arab boycotters. The basic and triggering cause, U.S. support of Israel, was hardly mentioned by the media and therefore quietly omitted by Henry. If Henry's State Department had adopted a neutral policy, a moral policy, toward the Mideast, there would have been no interminable lines of Americans at gas pumps. But Kissinger never received an iota of blame. Consequently, neither he nor any other public figure had to propose the simple and immediate solution to the problem — a reversal of American foreign policy in the Mideast. Every other Secretary of State in American history has had to face the often uncomfortable situation of publicly weighing and frequently advocating logical solutions to foreign policy problems. The media relieve Kissinger of this painful necessity by the simple expedient of smothering the problem in a conspiracy of silence. When a dilemma is totally ignored, it has no horns and consequently no one is impaled.

If Kissinger were a statesman, he would pick up his telephone and tell the Israeli government and world Jewry there would be no more American arms and no more American tax-deductible dollars until Israel returned all the lands it had stolen from Egypt, Jordan and Syria and all the homes it had stolen from the Palestinians. Within a week there would be peace in the Mideast. Having safely bypassed another nuclear

spark point, mankind would breathe easier.

But Kissinger is not a statesman. He is a creature of the media, a figment of the wire services, who lives on headlines not deeds, who is nourished by the praise of columnists and commentators, not by the cries of war-threatened and war-despoiled populations. One friendly lie in the *New York Times* has more vitamin content for a man of Kissinger's ilk than the hosannahs of a million homeless Palestinians.

Let us hope that those who live in and by the light of the tube, those phototropic ones who win prizes for partially and belatedly mitigating the effects of their own ideological perversities, will squirm, wriggle and eventually expire in the brighter and more intense beam of the superior reason and judgment of future generations.

But if the media's tinkering with the human brain is not stopped soon, we may arrive at the tippie point where we will lose all contact with reality. We can somehow muddle through when we are told each day that good is bad, vice is virtue, nonsense is sense. But the very thinking process itself comes to a halt when we are ordered to believe that the unreal is the real.

Who would have ever thought that an American Secretary of State would be reduced to running diplomatic errands for Jewish and Arab potentates in the Levant? Buying time for Israel and escaping the taint of Watergate demand certain talents, but not those that make for great statesmanship.

History is likely to show that Henry was a pitcher who was briefly immortalized for making a few sensational throws in the warm-up pen.

THE MOST INTERESTING RESPONSE TO *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY* CAME FROM THE YOUNG. TYPICAL WAS THE LETTER THAT SAID, "ALL RIGHT, YOU'RE RIGHT. WHAT DO WE DO?" LESS HEARTENING WERE LETTERS FROM FRUSTRATED ACTIVISTS. "I JOINED GROUP X OR GROUP Y AND WORKED MYSELF TO THE BONE, BUT IT ALL ADDED UP TO ZERO. THERE IS NO HOPE. THE COUNTRY'S HAD IT." PERHAPS THE MOST DISCOURAGING COMMUNICATIONS WERE LONG AND OFTEN SCURRILOUS ATTACKS ON OTHER ACTIVISTS.

THE FOUR PIECES THAT FOLLOW WERE ATTEMPTS TO ANSWER, TO ADMONISH AND TO ENCOURAGE THESE YOUNG READERS. FOR MY PAINS A FEW OF THE HOT BLOODS HAVE ATTACKED ME AS AN IVORY TOWER DO-NOTHING. I CAN ONLY REMIND THEM THAT THEORY, ALTHOUGH THE ENEMY OF ILL-CONCEIVED ACTION, IS THE FRIEND AND INSPIRER OF INTELLIGENT ACTION.

Chapter Six

HARSH ADVICE FOR YOUNG MAJORITY ACTIVISTS WHO ARE DISMAYED THAT, DESPITE THEIR BEST EFFORTS, THEIR RACE CONTINUES ITS PRECIPITOUS DECLINE

The road back from your dispossession is no eight-lane freeway. What has been lost cannot be recovered until every ounce of the energy and creativity allocated to the building of America is dedicated to its rebuilding.

Decadent and degenerate nations have a large inertial component. Unless you realize that the struggle to halt and reverse the decomposition of the American Majority will be exasperatingly protracted, you will never be able to sustain the high morale required for such an exhausting and long-winded project. Low morale is the automatic result of false optimism and unrealistic timetables.

One of the fundamental tenets of modern philosophy is "I think, therefore I am." This must now be modified — revolutionarily modified — to "I think *before* I am." If this age is not to be remembered as the end stage of Northern European man, both in America and abroad, the finest and most courageous Majority minds must reduce their ideas, insights and theoretical musings to books. Before it can act, the race must be *instructed*.

The written word does not bring with it the immediate satisfaction of the spoken word. Nevertheless, it is the authentic seed of action. Your successors, the second- and third-echelon movers and shakers of future generations, will harvest the crop you have sown in your loneliness and tragic isolation. But instead of being depressed by such a thought, you should be aware that very few humans have ever had the

priceless opportunity to be in *at the start* of a fateful attempt to save a great people from national suicide. Your reward, although delayed, will be the greatest of all rewards, a niche in history.

This is the age of books. To write or, equally important, to intelligently promote such books, you must have the world of learning at your fingertips. In the course of your proselytizing any descent from the intellectual to the physical plane may be an inefficient and even totally wasteful use of your time. Reason, not emotion, is the appropriate tool for enlisting the support of the extraordinary men and women needed at this initial stage. The bulk of the Majority cannot be approached successfully until the contradictions inherent in liberal-minority rule raise inflation, shortages, cultural depravity and racial crime to intolerable levels.

Until such time, there will always be small groups who will demand action at all costs. It will be your duty to counsel them, warn them and enlighten them. Even though they are working prematurely, even though no body of literature or doctrine has yet appeared to give their activity the proper intellectual foundations, even though they will tend to fragment the moment they meet any serious opposition because they have no ideological coherence, you should wish them well and, as long as they are working for the preservation of the race, never criticize them in public. Sooner or later one of them, whether as the embryo of a new political party or an offshoot of an old, whether a secret society in the American or a street movement in the European tradition, will emerge as the spearhead of the racial revival we have all been waiting for.

Meanwhile, never lose sight of the historical context in which you are operating. You are an American, not an Englishman, German, Scandinavian or "ethnic," not a Yankee, Southerner, liberal, conservative, capitalist, socialist, businessman or union member. It should be remembered, however, that the cultural stamp of America is

largely Anglo-Saxon, even though this element is now less than 44% of the total population. Any program or doctrine that grates on the instincts of this *nuclear* population group will ipso facto never get off the ground.

Consequently, you will win more hearts and minds if you use the empirical rather than the metaphysical approach, if you follow the linear, experimental path of Bacon, Newton, Darwin, Galton, Spencer, T.H. Huxley, Darlington, Jensen, Lorenz, Cattell and J. R. Baker and avoid the prophetic peaks and intuitive precipices of Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Spengler and Toynbee. The scientific justification of your propositions will eventually be supplied by behavior genetics and by the related fields of psychology, sociology and anthropology. Everything possible must be done to rescue these potentially great sciences from further perversion at the hands of liberal-minority shamans and propagandists. One of the first and greatest psychologists was the American, William James. One of the first and greatest sociologists was the American, William Graham Sumner. Psychology and sociology must reestablish a record of achievement that will do honor to their names.

Although Anglo-Saxons make up its largest element, the Majority is composed of a racial amalgam that extends well beyond Americans of British descent and comprises *all* those ancestors originated in Northern Europe. Recent attempts to divide the Majority into Wasps, Germans, "ethnics" and other nationality groups are simply maneuvers of the opposition to obscure the Majority's fundamental racial unity. The indiscriminate slaughter of Northern Europeans by Northern Europeans during World Wars I and II should be an unforgettable warning of the danger of placing nation or nationality above race.

In addition to putting undue emphasis on the different national origins of Majority members, the liberal-minority coalition will make use of religion, economics, politics, even age and sex to promote its strategy of *divide et impera*. Protestant will be set against Catholic, right against left,

business against labor, rich against poor, Democrats against Republicans, child against parent, wife against husband. The unifying concept of race is the most effective means of combating the semantics of social fragmentation.

Christianity in America has usually been a matter for the private conscience. It should remain so. No repetition of the dysgenic religious disputes of the 16th and 17th centuries which decimated Northern Europeans should be allowed in the 20th century. The Majority cause is Christian in the sense that if it succeeds it will reestablish a moral climate in which Christianity can effectively function. For this reason it should enlist the voluntary or involuntary support of the Christian rank and file. It is not Christian in the sense that its basic purpose is racial, not religious, and should not offend or exclude the sizable number of young Majority members who are presently nonbelievers and who see, as one of the principal agents of the Majority's decline, the contemporary triple alliance of Christianity, equalitarianism and minority racism.

Paradoxically, some of the most fanatical opponents of the Majority are rightwingers, conservatives and "patriots." Consequently, these appellations should be eliminated from the dictionary of Majority thought. The most inaccurate and ambiguous of all such terms is "white." The racial confrontation in America is not between whites and Negroes. It is between whites of Northern European extraction—the Majority—and an agglomeration of minorities consisting of Jews, dark-skinned Mediterranean whites, Chicanos, Indians, Puerto Ricans and Negroes. Any such racial oversimplification as the substitution of *white* for *Majority* assigns Majority members to a group that comprises some of their most dedicated enemies.

Also to be rigorously avoided are ringing appeals to save "our cherished institutions." Races make institutions, not vice versa. The Constitution will never save the Majority, but the Majority, once again in control of the state, may save the Constitution.

In the matter of foreign policy, the U.S. must reassert the Monroe Doctrine, ignominiously abrogated during the Russian infiltration into Cuba. Fortunately, our sophisticated nuclear technology has allowed us an unequalled opportunity to concentrate on domestic affairs without having to worry about incursions by foreign predators. As long as the capacity to destroy the Old World homelands of any and all invaders is retained, our vast intellectual and physical resources can be applied almost entirely to internal problem-solving, which must include the geographical separation of America's unassimilable minorities from the Majority racial complex. The U.S. will be little more than a jungle until each population group, the Majority included, is free to develop its own customs and way of life without outside interference and domination. As far as possible, differences among peoples should be institutionalized and similarities obliterated. America, by ending its own racial chaos and by refusing to engage in further military crusades overseas, can serve as the paradigm of the differentiated state of the 21st century, a model economic and geographical federation of separate racial communities. There must be no more Vietnams and Israels to desecrate American history, no more lavish outpourings of America's resources to "disadvantaged peoples," both at home and abroad. Perpetual charity guarantees the perpetual inferiority of the recipient.

Finally, you must understand that by working for the resurgence and liberation of your own race, you are performing the ultimate service to mankind by accelerating human evolution. The ascent of man has been accomplished by natural selection operating freely both within and between groups, a process of biological improvement which permits the accumulation of advantageous mutations in both individuals and races. A general amalgamation of the human gene pool violates both the letter and spirit of Darwin's immutable law and breeds out beneficial mutations before they have a chance to take hold. If successful, universal miscegenation would almost certainly herald the end of

evolution and the end of *Homo sapiens*. The lower-order primates of the early Pleistocene would again inherit the earth and the development of more complex and more cerebral life forms would be set back perhaps a million years.

In sum, you are not for the regeneration of your own race because you are a reactionary bigot, as the false and irresponsible accusations of the media would have the public believe, but because you are supremely intelligent and have the rare gift of evolutionary foresight. Almost alone among men, you have the intellectual courage to stand for the vital biological mechanisms on which nature herself relied for the creation of man and on which she must equally rely for the creation of a higher species than man.

Chapter Seven

PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITY FOR MAJORITY UNDERGRADUATES

The overweening intellectual pride and nauseating infallibility of the present-day rulers of American education make them extremely vulnerable to objective criticism. For example, a recent manifesto of a strident organization known as the Committee Against Racism states very clearly that academic freedom should not be extended to those who question the equalitarian theories that now dominate the social sciences. Paradoxically, such propaganda is of more value to its targets than its propagators, because it illuminates the shadowy policies of shadowy opponents.

There is no doubt that the muzzling of freedom of inquiry will increase to the point where the few books that expose the contemporary perversion of the educational process will fall under a total ban. Here again, the long-range gain will be ours. Already a few Majority social scientists of international reputation have begun to feel outraged at the boldfaced attempts of liberal-minority indoctrinators to ostracize from our schools, not only the scientific method, but the entire tradition of Western learning. Any present loss in the ability to publish will be compensated by more direct support from more than a few leading scholars.

Mounting intolerance and more frequent inquisitorial witch hunts on the part of liberal-minority professors and their student trenchermen open up a wide range of counteractivities by a few "unsold" Majority undergraduates. One of the first things to be done is to press for a definition of racism and racist. What category fits the Negro who shoots down white policemen or white passersby? Is the Negro or minority writer who writes book-length racial slurs against

the Majority a racist? Black movies produced by Jews preach open violence against Majority men and women, including rape, murder and arson. Yet somehow, in the eyes of the Committee Against Racism these movies are not racist. As a matter of fact, Susan Sontag, who wrote, "The white race is the cancer of history," is not considered a racist, but an anti-racist.

By bringing out these contradictions, by clearly demonstrating the inconsistencies in liberal-minority semantics, the Majority undergraduate can easily show that it is he, not the minority student, who is the real victim of racism and bigotry. The lies directed against the Majority actually become truths when redirected against the enemies of the Majority.

The racial antennae of the opposition are very sensitive. Although the mass media are under tight control, freedom of inquiry, moribund as it is, still emits a few feeble gasps in remote segments of academia. Something similar occurred in the Dark Ages, where classical learning was kept alive for centuries by a few courageous monks. For this reason, it is precisely in academia, where they are protected by the few surviving sparks of a great educational tradition, that Majority students should make a stand against environmentalism, equalitarianism, Marxism and Freudianism — the four horsemen of the present-day intellectual apocalypse.

The bulk of the Majority is not ready for effective action because it is still mesmerized by the material surfeits of technology. There are, however, a few brilliant Majority students, who have already sensed what is happening to their race and culture and do not need to wait for physical suffering to spur them into some kind of commitment. Among them are those who are easily, all too easily, frustrated because they cannot find an outlet for their energy in campus political activity. They cannot seem to understand that their aspirations will never be realized and their ambitions will never be satisfied until the proper intellectual

foundations are laid for the all-out struggle which is bound to come. If these same students, who are the hope of America's regeneration, could just be a little less impatient, a little more ingenious and perspicacious and a lot more creative, they would find all sorts of satisfaction in the intellectual activity that leads to constructive ideological pioneering.

Here are just a few projects that might be recommended as escape routes from present lethargy and acedia. Check the shelves and catalog of your college library. List the books of minority racists like LeRoi Jones, Eldridge Cleaver, Peter Schrag, Julius Lester, Max Dimont, H. Rap Brown and Michael Novak. Extract some of the glaringly racist passages from such works. Next, check the library catalog for the works of Arthur Keith, Ruggles Gates, Wesley George, Henry Garrett, Carleton Putnam and Robert Kuttner. The chances are you will find very few such books. *The Dispossessed Majority*, for example, has been rejected by many college libraries, even when it was offered to them as a gift. Also, you might compare the number of books favoring Israel in the Mideast conflict to the number of those favoring the Arab cause. With all these facts in hand, you are now in a position to raise the wholly justifiable and practically irrefutable charge of willful discrimination, censorship and bigotry.

Publicize your campaign with letters to the librarian-in-charge, the editor of the student newspaper and appropriate professors and administration officials. If nothing happens, circulate petitions or insert ads in the college or local paper, repeating your charges and adding that your legitimate protests have been greeted with total silence. All such agitation should be accomplished in an unassuming, low-key style that reeks of irreproachable erudition. By using this holier-than-thou technique, you are "outsnobbing" the opposition, a very effective ploy in a pseudo-scholarly atmosphere. It is much more difficult for a newspaper or an academic committee to reject a well-written petition than a sloppily composed set of slanderous allegations replete with

fuzzy and ungrammatical Birch Society overtones. Your language should never contain the least hint of racial inferiority or superiority. Let the facts speak for themselves. All you are striving for is the right to enjoy and develop your own culture, without outside interference. Actually, this is what minority racists say they want, but somehow they can't get around to sharing these goals with people of other races. As to which race is better or worse, closer to or further removed from the ape, history and science will make the final judgment.

Needless to say, the most important part of your activity should take place in the classroom. Saturate yourself in the social sciences. Endeavor to know more about your course than your teacher, which in many cases will not be too difficult, since he is an overspecialist in outworn cliches. Challenge him constantly with philosophical and historical references contradicting his point of view. Dare him to assign outside reading which gives the opposite side of the coin. Ask him to permit classroom debates on various sensitive topics. Obviously, at one point or another, he will reject your proposals. Now you have him exactly where you want him. You can easily show that he is guilty of the most heinous of all crimes known to the academic community – intellectual cowardice. The person who is supposed to deal exclusively in ideas turns out to be afraid of ideas. Since no one loves a coward, you ought to be able to win over a few of your unbrainwashed Majority classmates. And it is well to remember that at this stage of the battle one intelligent young convert is worth one thousand aged “patriots” and “Constitution savers.”

Whatever line of activity you pursue on campus, always put your opponents on the defensive by accusing them of being the real bigots. But use the tongue-in-cheek approach and reduce the level of argumentation to a minimum. The moment you raise your voice, you are no longer in command of the situation. Keep your head and you will force your teachers to do their homework and to decelerate their

hit-and-run indoctrination. At the same time, you will have greatly increased student interest, as you endeavor to turn each class session into a dramatic confrontation.

To be a St. George and rescue a few captive Majority minds from the dragon of minority racism and liberal dogmatism is a worthy mission and a most rewarding and creative way of spending your college days. If nothing else, it will be good training for the more intense struggle that awaits you after you get your degree. Things are not going to change overnight. But if someone does not get around to changing them in your lifetime, this country may not be a country a century from now.

Chapter Eight

A SEARCH FOR MENTAL COORDINATES

Prisoners who are served TV dinners in their cells and given the run of the jailhouse yard are nonetheless in durance vile. Softened and deluded by a high standard of living, Majority members are often as unaware of their servile status as pampered prisoners.

Although the Majority feels the chill of racial rigor mortis, it will still not face its worsening predicament realistically. Being human, we are inclined to blame our deficiencies on others. Being enterprising, but not enterprising enough to rely solely on ourselves for the solution of our almost insoluble problems, we look to our ancient institutions for deliverance, oblivious to the fact that these institutions, once the trusted guardian of our rights, are now being used to shortcircuit them.

We think individually when we should think collectively. We react when we should act. We whine when we should shout. We write our unpublished letters to the newspapers. In short, we do everything but the right thing. Incredibly, we are still mesmerized by the story line the media feed us in ever larger doses. Because it says so in print, we actually believe that we are the oppressors, not the oppressed.

Ignorance of the racial dynamics responsible for our dispossession prolongs our dispossession.

The truth is the Majority is no longer the establishment, but the disestablishment. It is no longer a privileged race, but a rootless agglomerate of the mentally and morally disarmed. Worst of all, it is a group that participates in and helps promote its own downgrading.

Unless it wants to be history's first example of a Northern European people permanently and willingly accepting

second-class citizenship, the Majority must initiate a program of liberation to put an immediate stop to its dispossession. But this cannot take place until we acquire the proper frame of mind, the proper set of mental coordinates, to direct the slow and difficult process of recovery. We squirm at accusations of bigotry while refusing to identify our accusers as the authentic bigots. We retreat before allegations of racism by opponents who are the real racists. We are deathly afraid to talk about racial solidarity, although it is the racial solidarity of others that has performed the miracle of our defeat.

Of all American population groups it is precisely the Majority which should take the firmest stand against bigotry, because it is bigotry, the all-powerful bigotry of the intelligentsia, which has turned a once great educational system into a transmission belt for liberal-minority propaganda. It is the Majority which should be in the vanguard of the struggle against racism, because it is racism, the all-powerful racism of the mass media, which has turned so many American politicians into clandestine agents of minority interests. It is the Majority which should fight hardest for freedom of assembly, of speech and of opportunity, because it is precisely these freedoms which the liberal-minority coalition has usurped for itself.

We were once idealistic enough to believe that, at least on paper, all men were equal. Now we know better. Now we know that those who honestly believe in equality are likely to become the servants of those who pretend to believe in it.

Now that the Majority has been assigned an inferior rank in American society, we must concentrate on one task alone – getting our oppressors off our backs.

But we must learn that ours is not a reaction of a decadent master race which has lost its privileged status in fair competition with less spoiled and more energetic peoples. The situation is far more simple – and brutal – than that. What has happened is that we have been dragged into a racial conflict whose chief aim seems to be the destruction of Western

civilization in the New World and the subjugation of its founders. If we are to win this war, we must conquer not only our enemies, but ourselves.

We are not at all interested in restricting or abrogating the rights of others. We simply refuse any longer to let others interfere with and distort our way of life.

In the 18th century Americans invented a whole new vocabulary to describe their immense strides toward personal, political and economic liberty. Today these mind-rousing, morale-lifting appeals have been reduced to a weary liberal-minority rhetoric to justify the ascendancy of population groups with a long history of political and social failure in their own homelands.

It would seem politic for the Majority to retrieve its vocabulary of freedom from those who have debased it and to use it to write a new Declaration of Independence, this time against domestic aggressors.

Chapter Nine

WHY, FOR THE TIME BEING, NOTHING MUCH CAN BE DONE

There are compelling reasons why the Majority is doing very little about its dispossession. Apathy is usually given as the principal cause, but this is only begging the question. To retrogress one link in the causal chain, we might ask what is the reason for the apathy?

The Majority, like all population groups of Northern European origin, is basically law abiding. It retains a massive, though diminishing, faith in both the reformability and adaptability of government. Associated with this is a clinging belief in the goodness and perfectibility of man, a liberal hand-me-down from Locke, Rousseau and the Founding Fathers.

Another ardor-cooling factor is the Majority's personal stake in the present system. Prominent Majority members are not only getting by but often getting rich as they ride the rising tide of minority racism. The more perspicacious Majority leaders know full well what is going on. They are more exposed to the intense pressures and the inside jockeying for power than anyone. Yet what are they to do? The slightest meaningful resistance, the most innocuous public statement, if it contains even a hint of the real forces at work, would mean instant disgrace, total loss of face and closing the door on any possibility of a successful career in public life. From the top of the social heap the offender would be immediately relegated to the bottom, a fall not only from grace but from a high-income bracket. As is well known, it is harder for the rich man than the poor man to make the supreme financial sacrifice.

At present the only Majority members who dare to speak

out are those who have nothing to lose — the very old, the safely retired, the eccentric and the freakish. The last two categories are beset with personality problems that severely limit success in any form of human endeavor. Such people have little or nothing to lose by making life even harder for themselves.

A cause without a leadership is hardly a cause at all. Shakespeare wrote, "A little snow, tumbled about, anon becomes a mountain." Today in America there is not one single public figure with sufficient courage to start the snowball rolling.

As long as the best Majority types are well fed and able to provide handsomely for themselves and families, they are not in the mood to take risks. There is also the question of the first move. No one likes to be first when it means he may also be the first to go broke, the first to be humiliated or framed, the first to be jailed or assassinated.

Unfortunately, what needs to be done to revive and regenerate the American Majority may often involve measures and acts which, though quite legal in the eyes of the Constitution and the common law, will be made to appear illegal by a defamatory press. A comfortably situated, properly adjusted Majority husband making \$25,000 a year and supporting a fairly goodlooking wife and two fairly decent children in a technological marvel of a house does not relish the prospect of being branded a criminal. No matter how hypocritical he must act in his business, no matter how often he must swallow his pride, no matter how frequently he is mugged, no matter how badly he and his fellow Majority members are libelled and lied about each morning in the *New York Times*, each evening in the CBS news and each week in *Time* magazine, he will hold his tongue. He may even vote for Henry Kissinger for president, when and if the necessary Constitutional amendment is passed. Who but the purist, the idealist or the romanticist can really blame him?

Let us look at the situation from the perspective of the latest findings of the ethologists, whose consuming interest in

animal behavior is only a mask for their concern for human behavior. The four basic life-supporting human drives, according to Nobel laureate Konrad Lorenz, are hunger, sexuality, flight and aggression.

As regards the successful Majority member, the first two of these drives, hunger and sexuality, are not exactly in a state of mortification. As for flight, it would seem there is no contemporary concatenation of events to trigger any mass display of such behavior. No foreign armies are landing on American soil. No foreign soldiers are requisitioning our homes, raping our daughters or relieving us of our most valuable possessions. We have, accordingly, no compelling reason to run.

On second thought, however, we are being robbed, more and more of us every day. We are being assaulted, both on the streets and in our homes, more often every day. Our daughters and wives are being raped, not all of them, or even a considerable portion of them, but rape is increasing faster than any other violent crime. Thus we have taken to flight, more and more of us every day, from the cities to the suburbs close to the cities, then to the further suburbs and now even to what is known as the rural ring.

When we turn our thoughts to aggression, the last, and perhaps the most important, of the "big four" instinctual drives, we should consider how we take it out on sports, either in front of the TV tube or by the more perspiring form of direct participation. We must not forget that we compete every business day in the economic area, that we spank our children and scream at our wives, that we get an additional daily dose of catharsis from the TV news and crime serials. Last, but by no means least, every ten years or so we rush into war.

According to the ethologists, man only gets his hackles up when his innate life-supporting mechanisms cannot be released. The cat who after months of stalking about the house cannot find a single mouse finally leaps up in the air in a *Leerlauf*, a fruitless pounce on a nonexistent prey. As yet,

few Majority members have been leerlaufing.

There are, of course, many things going on which will inevitably elicit aggressive behavior from Majority members, no matter what their rank. Minority males are in fact taking quite a few of our handsomest females (women, as is their habit, gravitating in the direction of power). Exponential inflation, when it comes, as it is bound to come, will produce hunger pains, which will pump some extra adrenaline into the Majority bloodstream. The soothing process of flight will sooner or later have to come to an end as the muggers, rapists and guerrillas corner the Majority in its last redoubts. And as the stimuli to aggression multiply, sports, TV and even a made-to-order war may be insufficient to appease the internal aggressive buildup.

Unfortunately, nothing of any consequence will be done to reverse the Majority's dispossession, until things get so bad that the superior Majority member is actually encouraged to take the irreversible leap into disrespectability, his initiation fee for joining the counter-revolution. While the tradition of American liberalism and the all-powerful surge of minority propaganda numb and immobilize the Majority mind, the life-supporting drives of the ethologists are still being maintained at a level that precludes any violent reaction.

Culturally the average Majority member is already little better off than a serf. Like the media, the arts have not only fallen into the hands of the minorities, but in many cases are now being used as weapons to dampen even the faintest flickering of Majority solidarity. Nevertheless, many cultural residues of Western man still persist in the privacy of most American homes, when the TV is turned off and the newspapers are thrown in the garbage. Even so, cultural oppression by itself has never cocked a pistol. Besides, the Majority's enemies are clever enough to preserve many of the forms of Western culture, while perverting and destroying the content.

We may expect to see more and more books, paintings, plays and movies debasing the American of Northern

European descent. We may expect to see the Negro, the Indian and the Jew continue to be apotheosized. We may expect to see our sons' extinction in wars and our genetic resources watered down by miscegenation and high minority birthrates.

We will see all of this happen – and worse – and still we will do nothing.

But one day, perhaps in five years, perhaps in fifty, the Majority's decline will be pushed a little too far and a little too fast. Something will finally snap in the neuron network of some talented Majority politician. For the first time a Majority member with brains, character and ambition will divert his life-supporting drives to his race rather than to his career. From then on the Majority curve will point up. The termite will then have to think seriously about moving to another mound and the fungus to another tree.

It will be a great day. Sad to say, those of us who most look forward to it, who most deserve to see it, won't be around. But our sons and our grandsons will – and they will justify the lives we led in the shadows by redeeming their lives in the sun.

NATION EUROPA, GERMANY'S MOST OBJECTIVE MONTHLY MAGAZINE, WAS KIND ENOUGH TO RUN A FAVORABLE REVIEW OF *THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY*, AS WELL AS A TRANSLATION OF THE ENTIRE LAST CHAPTER, IN ITS OCTOBER 1972 ISSUE. A FEW MONTHS LATER THE MAGAZINE PUBLISHED A LETTER FROM PAUL VAN TIENEN, A DUTCH READER LIVING IN SPAIN. MR. VAN TIENEN, WHO WAS WOUNDED BY AN AMERICAN TANK IN RUSSIA WHILE SERVING WITH HITLER'S INVASION FORCES, ASSERTED THAT THE AUTHOR'S PROPOSED WORLDWIDE CONFEDERATION OF NORTHERN EUROPEAN PEOPLES POSED A DANGER TO EUROPEAN UNITY BY EXCLUDING THE INHABITANTS OF LATIN EUROPE. THE FOLLOWING IS THE AUTHOR'S REPLY TO MR. VAN TIENEN AND SOME REMARKS ON AN ANSWERING LETTER FROM SPAIN.

Chapter Ten

WORDS ACROSS THE SEA

“The basic problem facing a European racial federation is one of morale and team spirit. While the white race may be too broad a qualification for an effective European racial team, Northern European may be too narrow. In the U.S. the term “white” incorporates certain minority elements who are most opposed to any manifestation of white racial unity. Needless to say, it is fairly dangerous to include members of the opposing team on your own. In America this danger can be avoided by building up the racial awareness of the American Majority, the U.S. *Staatsvolk*, which is preponderantly Nordic and Nordic-Alpine in composition. Numerically there are not enough Mediterraneans in the U.S. to offer any effective resistance to this kind of racial appeal.

“What I am really saying is that when it comes to racial myths the Nordic or Northern European myth may very well prove to be a more effective weapon of survival than the more generalized Indo-European or Aryan myth. This should certainly be true in the U.S. which, according to anthropologist Carleton Coon, contains the “world’s largest reservoir of Nordic genes.” As for the divisive effect of accenting the Nordic in a world where Nordics are in increasingly short supply, we have not too long ago seen the phenomenon of non-Nordics becoming more ardent boosters of Nordicism than Nordics themselves. Certainly there were just as many Alberichs as Siegfrieds in the Hitler movement.

“In the last chapter of *The Dispossessed Majority*, I indulge in the utopian vision of an international confederacy of Northern European peoples as a framework for a resurrected and regenerated Western civilization. It is, Mr. van Tienen, as you ironically suggest, easier for an American to

have such fancies than a European. We are more accustomed to the color problem and have been gifted with a sharper eye for pigmentation differences. I believe you err, however, when you infer that, because the average American white looks upon Latin immigrants as unassimilable and "foreign," we carry this prejudice over to the Latin countries of Europe. The swarm of American tourists who visit Spain, Southern France, Southern Italy and Greece each year help to contradict such a thesis.

"Also, you seem to cling to the assumption that *The Dispossessed Majority* classifies all Americans of French and Italian descent as unassimilable. Actually, the Huguenots who came from Bourbon France have been completely assimilated, and the French-Canadian element has been defined as assimilable. In regard to Italian immigrants Italy, as you must be well aware, is a biracial country--Alpine in the north and Mediterranean in the south. Twenty percent of America's Italian immigration came from Northern Italy and consequently is either assimilated or assimilable. It is the Southern Italian with his olive skin, black hair and burnt-cork eyes who poses an almost insuperable problem for assimilation in a color-conscious country.

"The one serious objection I have to your letter is your prediction that in thirty years America will have a black president. As the legal precedents for America's traditional apartheid break down under liberal-minority pressure, the races, both in the North and the South, are now being thrown into social contact with each other. The result has been an increase in race-mixing. But a more important result has been a surge of hatred for the Negro on the part of almost all strata of the white population. This hatred hardly existed a half century ago. In other words, America is now entering a period of racial stratification which far exceeds that of earlier periods in the country's history. The heyday of miscegenation is not the present. It was in the antebellum South, when white masters cohabited so routinely with their female slaves. This statement is supported by the 1972

presidential election, when an unpopular Republican president won a sweeping reelection victory over the candidate of a much larger political party. The Nixon landslide was due in part to the fact that the Democratic presidential nominee was considered the candidate of the blacks.

“I don’t know, Mr. van Tienen, if you are a gambler. If you are, I will give you \$100 for every year there is a black president in America if you will send me \$1 for every year there is a white president. I would, however, not make such a liberal offer in regard to the presidency of one or two Latin countries in Europe.”

* * * * *

Later Mr. van Tienen wrote an urbane reply to the above communication. He declined the bet, saying that when he was in his grave he would have no need of dollars, even if by then they had regained some of their lost value. He reiterated his deep concern for European unity and his fear that any brash remarks in favor of a Northern European hegemony might alienate Southern Europeans.

It is the author’s sincere conviction that if the Italians or any other Mediterranean population in Europe are offended by the idea of a Northern European confederation, there is nothing they would do or could do about it. The Spaniards, who have more successfully resisted the general decadence afflicting the West than any other country, have not won a war against a European nation since they repulsed Napoleon’s legions and could hardly provide any serious resistance to continental unification under the auspices of Northern Europeans. Mr. van Tienen might recall the calculated pacifism of Spain during World War II, when Franco refused to join the allies who had made his victory possible. We will not speak of Italy’s behavior in two successive World Wars, except to say that it is much wiser in any kind of confrontation to have Italy as an enemy rather than a friend.

Mr. van Tienen went on to exclaim that he was sorry Europeans had ever discovered America, because the opening up of a new continent drained off energies that could have been more profitably expended on the strengthening of Europe. This feeling is quite understandable. But let us suppose that the Santa Maria, Golden Hind or Mayflower had never headed across the Atlantic. Today, the North American continent might be a Japanese colony or an extension of Siberia. The Russians, it should not be forgotten, had a settlement about 50 miles north of San Francisco in the middle of the 19th century.

America's misconceived intervention in European affairs has only been one of many, many disasters to European growth and unity. More disastrous has been the 800-year-old balance of power policy that was not abandoned by Britain until after World War II. Equally gruesome were the murderous religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries. But worst of all has been, and still is, the inherent propensity of the Teutonic peoples to take as much delight and interest in killing fellow Teutons as non-Teutons.

The greatest triumph of man — bar none — has been the moon walk, which was the direct result of a strictly German-American partnership. Even greater triumphs may be ahead of us if this partnership can be developed in other than scientific areas. European unity will not be easily achieved in a world of superpowers, rampant Zionism and Soviet and Chinese imperialism unless it has the support of a regenerated America, racially attuned to the hopes and ideas of its English and German racial cousins. Only a revived Northern European race consciousness will end the internal menace of the dark white and colored peoples, both in America and Europe. Moreover, there are Northern Europeans in Russia who feel a greater emotional and intellectual pull to Europe than to Panslavism or Asia. It is not inconceivable that some day the best racial elements in Russia will join the best racial elements in Europe and America to create an advanced society that would do much more for evolution than any

number of European unions based on geography and nationality.

In speaking of America, Mr. van Tienen should recall that in both World Wars, particularly in the latter, Americans were overwhelmingly against intervention even on the eve of the attack on Pearl Harbor. It is true that Franklin Roosevelt and his high finance camorra of Jews and bought Wasps wanted us in the war from the start. But they were never able to pry a declaration of war out of Congress — despite Hitler's takeover of Czechoslovakia, which destroyed the moral argument of America's non-interventionists. If Hitler had renounced his pact with Japan, when it refused to attack Russia from the east in 1941, the U.S. would not have entered the European war for years, if ever. But Hitler did not think racially, at least in regard to his Japanese alliance. As the self-proclaimed defender of the white race, he should have been realistic enough to know who was running America and England, and therefore should not have given these gentlemen the opportunity to destroy him. It may be apocryphal, but it is said that Roosevelt opened up a magnum of champagne and happily toasted the Mikado and Hitler the moment he heard about the bombs raining on Pearl Harbor. This event, followed by Germany's insane declaration of war against the U.S., was the unique opportunity that the world anti-Nazi movement had been waiting for.

We in America tried our best to keep out of European affairs, but we were overpowered by the same liberal-minority coalition which has overpowered so much of Europe for so much of the 20th century. Hitler tried to establish German racial hegemony in Europe. He failed, and his failure was shattering to Northern Europeans, both in Europe and America, whose destinies are now in a more precarious situation than ever. If the race is to be saved, the main impetus will now have to come from America. In spite of, or perhaps because of, the ever more serious racial agitation in the U.S., the American Majority may be the branch of the Northern European peoples that will be forced

out of its lethargy and compelled for the sake of sheer survival to take the necessary measures that will end the political, economic and social decline of the race as a whole.

Mr. van Tienen is very pessimistic about the American future and predicts a series of murderous race wars between whites and blacks, with most of the Old World nations, both white and nonwhite, not only taking the side of the blacks, but actually using their navies and merchant marines to transport Negroes from Africa to support the black armies ravaging America. He said that when this happens he would be one of the few Europeans who would volunteer to join the white forces in America, even if he had to arrive on crutches.

Mr. van Tienen proposed an alternative to the race war. He suggested America trade its 22,000,000 Negroes for the 3,500,000 South African whites. He admitted that such a mass population transfer would not be remotely acceptable at the present time. But he did explain that if the South Africans reached a stage where their backs were against the wall as a result of an armed invasion to make Africa safe for "black democracy" and, if at the same time a temporary stalemate developed in the race wars he envisions for America, both American blacks and South African whites would then be more amenable to the suggestion.

There is no question that the U.S. would greatly benefit from trading its Negroes for South African whites. Right now, however, the idea is totally contrary to the present U.S. immigration pattern, which is heavily weighted in favor of every color of the racial spectrum but white, and now indirectly discriminates against the overseas members of the race of America's Founding Fathers. It is quite probable that many South African whites would much prefer to die in defense of their country than opt for a diaspora. But if it were a question of being thrown into the sea or going to America, South Africans might decide, like the Jews of old, that physical survival was preferable to the territorial imperative.

ALL GREAT NATIONS HAVING SUCCUMBED TO DICTATORIAL RULE AT ONE TIME OR ANOTHER, IT MIGHT BE INTERESTING TO SPECULATE ON THE KIND OF DICTATOR FATE HAS IN STORE FOR AMERICA.

THE FOLLOWING IS A COLLECTION OF MINI-PROFILES OF THE BETTER-KNOWN MODERN DICTATORS, PLUS SOME EXPANDED COMMENTS ON THE AUTHOR'S FAVORITE.

IF KEMAL ATATURK WERE AROUND TODAY, IT IS DOUBTFUL HE WOULD HAVE ORDERED THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS. TO HIM MEN CAME BEFORE GEOGRAPHY AND LAND WAS ONLY AS GOOD AS THE PEOPLE WHO LIVED ON IT. HE ABHORRED THE DEMOGRAPHIC MISHMASH THAT MAKES UP THE POPULATION OF SO MANY MODERN COUNTRIES.

KEMAL LOVED THE TURKISH MINORITY ON CYPRUS. BUT HE WOULD HAVE PREFERRED ITS MEMBERS BACK IN TURKEY. HE DID NOT BELIEVE IN THE KIND OF TERRITORIAL EXPANSION THAT INTRODUCES FOREIGN ANTIBODIES INTO THE NATIONAL BLOODSTREAM.

Chapter Eleven

HOMAGE TO KEMAL ATATURK

If some all-knowing, extraterrestrial school teacher sent out report cards on all the dictators who have flourished since World War I, we might be surprised to find the only one with straight A's was a man most of the Western world has already half forgotten. I am referring to Kemal Ataturk, the fair-haired, blue-eyed Macedonian who transformed the Ottoman Empire (for centuries the "sick man" of Europe) into the streamlined modern state of Turkey, the strongest nation in the Middle East.

How a dictator dies is not necessarily an indication of his overall success or failure. But it might be instructive to compare Kemal's death with, say, Mussolini's. Kemal died in a bed — a saint — and his sainthood, along with the more mundane aspects of his reputation, actually increased after his death. Mussolini ended his career upside down in a Milan square, with his battered mistress flapping beside him like laundry hanging out to dry. It was not an edifying spectacle. But fate has never treated political clowns kindly, even when they pretend to be a reincarnation of Caesar. There hasn't been a Roman in Italy for 1600 years. The Duce was an antiquarian who got away with murder, until he himself was done in.

Hitler went out in a manner appropriate to a Wagner lover. It was such a dramatic exit that some of his disciples now compare it to Calvary and are sanguine enough to hope it will trigger a new religious movement. In this world, however, Hitler accomplished almost the opposite of what he set out to do. His country is now partitioned and a hostage to the whims of a few Washington and Kremlin bureaucrats. Jews, whose power he hoped to defuse, are riding higher than ever

before. The economic miracle we hear so much about could be ended in one second by a few H-bombs from the bulging Russian nuclear arsenal.

Tito, who has been in the saddle longer than any other dictator except Franco, is a national communist, who came up through the party ranks. Since Yugoslavia has no land frontier with Russia, he was in the particularly fortunate position of being able to secede from the Comintern without provoking direct Russian intervention or succumbing to the purges that Stalin visited on most Red satellite leaders. In the late December of his years, Tito is running afoul of the national and racial divisions that have bedeviled and presumably always will bedevil the artificial Yugoslavian state. A Croat, Tito has ended up a quasi-Serb, just as Stalin, a Georgian, became a quasi-Great Russian. Both of them deserted their own minorities to build a firmer power base on their nation's majority.

Stalin, who supposedly died of a stroke, has probably exerted more influence on world history than any other dictator on our list, despite the fact he was not a creative statesman, but the product of an ideological machine. He forced massive industrialization on Russia, the secret of his country's survival, though his supine appeasement of Hitler in 1939-41 almost brought Russia to the wall. As it was, 40,000,000 Russians civilians died in slave labor camps for resisting Stalin's will and 20,000,000 Russian soldiers died; at least half of them needlessly, as the result of his failure to divine Hitler's true intentions. Incredibly, Hitler seemed to be the only national leader Stalin ever trusted.

Mao Tse-tung may go down as a greater dictator than Stalin because he was Lenin and Stalin wrapped up in one. At this moment, he seems scheduled for a peaceful death with all his enemies neatly disposed of. As the absolute ruler of the world's most populous nation and the champion of the East Asian masses against the white interlopers, whom he has now expelled along with his rival, Chiang Kai-shek, he has good reason to be proud of his accomplishments. But he

originally hitched his wagon to a Red Star and, his anti-Western paranoia to the contrary, relied on the apocalyptic manifestoes of a Western Jew to claw his way to Party bossdom.

Another dictator ready for a quiet demise is General Franco, a straightforward, high-buttoned general who had few ideas, but was the rare Spaniard with a penchant for law and order. He would not have won his war without Hitler's and Mussolini's help, which he ungratefully rewarded with neutrality in World War II.

Juan Peron, another Spanish-speaking totalitarian, died recently while in his second term of dictatorship. A ghost of his former self in his last fling at power, he bore some slight comparison to Marshal Petain, who was more of a symbol than a leader of the French interregnum (1940-44). Fidel Castro, who is very close to being a Cuban edition of Mussolini, was first the darling of the American liberal media and then managed to enlist the aid of the Russians. He will remain a dictator just as long as he can find some outside superpower to prop him up – and no longer. The Portuguese dictator Salazar was a professorial type who tried to save the last white colonial empire. He was failing when he died and the failure became official when his successor Caetano was exiled to Brazil in 1974, as Portugal dissolved into chaos.

Compared to all the above, Kemal Ataturk stands out like a statute of Praxiteles at an exposition of modern art. He was the general who punctured Churchill's asinine seaborne invasion to capture the Dardanelles, which piled so many Australian bodies on the beaches of Gallipoli in World War I. He did not, like Hitler, bite off more than he could chew, or suffer from the territorial itch that obsessed Stalin. He bit off less than he could chew. He was a retractor, not an expander of frontiers, giving up vast amounts of the Ottoman Empire to non-Turks. He did, however, cling violently to the old Turkish heartland of Anatolia and cleansed its western end of Greeks and its eastern end of Armenians.

He swept away the cultural cobwebs of the fez, the

beautiful but unwieldy Arabic script and lifted up the oppressed peasantry a few notches. He moved the Turkish capital from the corrupt cosmopolitanism of Constantinople to Ankara, which he found a village and left a modern city. His attitude toward Russia was correct and firm, in spite of intense Bolshevik pressure, and it did not take him long to make Turkey a respected member of the comity of nations. When one of Turkey's most influential financial experts, a Jew named Javid, tried to sabotage him, he had him hanged, after turning a deaf ear to howls of protest from the world Jewish community and the truckling media.

Kemal seldom indulged in the ideological crusades which have torn out the vitals of so many modern nations. He believed that a small homogeneous state is greater, stronger and healthier than overextended, heterogeneous empires which seek to expand or hold on to far-flung frontiers, while the home front collapses into dissension, inflation, crime and insurrection. He rebuilt the Turkish army by restricting its ranks to Turks. History and personal experience had taught him that the armies of racially mixed world states are just as likely to turn their weapons against each other as against the enemy — something that recent naval mutinies and officer killings in Vietnam have taught Americans. He knew that race was a principal wellspring of human behavior and supported the dubious theory that Turks were descendants of a prehistoric Aryan race.

The odds are great that every nation will have one or more dictators during its existence. Even England had its Cromwell. When it is America's time to go totalitarian, we should pray that we get a Kemal, who was more aware than any other great public figure of modern times that national resurrection depends first and foremost on the distillation process of racial separation.

THERE ARE MANY DIVISIONS IN NATURE AND IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURES THAT MAN HAS BUILT ON TOP OF NATURE. SEX, AGE, RACE, CLASS, NATION AND PARTY ARE AMONG THE MAJOR CATEGORIES THAT MILITATE AGAINST HUMAN SAMENESS AND THAT PUT UP THE BEST DELAYING ACTION AGAINST THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS WHICH POINTS TO OUR INEVITABLE DISSOLUTION IN A UNIVERSAL MELTING POT.

INSTEAD OF BEING PLEASED WITH THE VARIETY AND BEAUTY OF THE HUMAN CONDITION (SINCE IT IS BASED ON COMPARISON BEAUTY IS IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT VARIETY), THE EGGHEADS WHO DO OUR THINKING FOR US SEEM TO FEEL THERE IS SOMETHING EVIL ABOUT DIFFERENCE, AND CONSEQUENTLY SOMETHING GOOD ABOUT UNIFORMITY.

HORRIBLE AS IT MAY BE, WE HAVE BEEN SO BRAINWASHED WE CAN ACTUALLY ENVISION A MONORACIAL, ONE-CLASS, ONE-PARTY "ONE WORLD" OF PROLETARIAN DRONES. BUT WE CANNOT IMAGINE A UNISEX WORLD, THE OUTLINES OF WHICH ARE NOW BEING FOISTED ON US BY THE WITCHES, BITCHES AND DYKES WHO DREAMED UP THE WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT.

Chapter Twelve

A SECOND LIFE FOR WOMEN

Didn't it start with Eve who was tired of the idyll in Eden? She had no children to feed, no floors to sweep, no meals to cook, but something was bothering her. Perhaps her instincts were at variance with her mode of life. As the biologists say, ninety-nine percent of her species' history — her one million pre-Edenic years — had been spent stoking speluncar fires, gathering wild grains and berries, and bringing up her brood while her hunter mate was off spearing mammoths. With such a genealogy, Eve was not programmed to resist the apple. Modern woman, again out of her element, is again being tempted, this time by the serpentine oratory of Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem.

Today the apple is called women's lib. Liberation from what? From the female burdens of life? Liberation into what? Into the male burdens? The feminists seem to be saying that the office, where woman is at the mercy of a dictating male dictatorship, is better than the kitchen, where she is the unchallenged mistress of her pots and pans.

Those who like to tinker with other peoples' civilizations are very handy with wedges. They split us into classes. They invent the generation gap. Now they pit the sexes against each other in the hope of turning a very cold war into a hot one. Ms. Friedan and Ms. Steinem, having sprung from a race that has always treated its women like serfs, are now lecturing American women about their rights. While Steinem's and Friedan's ancestresses were ostracized each month during their days of "uncleanness," a custom still observed by many orthodox Jewish families, Northern European women were enjoying liberties which, according to Tacitus, were the envy of the richest and most "liberated"

Roman matrons. The dictum that men should rule over women was given divine sanction in the Semitic Near East (Genesis 3:16).

What we should be talking about is adaptation, not liberation. Both sexes need to tune their attitudes and aptitudes to the revolutionary new rhythms of modern technology. It is a truism that a male should not be paid more than a female for doing the same job. What is more unjust is that the different talents and capacities of women and men should have to converge on the same occupations. How can both sexes be equally qualified for jobs conceived and institutionalized by men?

It is a proven fact in politics that women are more likely to vote for men than for women. Is this because of an innate female suspicion of other females, or because politics is recognized by both sexes as a man's game, or because females have not yet invented a female politics? We hope it is the last. We also hope that the day will come when women will do the legislating, administering and adjudicating for matters that pertain exclusively to women. Who knows the wherefor of female behavior and the whereto of female aspirations better than the female?

Familial love, the code of amity, the maternal impulse—these are the instinctual underpinnings that have made the home and humanity possible. Extended to the world at large, they often produce surprisingly different effects. Universal love encourages oppressors to do their worst. Universal forgiveness keeps the habitual criminal out of jail, so he can keep compounding his wrongdoing. Humanitarianism within the group is a constructive bond that increases the chance of survival. But when politicians and diplomats start appealing to it, how many crimes are committed in its name.

An American historian had this to say about women:

“I insist that society, as an organism, has little or no interest in woman's reason, but its very existence is

bound up in her instincts. Intellectually, woman's reason has been a matter of indifference to men. As an intellectual competitor she has never been formidable; but maternity is a monopoly. It is the **passionate** instinct which is the cause and the effect of maternity, and which enables women to serve their great purpose as the cement of society. As an intellectual being, as the modern feminist would make her, she has only the importance of a degraded boy, though she is far more dangerous to society than such a boy. . . .The advanced feminist claims for the woman the right to develop herself according to her own will. She may decline to bear children or, if she consents, she is to bear them to whom she may choose. Such conditions, if carried out logically, must create chaos."

The above was written by Brooks Adams of the patrician Adams family, who might be fairly described as a turn-of-the-century patriarch. There is some truth in his words, some half truths, and some ideology that totally misses the mark. Obviously if too many women decide not to bear children or to bear the children of motley fathers, the race is in trouble. They are giving up the crux of their womanhood, a quasi-suicide actually recommended by feminists who claim they have woman's best interests at heart.

Now let us hear from an American woman who was born a few decades after Brooks Adams' death:

"I am not for women's lib if this means dumping children unceremoniously in child care centers while mothers play at business. The rearing of children is a task so physically and mentally draining that each child demands a woman's fulltime capabilities for six or seven years. Admittedly the maternal instinct weakens as the child grows older. It is not that the mother no longer loves her offspring. It is simply that her primary job of

feeding, caring and educating is less time-consuming as the children become more self-sufficient. During almost all of human history mothers died young after giving birth to a multitude of offspring. Now with their health and energy intact and their child-bearing mission completed, they find themselves locked into a daily household drudgery that is always unpaid and generally unappreciated. Only a small amount of caretaking is necessary for children who have reached the second or third grade in school. Soap operas, card parties and PTA meetings are not enough — and should not be enough — to fill in the empty spaces. These long, mindless, purposeless voids are a prime cause of divorce, alcoholism and other serious emotional dislocations.

“Modern woman can perform her primary biological function of race duplication as well as ancient woman. But she has the time, the will and the ability to do something more. This is what women’s liberation should be about. Woman does not want to push her way into the man’s world. She wants to build her own. If there is any competition, it will only be with herself. And the Majority woman has no feeling of hatred for the opposite sex, no desire for revenge for mistreatment over the centuries. If Ms. Steinem must get even with men, let her get even with her own men, who may deserve it.”

To the above the intelligent and well-meaning Majority male must say amen. But let’s not let it rest there. Let’s indulge for a moment in the annoying male habit of reducing everything to systems and timetables to see how we can concretize the needs and desires of present-day women before they once again, like Eve, get all of us into fearful difficulties.

We might first note that the life expectancy of the average Northern European woman, whether in the Old World or New, is now 75 and rising. If the Western mother would have

her first child at 20 and space the others (hopefully not more than two others in this overcrowding planet) two years apart, she would have her third child at 24 and would be 32 when her youngest child was in the second or third grade. Simple arithmetic demonstrates that at the precise time motherhood is no longer a round-the-clock operation the average Majority housewife has 43 years to live.

The parttime mother can spend these years, as many mothers do, as a prisoner serving a long sentence or she can treat them as stepping stones to an exciting new rebirth in which the mind takes over from the womb. If, for example, the 32-year-old woman decides to go to college she would get her Bachelor's Degree at 36, her Master's at 37 or 38, her degree in law or medicine or her Ph.D. at 40. She could then pursue an active career for 25 years before retiring or for 35 years if she did not wish to retire. If her nesting instinct is still throwing its weight around, she could convert her home from a claustrophobic sinkhole of frustration into a studio, a study center, a workshop or even a cottage industry.

The schedule we have drawn up is obviously not inflexible. It can be advanced or retarded by several years for women who wish fewer children or wish to space them further apart. The basic idea, however, is for women to have children earlier rather than later, so as not to interrupt or delay their post-motherhood career. Before the children arrive, the young woman's education should be aimed at acquiring as much of the race's cultural legacy as possible, which she in turn is duty bound to pass on to her offspring. It would also help to attend courses where she could learn the theoretical ropes of childbearing and child rearing. But the science of homemaking is best learned at home.

Thanks largely to medical science, worksaving appliances and other technological wonders of modern living, which have so dramatically increased her life span and so drastically minimized her household chores, the Western world has now become the woman's oyster. For the first time women are able to sublimate their instincts, their brains and their

experience into a productive existence that goes far beyond the narrow confines of the home. The knowledge they absorb so rapidly, when ripened into fruitful understanding, can be dispensed to the community in such a way that both the givers and takers will benefit enormously. The woman doctor can concentrate in the areas of childbirth, child health and female medicine. The woman lawyer can become expert in those legal matters which have to do with the distaff side of life. The woman in government can exercise her talents on behalf of her vast female constituency, which often requires and deserves its own legislation.

What all this adds up to is a second life for women, made possible by the metamorphosis of woman as childbearer into woman as human being. Dubious as it may seem to many males — and to many females as well — woman is now in a position to create a vast new stratum of civilization without sacrificing one ounce of femininity. In fact she will become more feminine as she reaches out and stamps her original and distinctive imprint on every level of cultural activity.

This is not to imply that females are going to take over the Pentagon, the Yankee Stadium or the pages of *Poor's Directory of Directors*. Women will never succeed as women by keeping men from succeeding as men, which means they must never forget that males are thoroughly permeated or, if you will, damned with the aggressive instinct. When they are not allowed to let off steam in their natural work habitat, they will find outlets in violence. In other words, where women enter business and the professions they should select enterprises and fields of endeavor suited to women's interests and needs. Men, of course, should be driven out of the woman's world, where they have never felt comfortable. But the authentic world of men must remain inviolate.

If after enough time has passed it can be shown empirically that women cannot measure up to the possibilities offered by their second life, the flow of civilization can easily be redirected into traditional and patriarchal channels. But if they do measure up, what a wealth of magnificent color and

variety a freewheeling femininity would introduce into a society ever more conformist, ever more unisexual and ever more drab!

Men and women are a double star, divided but indissolubly joined. They each light up the other. The more light each radiates, the more each basks in reflected glory.

FOR GOOD OR EVIL THE SPECTER OF MORALITY HANGS HEAVY OVER THE MINDS AND ACTIVITIES OF MEN, MOST EMPHATICALLY OVER 20TH CENTURY WESTERN MAN. MORAL ARGUMENTS, OFTEN WITHOUT ANY FACTUAL SUBSTANCE, CAN STILL MAKE MINCEMEAT OUT OF REASON. WHEN IT COMES TO THE ULTIMATE DECISIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC WORLD, WHAT IS RIGHT ALMOST ALWAYS YIELDS TO WHAT IS MORALLY RIGHT, ALTHOUGH, AS ANY KEEN OBSERVER KNOWS, THE TWO ARE OFTEN POLES APART. IN FACT, IN RECENT YEARS THE MORALITY OF THE MEDIA HAS, MORE OFTEN THAN NOT, BEEN A CAMOUFLAGE FOR THE RANKEST IMMORALITY.

IT IS GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD THAT ANYONE, NO MATTER HOW PURE HIS INCENTIVES OR SPOTLESS HIS PERSONAL HISTORY, WHO MAKES ANY PUBLIC EXPRESSION THAT CAN BE INTERPRETED AS FAVORING A HEREDITARIAN OR ANTI-EQUALITARIAN VIEWPOINT IS AUTOMATICALLY LABELLED A RACIST. SINCE RACISTS ARE CONSIDERED IMMORAL, THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN RACE AND ARE WILLING TO BACK UP THEIR BELIEFS IN PUBLIC MUST GO THROUGH LIFE WITH AN INTOLERABLE STIGMA, AS MUST THOSE WHO GIVE THEM A FAIR HEARING. WHO WILL LISTEN TO AN IMMORALIST? ONLY THOSE WHO ARE THEMSELVES IMMORAL. IN SUCH A HOSTILE INTELLECTUAL CLIMATE THE NUMBER OF POLITICIANS OR INTELLECTUALS WHO LEND ANY OPEN CREDENCE TO RACE IS AS SMALL AS THEIR AUDIENCE.

CURRENT MORALITY BEING CLOSELY LINKED TO POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY GROUPS, IF IT CAN BE SHOWN THAT

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF RACE THEORY WILL INCREASE SUCH OPPORTUNITIES, THEN RACE ITSELF HAS A CHANCE OF BECOMING MORAL. IF, MOREOVER, IT CAN BE PROVED THAT TANGIBLE ADVANTAGES FOR MINORITIES WILL COME FROM RACIAL SEPARATION, THEN INTEGRATIONISTS AND EQUALITARIANS WILL HAVE A MUCH HARDER TIME DUCKING THE ETHNIC ISSUE BY TURNING IT INTO AN ETHICAL ISSUE.

Chapter Thirteen

THE UTOPIAN STATES OF AMERICA

Utopias, whether formal literary exercises or mere Gedankenexperiments, are little more than sounding boards for the philosophical, political and economic predilections of their authors. Generally speaking, they are based on the age-old environmentalist fallacy that institutions make men, not the other way around.

To avoid this Pavlovian dead end, this Skinner box in which humans can supposedly be conditioned as easily as rats, utopists should begin to put men before things. They might open their minds to the possibility that, when the chips of life are down, the organic inevitably outweighs the inorganic.

It is a woeful waste of mental power to draw blueprints for artificial commonwealths, while ignoring the biological makeup of their inhabitants. Any utopia worth its salt should concentrate on ideal men rather than on ideal states, for the simple reason that the latter are not possible without the former.

First things should come first, even in the rarefied and inductive perfection of Plato's *Republic*, Bacon's *New Atlantis* and Thomas More's literary "Nowhere," which introduced utopia into the language. Nature should come before nurture, biology before theology, genetics before cybernetics. To show us how to go about building a utopian race, we have as a model the time-tested process of human evolution. If we are to improve on mankind, we could not do better than study nature's evolutionary program. Darwin, his 19th and 20th century disciples and the modern school of behavioral genetics have made evolutionary dynamics into a science that only religious fundamentalists and Marxists are

willing to challenge.

Life forms progress from the simple to the complex by the slow accumulation of mutations beneficial to survival. In the case of primates these mutations raised man from the simian to the *sapiens* level chiefly by expanding the size and complexity of his brain. It is to be hoped that evolution has not come to an end with this giant step and that some human beings have as good a chance to evolve into a higher species as the Pleistocene ape had to graduate into the modern Northern European.

One of the great tasks confronting us is to determine the type of social organization most conducive to evolution.

If any single individual should be given a copyright on a biological utopia, it is British anthropologist Sir Arthur Keith (1866-1953). It was Keith who first investigated what he called the basic evolutionary unit, which in the early days of mankind often consisted of hunting bands of no more than fifty adults and children, occupying an area of some 400 square miles. These minuscule groups later expanded into tribes of 7,500 to 30,000 members. Only relatively recently have tribes coalesced into independent states or nations, a development which seems to have put a damper on evolutionary activity.

By far the greatest and most eventful part of human evolution has taken place in Keith's 50-member clans, which spread over much of the earth by a process similar to cell mitosis. Whenever the hunting group grew too large for its original territory, part of it would spin off and establish itself in a new territory. The advent of agriculture made it possible for the hunting preserve to support ten or twenty times its normal population.

Production (of new heritable traits), competition and selection are the three *sine qua nons* of evolution. They are all present and active in Keith's small hunting bands and to a lesser extent in the tribe. Small, isolated human groups are always under the strong and relentless pressure of genetic drift, and over a period of time the members of these groups

develop physical and mental traits which are not only advantageous to survival but which set them apart from other groups. Selection operates most successfully when the possessors of beneficial mutations unite to produce offspring that have a better chance of survival than the offspring of those not endowed with such mutations. The better adapted will eventually crowd out the less adapted by having more children, by living longer and by occupying and successfully defending the richer hunting grounds or farmlands.

In a small endogamous group, whose members are already endowed with superior genes, beneficial mutations can quickly take hold in the common gene pool. In bigger and more heterogeneous societies such mutations have greater difficulty in surviving. They have to penetrate a much more extensive and more diffuse genetic matrix. In such cases, the chances are the beneficial mutations will be swamped before they can get established. It is the difference between throwing a good seed into the wind and planting it in the garden where it originated.

The modern nation, needless to say, offers fewer advantages for evolutionary activity than the tribe or hunting band. Selection is more difficult because modern medical technology may actually conceal or camouflage gross physical defects. The overwhelming number of mutations are deleterious to survival, not advantageous, and in the past nature simply winnowed out those who possessed them. Today the new wonder drugs and the new discoveries of medical science actually facilitate the proliferation of genetic defects. Also, equalitarian and liberal ideology tends to discourage selection in the hope of reducing everyone to a common racial denominator, thereby violating the basic axiom that variation among groups speeds evolution.

Finally, until the modern age, competition whether between or within groups usually assured the victory of the strong, the healthy and the courageous over the weak, the physically disadvantaged and the cowardly. Today, a ninety-pound misfit can push the button that launches a

missile with a nuclear warhead — a missile which, if aimed correctly, may obliterate ten million people. Even though wars are now bigger and fiercer than ever, the men who fight them hardly ever see the enemy and almost all the killing is done at a distance. Today, survival in war or in less intensive forms of competition does little to encourage the physical and mental traits that favored survival in the past and that were key factors in plotting the course of man's biological progress.

Raymond B. Cattell, one of the world's foremost research psychologists, has gone one step further than Keith in his search for the most effective social catalysts of evolutionary advancement. Cattell points out that practically all the institutional pressures of modern civilization militate strongly against the natural selection that succeeded in creating man, not instantaneously out of a handful of dust, but out of a simian progenitor by a slow-acting biological upgrading that took millions of years. Rather than stimulate the greatest possible variation among human groups in order to accelerate evolutionary progress, modern intellectuals try to eliminate group differences by urging, and at times even forcing, racial amalgamation. The proper mission of the United Nations, according to Cattell, should be to keep human groups apart. Yet the UN Charter, which he calls the "hedonic pact," obliges the world organization to pursue an integrationist role. Cattell warns that such a policy, supported by the equalitarian ideology of liberal and minority social scientists, is now leading the world down the path of devolution.

Can the evolutionary precepts of Keith and Cattell, which follow logically from the ideas of such great evolutionists as Darwin, Galton, Spencer and T. H. Huxley, be rescued from almost total neglect and applied in the present-day United States? The magnitude of such a project automatically puts it in the class of a utopian exercise. The first step would have to be the physical separation of the different races, either by concentrating them in various parts of the country or by repatriation. With the technological means now available,

including the vast computerized transportation networks, the act of separation would not be as difficult as it seems. The chief problem would be the almost insuperable one of creating the appropriate intellectual climate.

Assuming such a gigantic project could be initiated, assuming a massive educational program could be inaugurated to dethrone the race-leveling theories that have reigned supreme in the U.S. for most of this century, assuming it could be possible to bring off a revolution in the news media as well as in the social order, we offer some tentative demographic blueprints for a commonwealth to be called The Utopian States of America.

As indicated previously, this adventure in induction will not be to portray an ideal commonwealth in the style of Plato and More or the ideal states described inferentially in the reverse utopias of Orwell and Aldous Huxley, but to suggest what must be done to produce the kind of superior human being that can make a utopia work. The methods and processes here developed will apply equally to any society. The primary aim is not to create a special culture, civilization or state, but to create the conditions which will make it possible for all human groups to develop their own particular social and cultural gifts in their own particular way. Only then will the biological preconditions of a utopia be met. Only then can diverse population groups converge on diverse utopias by following basic procedures that would provide the maximum flow of the evolutionary currents inherent in all human gene pools.

To divide America into a confederation of homogeneous population groups that are the modern equivalent of Keith's hunting bands and tribes will require the separation of the population, not only according to race, but also according to national origin and cultural background. We can explain the process by starting with the easiest part of this intricate demographic operation – the ways and means of precipitating the yellow race out of the American racial mix.

There are three fundamental divisions of the yellow race in

America: (1) Mongoloids of remote Asiatic origin (American Indians); (2) 19th and 20th century arrivals from China, Japan, Philippine Islands and other areas in Eastern Asia; (3) Mexicans and other Latin Americans who are a cross between white Mediterraneans and Mongoloids.

Compared to the staggering problems to be dealt with later, the physical separation of the Mongoloid racial groups, both from non-Mongoloids and from each other, will be relatively easy. Seventy percent of the nearly 800,000 American Indians, for example, already live on reservations. If the white government in Washington withdraws its control over these reservations and transforms them into autonomous Indian communities, it might not be too difficult to persuade the non-reservation Indians to return. With the realization that help from the outside is in itself a loss of independence, every effort should be made by both Indians and whites to insure that the new Indian communities become self-supporting as soon as possible. If more or better land is necessary to achieve this goal, it should be made available either from government-owned parks and wilderness areas or, if necessary, from private holdings. Since Indians had not progressed beyond the hunting stage of civilization when whites arrived, they should be allowed to make their new start in an environment as closely related to that stage as possible. In other words, they should not be lifted physically and spiritually into the 20th century, but should be permitted to cross this wide cultural bridge under their own power and following their own timetable. Who knows but what a very interesting cultural synthesis might develop under such conditions?

The physical separation and, where necessary, the relocation of the population groups from China, Japan and other East Asian areas would also be comparatively painless. About two-fifths of the nearly 600,000 Japanese-Americans and about half of the 200,000 Filipino-Americans are already domiciled in the Hawaiian Islands, while Oriental groups on the mainland (principally the Chinese) are already established

in separate enclaves. Orientals scattered elsewhere throughout the continental U.S. would be encouraged to move to such enclaves, if appropriate ones existed, or migrate to the Hawaiian Islands. Simultaneously the whites in Hawaii would return to the mainland, except for those directly connected with the defense establishment. If the time should come when there was no threat to American security in the Pacific area, the remaining whites would then leave the Islands, which would already have become a confederation of self-governing Oriental population groups separated according to national origin. One island, preferably Niihwa where some Polynesians already live in voluntary isolation from Caucasians and Mongoloids, should be reserved for the regeneration of the Polynesian race, whose Hawaiian members are now faced with extinction. At the last count there were only 12,000 pure Hawaiians left. It is exactly this kind of racial disintegration, caused largely by the cultural and economic intrusions of more dynamic peoples, which the Utopian States of America will attempt to prohibit.

Almost all the more than 5,000,000 Mexican-Americans living in the United States are already settled in the Southwest. The difficulty is to draw a northern boundary to delimit continuing northward expansion of this proliferating population group. Mexicans should be moved southward into areas where they comprise the overwhelming majority of the population. Concurrently, whites in these locations must leave and move north.

A band of territory reaching forty miles north of the present Mexican frontier and extending from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf of Mexico might provide enough living space for an independent Mexican-American nation. Whites would have to give up cities like San Diego, Yuma, El Paso and Brownsville — a not inconsiderable sacrifice — but well worth it if it would eliminate the racial strife and cultural confrontation between the two races that is on the increase throughout the entire Southwest. As whites vacate the forty-mile zone, Mexicans from the north would replace

them, and many of the racial problems now plaguing central California, Colorado and central Texas would go with them. One nonwhite enclave, however, would remain north of the new frontier to serve as a haven for the 250,000 Hispanos who have lived in New Mexico for almost 300 years, mostly in the Santa Fe region. The Hispanos have little or no cultural affinity for the Mexican-Americans who, unlike themselves, came after, not before, the Anglo occupation.

Sorting out and separating the Negro population in the U.S. is a problem of much greater magnitude. About half the 22,000,000 black Americans are located in the North, Midwest and Far West, mostly in large cities. The other half live in the South, where more and more of them are concentrated in metropolitan areas. In urban America the de facto separation of Negroes in hundreds of ghettos could become a de jure apartheid by enlarging the areas of the twenty biggest black communities to make room for blacks from cities where the Negro proportion of the population is relatively low. There would be no all-black cities because the Negroes are not yet technologically or economically geared to take over the operation of a large municipality. Their communities, however, would be self-governing cities within cities and their relationship with other population groups would be primarily economic. In the rural South there would be a formal division of the land into all-black and all-white counties.

Concurrent with the establishment of separate and independent Negro communities within the United States there should be a revival of the old idea of repatriating Negroes to Africa — an idea once supported by Lincoln and many other prominent white and Negro leaders. In its tremulous advance into the modern age, Africa would greatly benefit from the presence and assistance of American Negroes, many of whom would bring with them badly needed technical skills. There is even the possibility that when and if black Africans threaten to overwhelm the 3,500,000 white South Africans by sheer numbers, the latter

could be exchanged for a sizable segment of the American Negro population. The recent collapse of the Portuguese empire has done nothing to make this projected two-way migration less possible.

The separation of whites and blacks, though it would represent almost intolerable sacrifices on the part of the former, would produce immeasurable social rewards. The scabrous issues of busing, school integration and street crime (at least in white areas) would disappear almost overnight, together with the daily confrontations that are leading to an open conflict between the races. Separation would finally put the destiny of American Negroes where it belongs — on themselves. The only exception to separation would be the commuting of blacks to factories in white areas until such time as enough jobs could be provided by Negro enterprises. Other than this, there would be few contacts of any kind between the two races. It goes without saying that white financial and technological assistance would have to be provided to make Negro communities self-sustaining. But when Negroes are in complete charge of their own living space, when white landlords and white entrepreneurs are forbidden by law to own property or engage in business in Negro neighborhoods, blacks will have to cease blaming whites for their troubles and become self-reliant. The most effective way to cure a backward population group of voluntary or involuntary parasitism is to force its disassociation from the host body.

Puerto Ricans have many Negro genes, but they differ from Negroes in that they are Spanish speaking and have rather close ties to their island homeland. There are some 1,500,000 Puerto Ricans in the U.S., almost half in New York's Spanish Harlem. If this area could be sufficiently enlarged, it would be able to contain all the Puerto Ricans in the U.S. It could also serve as an embarkation point for Puerto Ricans who wish to return to the land of their birth. This migration is already underway as the result of the energy shortage, diminishing job opportunities and the ever more

intolerable living conditions in America's largest cities.

Moving over to the white side of the racial spectrum we find another Spanish-speaking population group — some 600,000 Cubans, most of whom arrived after the Castro takeover in 1959. The largest Cuban element is congregated in Miami and other parts of southeast Florida. It would seem that other Cuban-Americans would have little objection to joining their compatriots in this area, where the weather, geography and other environmental factors are more "Cuban" than elsewhere in the U.S. If and when Castro or his successors enter into some kind of detente with Washington — on the model of Nixon's rapprochement with Mao Tse-tung — many Cuban immigrants will return to Cuba and the remaining Cuban-Americans can be organized to function as a self-sustaining and separate community in the Miami area.

The Cuban-Americans represent only one of many Latin or Mediterranean minorities in the U.S. The largest of these is the Southern Italian population group, which is racially distinct from Italians of Northern and Central Italy. Of the 6,000,000 Americans of Southern Italian descent, almost one-third live in New York City and most of the rest are scattered about in other large metropolitan areas. The separation of Southern Italians, like that of urban Negroes, could be accomplished by their moving from cities where they represent a very small proportion of the population to the half dozen large cities where they compose a sizable segment of the inhabitants. Other Mediterranean minorities — from Portugal, Greece, Southern France, Spain and the Near East — should undergo the same process. In some cases the entire minority could be congregated around the demographic nucleus that already exists, such as the Greek settlement in Tarpon Springs, Florida.

Jews represent perhaps the most urgent item on the separation agenda. In nearly all their countries of residence history indicates that over the long term Jews have never have able to establish a constructive and peaceful relationship

with the non-Jewish population. From their stay in ancient Egypt up to the present, periods of integration and prosperity have almost always been followed by segregation, subjection, pogroms and expulsion. The only intelligent way to put an end to these depressing and seemingly endless cycles of pro- and anti-Semitism would be to sever Jews politically, economically and culturally from their host populations.

The establishment of separate Jewish enclaves in the U.S. would not be too difficult from a logistical and geographic standpoint. About one-third of America's 6,000,000 Jews already live in the New York metropolitan area and many of the remaining Jews are concentrated in Los Angeles and Miami Beach. Jews scattered in other parts of urban America could be resettled in these three cities with only a fraction of the trouble and effort it would take to solve the problem of Negro relocation. In New York, Jews could be given a borough and perhaps part of Long Island; in Los Angeles the Beverly Hills area; in Florida all of Miami Beach.

The separation of the Jewish community from the American body politic would have an additional advantage in that it would bring to a halt the almost irresistible Zionist pressure on Washington and the media to support Israel's neo-colonialist and neo-imperialist ventures in the Middle East. It was this policy, totally against the interest of America's non-Jews, that has permitted Russia to enter the Eastern Mediterranean as a champion of the Arabs, exacerbated America's energy crisis, turned 100,000,000 Arabs and 400,000,000 Moslems against the United States, and seriously weakened America's military alliance with Western Europe.

We have now proposed a few rough ideas for the concentration or relocation of America's unassimilable population groups. For such minorities separation would be obligatory. For the assimilable minorities, however, separation would not be obligatory and in most cases would not even be desirable, because a large proportion of their

members has already joined (or seems destined to join) the American Majority, the nation's largest population group and the one which, until recently, set the pattern of American life and manners. English immigrants originally comprised the racial backbone of the American Majority and those Northern Europeans who came later, among them the Scandinavians and Germans, have been largely absorbed in the Majority cultural complex. Except for the Irish, our assimilable minorities are mostly drawn from the New Immigration, which crested at the turn of the century. They include the French-Canadians, North and Central Italians, Finns, Poles, Russians and other Eastern Europeans. Although there are still many assimilable minority members in the United States who wish to preserve their ethnic identity and their Old World way of life, their racial and cultural differences are not sharp enough to prevent their eventual amalgamation with the Majority and the subordination of their special minority interests to the national interest, which is here defined as the Majority interest.

As should now be apparent, the Utopian States of America will not be an evenly balanced confederacy. It will be a Majority heartland with free cities or free states of Negroes, Indians, Mexicans, Jews, Mediterraneans and members of other unassimilable minorities. Because the continental economic system cannot be easily abandoned, because foreign predators will threaten North American security for some time to come, Majority and Minority America will still have to cooperate in developing common defense and economic policies, though overall control and implementation of these policies will remain in the hands of the Majority. But only in the event of a military attack will Majority armed forces be permitted to penetrate the minority communities, and no economic planning will be forced upon any minority community without the latter's full approval. Beyond a certain measure of military and economic association, the former of which may eventually disappear if

the American utopia is imitated on a world wide scale, there will be no further contacts between the various population groups. Even the usual diplomatic and cultural relationships between sovereign states will be largely curtailed to reduce to an absolute minimum any recurrence of the domestic racial frictions and power plays that brought the Old America to the edge of extinction. Also, the day will have passed when soaring, or unequal birth rates allow one population group to enlarge its territory at the expense of another.

But the separation proposed above does not begin to approach the demographic compartmentalization required for the most efficient play of evolutionary forces. In both the Majority and Minority communities, municipal and rural planning must provide for the breakdown of the population into groupings, if not as small as Keith's hunting band, at least no larger than the prehistoric and historic tribal organizations which set the stage for the evolutionary quantum jumps that have produced the finer specimens of modern man. The esthetic and social disasters of the large cities and the sprawling urbanized suburbs must be fragmented into small population units, each with its own schools, college, theater, library and other cultural accessories.

The Utopian States of America will be dedicated to the proposition that the principal agents of high civilization are a collection of small racially linked communities populated or dominated by a gifted and homogeneous people with a relatively uniform cultural and genetic background. It is true that a subject race may be present, as in ancient Greece, medieval Europe and the antebellum South. But nothing of great cultural consequence has ever occurred in a country where power was shared by two or more races. Homogeneity, or at least a hierarchical and institutionalized heterogeneity, seems to be the basic prerequisite of high culture. And even in those high civilizations where there has been a dominant and a subject race the latter has been a lurking cancer ready to flare up and kill the social organism that nourished it.

The most utopian picture of the Utopian States of America consists of a colorful mosaic of small nation states and free municipalities, a thousand Athens and Florences, each with a differentiated gene pool, a differentiated way of life and differentiated styles of art, literature and music, all busily competing with each other in the evolutionary pentathlon. Variety, always the spice of life, will be the form of life. If it is at all possible to root it out of man, war will be transformed into ritualized, intramural athletic and cultural contests in which the martial spirit will still stimulate men to heroic acts, but this time without the dysgenic counterpoint of bullets and hydrogen bombs.

Chapter Fourteen

MORALITY AS A WEAPON

A perceptive critic of an advance copy of the previous essay wondered if I was not showing unmistakable symptoms of "respectability." His point was well taken. Every writer of underground literature (deep underground, not the commercial underground publications that sell by the hundreds of thousands) seeks to expand his minuscule audience. Every such writer knows that a drop of saccharine attracts more acolytes than a gallon of diatribe.

Nevertheless, no matter how desperately he may crave it, no American who writes objectively on racial issues is likely to achieve even the smallest measure of respectability in his lifetime. I am afraid that I will have to bear the mark of Cain for as long as I can hold up a pen. No amount of soap (or softsoap) will ever wash off or get rid of what the liberal-minority coalition would call my ideological blemishes. Even more dismaying is that anyone who honestly attempts to grapple with the Jewish problem has to live by the same ground rules that earlier ages imposed on lepers.

No, I was not shooting for respectability, but I was testing some old ideas in new contexts in an effort to make them more digestible than my usual incendiary didactics. I had grown so tired of receiving rambling tirades about what the x verse of the y chapter of the Book of Daniel says about the present world situation, so tired of hearing about the Zionist cabal which sits behind Brezhnev's throne in the Kremlin, so weary of being lectured on the lost tribes, spontaneous creation, identity and that wicked old atheist Darwin that I decided to sit down and write some pages that might possibly earn me one brief nod among the million frowns with which the average liberal or politically non-aligned reader greets my

work, when by some miracle it manages to knock an isolated chink in the Great Wall of censorship and comes to his attention.

If my perceptive critic's unenthusiastic reaction is typical, I will have to describe my brief excursion into utopianism as a bad trip. To make amends, to preserve the thought at the expense of jettisoning the style, I shall restate my argument in a down-to-earth, bare knuckles language which will be hopefully free of any shred of respectability, though my critic will probably find that I have committed worse crimes before I finish.

I will get directly into the polemical mood by saying I would gladly sacrifice the entire American Majority, if I thought there was the faintest chance that our race had reached the stage of degeneration where its acts, its attitudes and its mere existence were tending to reverse or endanger the course of human evolution. My first loyalty is not to any race, but to raising *Homo sapiens* to a higher species.

But since I am convinced that the best way to accelerate evolution is to liberate our people (Americans of Northern European descent) from the increasing horde of human parasites which have fastened on to our body politic, I must take up the cudgels for the Majority and assume the mantle of a Majority racist, even though my perceptive critic says I really do not qualify for the title. This does not mean, however, that I am for the suppression of races other than my own. It means only that I am for the separation of races. Suppression, I believe, would lead to repercussions that might bring about the destruction of our race. Separation, difficult as it may seem in the present climate of fanatic equalitarianism and racial leveling, is a much more practical goal.

Separation, to my mind, carries with it a minimum of danger. There is, for example, no possibility that, if left to their own devices either in walled-off enclaves in America or in their native compounds in the African bush, blacks would ever be a threat to anyone except themselves. Nothing, in my

opinion, would stop the black population explosion faster than to give blacks independence. The recent Biafra war is just one indication of how blacks can be counted on to provide a kind of "final solution" to their own population problems.

The terms "racial separation" and "independence," as I define them, do not indicate moving a race to some particular geographical area, allowing it to set up a limited form of self-government under the eyes of scores of white advisers and then subsidizing it from here to eternity with white dollars and white technology. Racial separation, to me, stands for separation to the point of complete independence from the political, economic and cultural influences of other races.

The spiraling population of the Third World continues to spiral only because the white world has upset the colored races' historic equilibrium of local food resources, birthrate and life span. In the name of helping the disadvantaged, in the name of brotherhood and human rights, we are exacerbating a situation which in the end will produce far more suffering and chaos for the receivers (not to mention the givers) than would have been the case if whites had never penetrated the colored world.

Remove Russian aid from Cuba and the Castro regime would collapse in a few months, unless another foreign godfather was immediately found to fill in the vacuum. Deprive the Latin American minorities in the U.S. or the Latin American countries of Majority or Northern European technological assistance and their explosive population growth would come to a whimpering halt. The same pattern of isolation would produce the same effect in India and in the "developing nations" of Africa. Let us assume the Jews were precipitated out of the world population mix and had to go it on their own. Israel would immediately have to seek an accommodation with the Arabs. The Middle East would no longer be the chronic flash point of worldwide nuclear war. Class war and cultural degeneration, the hallmarks of the

Jewish presence in the West, would no longer be major social diseases

Such are the instant dividends we could expect from racial separation. Those who disagree might recommend a new wave of imperialism or the reimposition of a system of slavery or serfdom as a better solution to the foreign and domestic challenges of the colored races. Let us hope we have finally learned enough about the dangers of race-mixing to understand that any form of interracial contact sooner or later gives bleeding hearts and truant gonads the opportunity to break down ethnic barriers.

As a further advantage, racial separation contains an interesting escape clause. Suppose, as our doomsayers exultingly declaim, the Northern European segment of the white race is on its last legs. Suppose there is some organic Spenglerian timetable which is ringing in our proximate demise. If there was racial separation, there would still be scores of other races or subraces ready to take up the evolutionary burden. I don't think they have the capability. But if we should fail, it doesn't seem sensible to arrange matters so that everyone will fail.

As an egotistic member of history's greatest gene pool, I want my team to keep ahead in the evolutionary race. But if we have to drop out, in no case do I want the race to be cancelled. If my team cannot win, I don't want to prevent others from winning.

I was gently reprimanded by my critic for being more "tactical" than truthful when I tell my readers that the real racists in this country are the minority racists and the real bigots are the liberal bigots, and when I imply that the Majority, although it represents more than sixty percent of the American population, should act like a disadvantaged minority.

For the life of me, I can't see how anyone now living in the U.S. can say that the Majority, compared to most other population groups in the country, is not a persecuted race. Majority members are not killing blacks. Blacks are killing

Majority members—and at a much higher rate than the lynchings of yesteryear, each one of which created a media firestorm. All important channels of public communication and almost the entire governmental process are now deliberately rigged against the Majority. Since the economy would collapse overnight without the Majority work force and the Majority work ethic, we are still permitted to enjoy a modicum of personal liberty. But our freedom stops at the doors of Congress, the Supreme Court and the nearest TV station.

To think we are not the pariahs of the American social order is to totally misunderstand current history. The rhetoric about freedom and human rights, which liberal-minority demagogues employed so successfully in their takeover of power, no longer describes their situation but ours.

Since the media and academia are stacked against the Majority, our racism cannot possibly achieve the respectability of minority racism. But if we cannot be respectable, we can with some degree of effort be more “moral,” or at least less “immoral,” a statement which will no doubt send another shiver of annoyance through the neural network of my perceptive critic.

I say this not because I am a moralist, but because I think I know enough about human nature, particularly the human nature of Majority members, to realize that when it comes to politics they respond more vigorously to moral appeals than to any other kind. Just as long as the Majority does not put a moral smokescreen around its racial aspirations, just so long will the minorities, who are accustomed to requisition all the available morality for themselves, win the war.

Strong biological reasons can be adduced for certain types of racial repression. But the very mention of such an idea in public is the surest guarantee that it will never get off the ground. If you want to overthrow a society, let us say, that speaks Esperanto, you must learn to speak and write Esperanto. The political language of present-day America is

not the king's English. It is moral English.

One of the great sources of Jewish power is the Jews' ability to carry on the game of permanent revolution in the language of the nation in which they happen to reside. This does not mean that they develop any great proficiency in the grammar of their adopted language. In fact, one of my learned correspondents maintains that he can detect evidence of "Jewish pidgin," in every article written by a Jewish intellectual. Certainly poor grammar and pronunciation have not in the past been a great disadvantage to Jewish magnates, whether in Hollywood or in the Department of State. Where the Jews do excel in the field of linguistics, however, is in the use of moral language.

We should take a leaf from their book. For example, we should never talk about apartheid, only about the racial autonomy that will give Negroes a better chance to improve their political, economic and social status. Busing is bad, not because it destroys the white neighborhood school, but the black neighborhood school. We should never refer to racial superiority or inferiority, only talk about racial differences, carefully avoiding all value judgments. White supremacy is considered highly immoral by "public opinion," but millions of Negroes and whites are able to detect some morality in the notion of independent group achievement. Racism is now thought to be more immoral than incest. But if it is a sin to be a Majority racist, then perhaps it is one-quarter of a sin to be a Jewish racist. Zero population growth, it seems, is de rigeur for Majority members, though it is quite all right for minority members to reinforce their political ascendancy by widespread proliferation. Consequently, we must not criticize Negroes for having large families, but we can suggest that they limit the number of their offspring until whites can provide them with a better environment. We should not attack Negroes for being overrepresented in crime. We should remind them that if, as they say, it is white racism that drives them to criminal activities, then this deleterious state of affairs would automatically cease if the white presence was

removed. Negro prisoners, we might add, need Negro prisons if they are to get the effective rehabilitation that every Negro criminal claims as his right. Let us go along with the Negroes' desire to attend college regardless of their academic qualifications. But let us show them that they will do much better in a Negro college, where there will be many more black studies classes and where less important courses such as English literature, ancient history, physics and engineering will not clutter up the curriculum. Jews tell us that they are being discriminated against in commercial banking and big industry. We should tell them that we are being discriminated against in Hollywood, in TV, in newspaper jobs, in private banking and in the jewelry trade.

The above are just a few examples of how morality can be put to work on behalf of the Majority. Isn't it time for the descendants of the super-moralists who founded New England, wrote the Declaration of Independence, fought the Civil War and made the world safe for democracy to use their innate expertise in ethical propaganda for the preservation of their own threatened race?

I feel that my perceptive critic should understand that there may be a great political advantage, if not in respectability in general, at least in moral respectability. I might go further and say that no resurrection of the American Majority will take place unless it is accomplished in a manner that is considered morally respectable. The Pilgrims did not land in Massachusetts to decimate the Indians, which they did, but to build a city of God, which they did not. If they had been frank enough to discuss the real problems that faced them, instead of harping on their moral purpose, the Mayflower would probably have remained in the rum trade.

If I may be excused for putting words in my perceptive critic's mouth, I am certain he agrees with me that our people are superior to every other in almost every category of human endeavor. But I must go on and ask, if he is so convinced, can he not see the wisdom of developing moral arguments to make it easier for the hardpressed Majority to

cash in on its assumed superiority?

If we are superior, then all we need is the chance to prove it — not by words but by works. Abhorrent as it may sound, why should the Majority not come out more strongly for enforcement of civil rights, since we are now being discriminated against in education and employment, and can no longer get a fair trial before racially mixed juries. The pusillanimous Supreme Court, for example, recently refused to rule on a case where a law school applicant (ironically a Sephardic Jew) was refused admittance to make room for a less qualified black. Majority members are facing the same process of exclusion in hundreds of colleges throughout the country but, apathetic as ever, have refused to bring the matter to court. The Majority Justices of the Supreme Court, also apathetic as ever, have refused to defend the rights of the Majority by hiding their heads in the sand.

Abhorrent as it may sound, why should we not urge the signing of the Genocide Convention, originally intended as a restriction on our freedom of speech, but which now might turn out to our advantage, since we are becoming the most likely victims of genocide and since the minorities are causing our ethnic group, in the language of the Convention, immense “mental harm” every hour of the day. Since books defending the Majority are censored at the source or do not get published at all except by impecunious and unknown publishers, the *Genocide Convention*, if enforced, would make unlawful the publication of the minority bestsellers that are now calling for our destruction. If not enforced, the double standard that is denying the Majority the right to argue for its own survival, while supporting those who propose the Majority’s annihilation, could serve as the most convincing proof to date that the judiciary has become an agent of minority racism and consequently the arch perverter of the Bill of Rights.

If there really was such a thing as equal opportunity in this country, and if Majority members are on the average more gifted than members of other races, there would be no doubt who would get to the top of the ladder. The truth is,

unfortunately, that there is no equal opportunity, either in education, politics, business or whatever. There never was in the past when the Majority was "in." There is no such thing in the present, when the Majority is "out." Affirmative action programs now give a decided edge in the battle of survival to the colored races, while minority racism, which puts group rights above individual rights, creates and implements foreign and domestic policies that work for the minority interest and against the Majority interest.

All that we really need to prevail is a fair shake—the age-old moral appeal that has so often worked political and economic wonders. Right now since we are in desperate need of a few such miracles, I propose we adopt this tried and tested "underdog line" in an effort to recoup our losses.

To conclude, I would like to suggest that some Majority members remind me of that old royal madman, Lear. They have lost their kingdom, lost all the substance and the trappings of their power, yet they still believe they are kings. They fancy themselves the salt of the earth, yet they are little better than the scum of the earth. They have sunk so low that they literally have to betray their own ideas, their own institutions and their own people in order to enjoy even a small measure of political, economic or academic success. How much worse off can anyone get?

If there was ever a race which had a moral case, it is the Dispossessed Majority. Yet there has never been a people more reluctant to use it. Perhaps we are so blinded by our defeats that we still cannot see our plight in a moral perspective. Until we do, our curve is likely to remain on the downside.

About The Author

Wilmot Robertson was born in Philadelphia, back in the days when America was America. He went to an Ivy League college, studied abroad and, after doing his best to keep the U.S. out of World War II, fought in the North African and Italian campaigns as a combat engineer officer. When the war ended he wasted some precious years in a Madison Avenue advertising agency, then studied physics at Berkeley. Business finally beckoned and he started a small scientific company in the San Francisco Bay Area, accumulating enough funds in the process to take a few years off and put the finishing touches on the manuscript that eventually was published as *The Dispossessed Majority*. Mr. Robertson now has a mundane job in Florida and in his spare moments, in addition to writing a sequel to *Ventilations*, is trying to help Howard Allen become an influential publisher of books designed to dispel the woeful ignorance that conceals the true causes of the Majority's dispossession.